

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1848.

No. I.

ART. I.—*Suggestions on the Religious Instruction of the Negroes in the Southern States; together with an appendix, containing forms of Church Registers, form of a constitution and plans of different denominations.* By Charles Colcock Jones, D.D. Philadelphia. Presbyterian Board of Publication. 1847.

MANY centuries ago, a holy seer said, "Ethiopia shall soon stretch out her hand unto God." In view of the fulfilment of this prophecy, the royal bard called for a song of universal praise. The words next succeeding this prediction are, "Sing unto God, ye kingdoms of the earth: O sing praises unto the Lord." The writings of Jeremiah inform us who the 'Ethiopians were, when he speaks of them as contra-distinguished from the rest of the race by their colour, as the leopard is from the rest of the feline tribe by his spots.

The first step in the providence of God towards an amelioration of the spiritual condition of the negro race, was their dispersion among other races of mankind. This work, both cruel and bloody, had not been completed, when Christian philanthropy, ever vigilant, sought them out in bondage, and bore to

suggest the most edifying form. Even the reading of the scriptures alone morning and evening in the family, solemnly called together for that purpose, would not be unavailing; nor after such a beginning, would prayer, and where practicable, psalmody, be long neglected.

There are auspicious signs in the movement of the mind of the church on this subject. We trust the Holy Spirit is in the movement. He evidently calls for a nearer conformity of our thoughts to the methods of his own work. The hope of such improvement is encouraged by several facts. That simultaneous impulses in the same direction come from different quarters of the church; that high and strong ground is so firmly taken, and that a pious purpose is so fully declared of pressing the truth respecting family religion and salvation on the conscience of the church, are indications of what we will call the family revival. It is now a time of interesting suspense. We are looking for good to Zion. The sects of the church are turning their eyes expressively on one another. We are inquiring for the old paths. The foundations of the church are presented to be explored anew. The principles of unity, the nature of faith, the laws of church growth, and the distinguishing properties of the church itself, are coming up in spirited review. It is a healthful, a delightful process; and such works as the one now before us, so timely, instructive and attractive, will contribute to render it a permanent blessing.

JAN
ART. V.—*A Commentary on the Book of Leviticus, Expository and Practical, with Critical Notes.* By the Rev. Andrew A. Bonar, Collace; Author of *Memoirs of Rev. Robert McCheyne, Narrative of a Mission of Inquiry to the Jews, etc. etc.* London. 1846. 8vo. pp. 500. *flu*

THE central mass, both of the history and antiquities of the Old Testament, is the Mosaic Legislation. Its relative importance may be fairly stated thus. The only way in which the parts of the Old Testament can be brought into agreement, so as

to constitute one harmonious whole, is by assuming, that what goes before the Law of Moses was intended to prepare the way for it, and that what follows was designed to show how far it was observed, departed from, or modified in later times. Nor is this true only of the history. The prophecies bear a definite relation to the law, without due regard to which they are almost unintelligible. The same is true, though in a less degree, of the remaining books. This subject, therefore, furnishes a key to the entire Old Testament, and cannot but be of great importance to the proper understanding of the New.

These considerations render it a matter of rejoicing, that this part of the divine revelation is again attracting the attention of so many able writers, not in one church or country merely, which might lead to an exaggeration of onesided views, without any general advancement of our knowledge, but in various schools and languages. From every imaginable point of view, in all conceivable directions, and with the aid of the most diverse optical appliances, a multitude of keen observant eyes have been, within a few years, turned anew to this great object. The results of this manifold investigation are not only inconsistent with each other, but often individually most extravagant. Believing, however, as we do, that some acquaintance with the progress of opinion, in such cases, is conducive to the strength of orthodox convictions, we propose to take a rapid view of the subject, as it has been treated by the latest writers known to us. We offer no apology for connecting this synopsis with the work of Mr. Bonar, which, though eminently pious in its tone and spirit, and exceedingly instructive as to many interesting points, is really an exhibition of but one among the many phases which the subject has assumed, and quite deficient in comprehensive and preparatory statements, such as might have furnished the materials of a general introduction. Contenting ourselves, therefore, with a hearty recommendation of the book, as one of the most truly evangelical and edifying lately published, we shall waive all special criticism, except in the form of incidental observations, growing out of a more general survey and exhibition of the subject.

The first topic of inquiry and discussion, among those who have given their attention to the Mosaic Legislation, is the form in which it is recorded. The record is contained in the last four books of the Pentateuch, to which the first is a historical intro-

duction. The fifth book is distinguished from the other three, as a recapitulation, delivered at one time, and in the form peculiarly adapted to a popular address. The remaining three books, Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, are really one continuous composition or official record, the division, although ancient, being only for convenience. These books contain the Law of Moses, in the strict and proper sense. It is, therefore, to the form of these that we must first give our attention.

Their grand peculiarity is this, that they consist of two distinguishable elements, combined in an unusual manner. One of these is the Legislation, properly so called, a series of minute yet laconic regulations, directly opposite in form to the endless iterations and synonymies of modern statute-books. These laws, instead of being wrought into a system, or standing insulated by themselves, are interrupted yet connected by a running narrative, with dates and geographical specifications, at unequal intervals. To account for this peculiar form, several hypotheses have been proposed, the principal of which it may be proper very briefly to enumerate. In doing this, we shall begin with the lowest and least plausible, and gradually rise to what we believe to be the true ground.

It may seem incredible, that some of the Germans have been able to persuade themselves, or at least have attempted to persuade their readers, that the Law of Moses, as we have it in the Pentateuch, is not only far posterior in date to his times, but exhibits an entirely different state of things from that which then existed. Some have even gone so far as to deny that Moses and his contemporaries were monotheists. If this were so, it would hardly be worth while to believe that such a person ever lived. This extravagance may serve as an example of the cool audacity, with which the same class of writers can reject the testimony of all history and all tradition, and yet expect their own insane imaginations, on the self-same subjects, to be swallowed and digested.

Some, who recoil from this extreme, maintain, however, that the minute and comprehensive code of laws, now extant in the Pentateuch, is the product of a later age, invented for the purpose of imparting to existing institutions the authority and sanction of remote antiquity. But this leaves the origin of the institutions themselves entirely unaccounted for, and nothing can be more absurd than to reject a traditional explanation of notorious

facts, if intrinsically credible, when there is nothing to supply its place. This theory is also refuted by the numberless allusions to the circumstances, under which the law was given, and which a later writer, in the case alleged, neither could nor would have forged.

Another theory concedes a partial antiquity to the Law of Moses, but denies its unity and systematic character, regarding it either as an accidental combination of heterogeneous fragments, or as a laborious compilation of documents, belonging to many different dates and authors.

Out of this chaos of confused opinions light at length begins to spring, by the admission, on the part of the same writers, or at least of the same school, that the Law undoubtedly contains Mosaic elements, though few and dubious, and mixed with an immense amount of later matter. By slow degrees, this genuine portion of the Law has been becoming, in the microscopic view of these infallible observers, more and more extensive, till at last it is announced, as the result of the most searching analysis by some of them, that, with few exceptions, the entire legislative portion of these books is as old as Moses, and perhaps recorded by himself. As a salvo to the pride of skeptical criticism, this concession is still coupled with a positive assertion, that the historical portion of the same books is of later date.

We are far from looking upon these results of skeptical inquiry as entirely negative and unimportant. It is true, they bring us back, by a circuitous process, to the ground already occupied for ages by the church; but then they bring us back with the advantage, unattainable in any other way, of having tried all other grounds and found them utterly untenable. The gravity with which this class of critics sometimes tell us, as a fresh discovery of their own, what our fathers and our fathers' fathers knew before us, is often ludicrous enough. Their position is like that of persons walking blindfold, who have stumbled unawares upon the very spot from which they started, and of course look very foolish when the bandage is removed. But foolish as they look, and as they sometimes are, their testimony has its value, for the reason above stated, in explaining why we dwell upon the late concession of some German critics, as to the antiquity and genuineness of the Law.

This concession has at last been pushed so far as to admit,

that the legislative portion of these books is not only ancient and genuine, but methodical, the whole law, in the strict sense, forming a regular connected system. One of the latest forms which this view of the matter has assumed may interest some readers by its very novelty and ingenuity. It may also serve to show that even in returning to the old paths an inventive genius may discover something new. One of the younger living orientlists of Germany, Bertheau of Göttingen, who is far from falling under the description of "foolish," being eminent both for his talents and acquirements, was led to institute a searching scrutiny of these three books, in the hope, according to his own account, of proving them to be a heterogeneous mixture. The actual result of his researches was not only to convince him that the parts were perfectly harmonious, but also to disclose a fact before unsuspected and of great importance, as a proof of unity in the composition. Setting out from the Decalogue or Ten Commandments, he was led by analogy to the conclusion, that the Law is full of Decalogues, and that these are grouped, with a surprising regularity, by sevens. The general formula, to which he reduces the whole system, is, seven groups, in each group seven series, in each series ten commandments.

There would be something very captivating in this scheme, if its details were in exact correspondence with its general idea. But, as in most other cases of the same sort, on descending to particulars, we find that the exact regularity, which constitutes the beauty of the theory, can only be secured by clipping and paring, striking out as spurious, or of later date, whatever overruns the prescribed bounds. In making these distinctions, it is evident, moreover, that the author is guided, not so much by any critical principle whatever, as by the conditions of his own hypothesis. In other words, he imagines reasons for rejecting what he no doubt would retain without a scruple, if it just made up the necessary number. In this way he robs Peter to pay Paul, by taking back with one hand what he gives with the other. In the very act of proving the consistency and unity of the Mosaic legislation, he introduces a false principle of criticism, no less injurious or groundless than the corresponding process, by which Ewald and others expunge from the poetical books whatever will not fit into the arbitrary frame-work of an imaginary strophical arrangement. At the same time, we have no

doubt as to the truth of the main facts, upon which Bertheau erects his theory, to wit, the regular structure of the Legislation, and the predominance of the numbers ten and seven, in determining its form. The explanation of this latter circumstance would lead us into an inquiry, curious and by no means unimportant, but beyond the limits of our present purpose.

One inference from these facts, which to us seems irresistible, is rejected by Bertheau himself on very insufficient grounds. The unity and systematic form of the legislative passages create, we think, the strongest possible presumption, that the history, with which it is so intimately blended, partakes of the same character. Nothing could be *a priori* more unlikely than that any later writer should undertake to separate the parts of a digested code of laws, by interspersing them with stories of his own invention. The wildest license of fictitious composition, in our own day, although it has run riot in corrupting history, has never dreamed of thus embellishing the Pandects or the Statutes at Large. In the case before us, such a supposition might be reckoned less improbable, if the narratives were evidently meant to furnish the historical occasion of the legislation. But that this is generally not the case, is one of Bertheau's strongest reasons for denying both to be coeval. He proceeds upon the supposition, that the history, if genuine, could only be intended to explain the circumstances out of which the legislation grew, not merely in the general, but in each particular instance. But if invented for this purpose, why was it not so invented as to answer the purpose? Besides, he has unfortunately overlooked another supposition, far more natural in itself, and affording a more satisfactory solution of the facts. This is the old and obvious supposition, that the laws are given in the very order of their promulgation, the intermediate and synchronous events being recorded in their proper places. Certain laws and certain narratives are put together, not because they were intended to explain each other, but because they came together in fact.

The correct view, therefore, of the *form* of the Mosaic Legislation is, that it is regular and systematic, that is, one in purpose and harmonious in detail, but recorded in the order of its promulgation. It differs from a formal system, such as some would find in it, just as a modern Statute Book or Digest differs from the Journal of a Legislative Body, in which the enactments are

recorded at length. It is a code of laws inserted in a frame of history. To this fact due regard must be had in the interpretation of the laws themselves.

But what is the internal character and purpose of the Law thus recorded? This is the second question which presents itself, and which must be disposed of, as an indispensable preliminary to the just interpretation of the Law itself. It has accordingly received a due share of attention from the various writers on the general subject. Leaving out of view individual eccentricities of judgment, there are three hypotheses, in reference to this point, which have greatly influenced the scientific treatment, and less directly the popular impression of the whole subject.

The first is the doctrine of some early writers, still extensively adopted, and familiar to most readers on the subject. It supposes the Law of Moses to contain two distinct and entire systems, one of religious worship and ecclesiastical organization, the other of civil and political government. Both these systems are supposed to be exhibited with almost equal prominence and fulness, and the particular enactments are referred to one or the other, as appears most natural.

The second theory is that propounded by John David Michaelis, in his celebrated work on the Mosaic Law. The real, although not the avowed principle of that work is, that the Law of Moses was a civil institution, and that its highest praise is that of a consummate legislative wisdom and sagacious policy. In carrying out this radical idea, which he does with rare ingenuity and learning, he is guilty of extravagances tending to lower both his subject and himself. As for instance, when he represents all the ceremonial laws of cleanness and uncleanness, with respect to things and persons, as police regulations, intended to secure habitual cleanliness and to preserve the public health. A much more serious objection to this theory is, that it deliberately puts out of view, as far as possible, the great ends of the legislative system, and reduces it to a level with those of Solon and Lycurgus. The remaining faith in the divine authority of the Mosaic Legislation, which Michaelis professedly, and perhaps really, entertained, was founded upon early education, and at variance with his doctrines, so that his disciples, as in all such cases, held fast to the latter and gave up the former.

A third hypothesis reverses this view of the matter, and assumes the Mosaic Legislation, as we have it in the Pentateuch, to be entirely a religious system. What appears to be purely civil or political in its enactments is supposed to be introduced on account of its connexion with religion, or, in some cases, to be not so much legal as moral in its character. Thus Hengstenberg explains the provision for the poor, and the prohibition of certain acts, and even feelings, which could never practically fall under the cognizance of any human magistrate or court of justice. This theory does not involve a denial, that the Israelites of the Mosaic period had a civil government distinct from their religious institutions. It only denies that it was any part of the design of the existing revelation to describe these civil institutions fully. What we know of them we know from incidental statements in the history itself, or in connexion with religious and ecclesiastical enactments. It assumes that the whole Mosaic Legislation, as we have it, is a system of religious rites and government, the influence of which upon civil institutions made it unavoidable to exhibit some of these, while most of them are mentioned, either not at all or only incidentally.

The main objection to this doctrine, in the form here given to it, is, that it appears to presuppose the existence of a contemporary civil constitution not described in scripture. Now was this constitution a mere human device or a divine ordinance? The former supposition seems at variance with the whole drift and tenor of the history of Israel, as a peculiar people, every part of whose experience was determined by a special divine guidance and control. If, on the other hand, their civil constitution was as much a divine ordinance as their religious system, why is it not equally included in the record, which describes so minutely the whole progress of the people from its birth to its rejection?

Perhaps the best mode of avoiding these objections, and of presenting the whole subject in its true light, is by adhering to the idea of a Theocracy, in the strict sense, as extending both to civil and religious institutions, or rather as excluding the distinction altogether, because founded in a difference of circumstances, which appears to be at variance with the very idea of a theocracy, if that name be supposed to mean anything more than providential government, to which all nations are alike subjected.

If we once admit, that all the national concerns of Israel were under an extraordinary guidance from above, it becomes unnecessary to assume a twofold constitution, since all public affairs were, in a certain sense, religious, because all designed for a religious purpose, and divinely ordered so as to secure it. Under such a dispensation, things, which with us require a double machinery, could be effected by a single undivided organization. The whole nation was a kingdom of priests. Its rulers therefore were religious rulers. In providing for the spiritual wants of the people, provision was effectually made for many of their most important secular interests, or such as must be secular in our case, from the total difference of our situation. Those regulations of the Law, which seem to have least of a religious character, are not then to be looked upon as fragments of another system, accidentally and partially disclosed, but as the more subordinate and less important parts of that which is described at length.

Whether this be regarded as a fourth hypothesis, or as a modification of the third, it will be seen that, while they differ in the relative position they assign to the more secular provisions of the Law, they agree in giving the priority to that part of the system which relates to the distinguishing religious institutions of the people, and which, from its peculiar character, is commonly called the Ceremonial Law. As every thing else in the Mosaic Legislation is directly or indirectly shaped by this, and must therefore be interpreted by it, the Ceremonial Law may be said to occupy the same fundamental or central place in the legislative system, that the latter, considered as a whole, does in the history and antiquities of the Old Testament.

A third question, therefore, which has occupied and divided the writers on this subject, both in earlier and later times, is the question as to the specific purpose of this ceremonial system, considered as a part, and an important part, of the great scheme of preparation for the coming of Christ. We may here, if only to save room for something better, set aside those theories which rest upon an infidel or antichristian basis, and confine our view to those which hold the common ground of an intimate relation between the institutions of the Old and New Testament. These are in fact so numerous, that only some of the more striking variations can be even superficially described. Of the skeptical hypotheses a sufficient sample has been given in considering the

form of the Mosaic Legislation. Nothing more will here be requisite than simply to record the fact, that some modern writers still explain the Ceremonial Law as the accidental product of a gradual process of refinement, acting on the horrors and absurdities of heathenism; while others hold, that all its parts may be supposed to have arisen from a transfer of the forms familiar in the oriental courts to the worship of the Deity, the sanctuary being nothing but his palace, the priests his ministers of state, the sacrifices feasts, &c. If the first of these hypotheses could be maintained without absurdity, history would no longer have a use or meaning, as its place might be more than filled by imaginative fiction. The other theory, although it does not utterly ignore all history, reverses its decisions, making that the source which experience shows to be the stream, and vice versa. The practice of the ancient oriental courts was to borrow the form of civil homage from the rites of religious worship, not to lend it to them.

But without dwelling longer on these monstrous obliquities of judgment or invention, let us look for a moment at the points of agreement and of difference among those who acknowledge a special divine purpose in the forms of the Mosaic Legislation, and especially in those of the Ceremonial Law. Among such there can be no dispute, as to its systematic unity, nor as to the general fact of its prospective reference to the times of the New Testament. They are also agreed in ascribing to the system an important moral purpose, and a corresponding actual effect, in preserving Israel from the corruptions of the neighbouring nations, not indeed wholly, but to such a degree as to give them an exalted relative position in the ancient world. Another undisputed purpose is that of saving them, not only from the deepest moral debasement, but from those religious errors which it always accompanies, and which may all be summed up in Idolatry. But neither of these ends could be even partially secured if unrestricted intercourse with the surrounding heathen were permitted. It is, therefore, furthermore agreed among the writers now in question, that the Ceremonial Law was intended to secure the segregation of the chosen people till the end of the restrictive and preparatory dispensation. But with all these strong points of agreement, the question still remains, what more was the Ceremonial Law intended to accomplish? In deter-

mining this question, those who were agreed on all the other points, diverge essentially from one another.

Some reply, that nothing more whatever was intended; that the objects which have been already mentioned are sufficiently important to account for the complexity and rigour of the system; that if the Israelites were kept apart for ages from all other nations, and thereby preserved from idolatry, with its concomitant and consequent corruptions, we have no need to look further for the meaning and design of the whole law or of any of its parts, the peculiar form of which may have been derived, either directly or by contrast, from those false religions with which the people had been most familiar, or arbitrarily selected with a view to make the whole more coercive and distinctive. This is, in fact though not in form, the principle of Spencer's great work on the Hebrew Ritual, which has done so much to influence the views of later writers, both in England and in other countries. It has been more especially a favourite with those who were least attached to the distinguishing truths of Christianity, and most disposed to a lax and liberal theology. By the rationalists of Germany it has, of course, been carried out still further; but we are speaking now exclusively of doctrines held by writers who acknowledge the divine authority of the Scriptures in general, and of the Mosaic Legislation in particular.

In opposition to this negative hypothesis, the stricter sect of orthodox and evangelical interpreters have strenuously urged, that it supposes a complete stagnation of the chosen people for a course of ages, during which, although externally more pure, they were scarcely more enlightened than the heathen. When to this it is replied, that the people possessed spiritual views of God and of moral truth, otherwise communicated, this only makes it still less probable, that no such views were embodied in the Ceremonial Law itself. It is also urged in opposition to this theory, that it robs the Mosaic dispensation of that pedagogic and preparatory character, so constantly ascribed to it in the New Testament. If the design of the Ceremonial Law was merely negative, it could not be said to have prepared the way for the coming of Christ; it could, at most, only keep the people, through a course of ages, as they were at first. The force of these objections cannot be consistently denied by any who admit the exegetical authority of the New Testament.

Under the influence of these considerations, the great mass of evangelical interpreters, especially in former times, have made it a main object, in their expositions of the ceremonial law, to shun the error of excluding Christ and gospel times from the signification of the legal shadows. In attempting this, it is not, perhaps, surprising, that their zeal has sometimes led them towards the opposite extreme. The exaggeration, both of this and of the contrary hypothesis, has led to the same general result, but in ways directly opposite. Both have deprived the Ceremonial Law of its preparatory character, the one by reducing its significance too low, and the other by exalting it too high. If the ceremonies of the Law meant nothing, they could not be preparatory to the Gospel. If they meant everything, and made known everything which needed to be known, they were not so much a preparation as an anticipation of the gospel itself.

This is the main objection to the Typical hypothesis, at least in its extreme form, as applied to the interpretation of the Law. It does not view it as a temporary substitute and preparation for the Christian system, but as a full though enigmatical disclosure of it, both in outline and detail. Once furnished with the key to this anticipated gospel, the believing Jew might gain as accurate a knowledge of the latter, as we can now gain from the New Testament or from a modern system of theology. This, it is said, is not the relative position which the old economy is represented by our Lord and his Apostles as occupying to the new. They nowhere recognise the ancient church as in possession of the same revelation that was afterwards made in the New Testament, even as an esoteric doctrine, comprehended only by the more enlightened, while the people at large regarded the same objects as a set of riddles. The Old Testament saints, it is alleged, although saved in the same way with us, and fully equal to the highest specimens of Christian experience in the warmth of their devout affections, occupied a lower place with respect to the fulness and extent of their religious knowledge. This truth is believed, by those whose opinions we are now expressing, to be taught in that remarkable statement of our Lord respecting John the Baptist, as belonging to the old dispensation and in some sort representing it, that although a greater prophet never had arisen, yet even the least in the kingdom of heaven was greater than he.

Another objection to the Typical hypothesis, at least in its extreme form, is founded on the obvious assumption, that a system of significant rites must have been designed to speak for itself, to convey instruction through the senses, without an accompanying oral explanation, which must either have been superfluous itself or made the rites so. If this be granted, it would seem to follow, that an obvious resemblance and a natural association was an indispensable condition of the end to be attained. But it certainly cannot be alleged that any such resemblance or association really exists between the rites of the Mosaic law and all the minute points of the Christian system. The very ingenuity employed in tracing the analogy may serve to show that it is not self-evident. That it is not even easily discovered, is apparent from the fact, that the most celebrated typical interpreters are not agreed, as to a large proportion of the types which they explain. It may be said, indeed, that there is no unanimity at all, except in those points which the New Testament authoritatively settles for us.

The typical interpretation of the ceremonial law is so interwoven with Christian experience, and so indelibly impressed upon our best religious literature, that there is a salutary prejudice against whatever even tends or threatens to assail it. We have reason, therefore, to observe with satisfaction, that the strong objections, which have just been stated, do not lie against the principle of this hypothesis, but against the method of its application. If then it can be modified in such a way as to obviate these difficulties, while at the same time its essential principle is held fast, an important step is likely to be taken towards the ultimate solution of a difficult and interesting problem.

This has been attempted in what may be called the Symbolical, as contradistinguished from the Typical theory. This terminology is not, however, such as to explain itself. Interpreted according to popular usage, it conveys no definite idea, or a false one. It may not be amiss, therefore, to elucidate it by a brief statement of the theory of Symbols upon which it rests. Understanding by a Symbol a sensible sign of an invisible reality, we may classify all Symbols by a reference either to their origin or their design. When considered in reference to its origin, a Symbol may be natural, conventional, or arbitrary. A natural Symbol is one founded on a natural association, and requiring neither explanation nor authority to recommend it. A conventional]

Symbol is one founded upon usage and the agreement which it presupposes. An arbitrary Symbol is imposed by authority. These three definitions, it will be perceived, are not exclusive of each other. A natural Symbol may be sanctioned by long usage and likewise prescribed by an existing law. A more important distinction is the one which has respect to the design or meaning of the Symbol. If this is a universal truth, the Symbol is philosophical or doctrinal, and may be called an emblem. If the thing denoted is a past event, the symbol is historical, a memorial or a monument. When the thing signified is something future, the symbol is prophetic, or at least prospective, and may be called a type, in the restricted sense.

Now both the theories in question, the symbolical and typical, agree that there are types, i. e. prophetic symbols, in the Ceremonial Law. But the typical interpreter sees nothing else, whereas the symbolical interpreter sees also many doctrinal symbols, not expressly prophetic of Christ or of the Christian church as such, but significant of doctrines suited to the actual condition of the people, and intended to prepare them for the clearer revelations of the gospel. This general description of the two hypotheses will be rendered clearer by a statement of the mode in which they are respectively applied to the several divisions of the ceremonial system. In attempting such an illustration, we may follow the fourfold distribution which has been adopted, by the latest as well as by the older writers, on the sacred institutions of the Jews. The four main topics thus distinguished are those of Sacred Places, Sacred Persons, Sacred Rites, and Sacred Times, or to use a more laconic terminology, the Sanctuary, the Priesthood, the Ritual, and the Calendar.

What was the meaning, the idea, of the Sanctuary, both in its moveable and settled form? We need not stop to notice the hypothesis, that the Jewish Sanctuary was a mere refinement on the temples of the heathen, without any spiritual import of its own; or that it was borrowed from the palaces of earthly kings, and appropriated to Jehovah in that character. For such a purpose it would have been made more spacious and more splendid. Such a hypothesis affords no explanation of the small dimensions of the tabernacle especially, and of the minute detail in which its structure is described. It is almost equally superfluous to mention the idea of Philo and Josephus, entertained by

several of the Christian Fathers and the later Rabbins, that the Sanctuary symbolized the doctrine of creation, its several parts and its significant numbers pointing to the heavens, earth, and sea; the sun, moon, and seven planets; the days of the week, the months of the year, the signs of the zodiac, the points of the compass, &c, &c. Besides the absence of all obvious resemblance or natural association, such a system of symbols would be wholly without any moral effect, and much less in keeping with the scriptural theology than with the ethnic superstition, considered as a worship of Nature. Nor is this objection really removed by the modern refinement on this ancient doctrine, which explains the Sanctuary as a symbol, not of the actual creation or its material products, but of the relation between the Creator and his creatures. This intangible abstraction would be still less readily suggested to the mass of worshippers, while the total absence of all moral or spiritual influence would still exist as much as in the other case. If this part of the system was significant at all, a very different solution must be given to the question, what did it denote?

The typical interpreters, as represented by Cocceius and others, answer, that the Sanctuary signified the Christian church, the visible church being represented by the court, the invisible by the house; the latter, as it now is, by the holy place; as it shall be hereafter, by the holy of holies. In conformity with this generic view, the most minute details are brought into connexion with distinct points of Christian doctrine or church history.

The general fact of correspondence and significant design is equally admitted by the symbolical interpreters, distinctively so called, who acknowledge the authority of the New Testament, as to all the specific types of Christ there mentioned. But they hold that, in addition to these types, the sanctuary symbolized certain general truths not peculiar to the Christian revelation, especially the great truth of God's dwelling among men, to represent which he provides himself a house like the houses of his people, dwelling in tents while they are in the desert, or still unsettled in the promised land, but when the theocracy is finally developed and established, removing to a permanent abode. Under this general idea of the sanctuary, different explanations of minuter points are given by symbolical interpreters. One of

the latest and most eminent, for instance, understands the court with its contents as symbolizing the actual communion between God and man, the sacred edifice as symbolizing its ideal perfection to be realized hereafter. Within the house, the two apartments might suggest the same essential idea, while one made more prominent the gifts conferred by God upon his people, the other those offered by them to him. The mercy-seat placed above the tables of the law would be a natural emblem of mercy rejoicing over judgment, while the altar of incense, the golden candlestick, and the table of show-bread would suggest the necessity of prayer, diffusion of the truth, and perpetual devotion to God's service. In the court, the laver and the altar of burnt-offering would continually preach the necessity of purification and atonement, the latter being shown, by the position of the altar, to be absolutely necessary to communion between God and man.

Into still minuter questions of detail it will be needless here to enter, as for instance the significancy of the stuffs and colours so particularly required and described in the construction of the tabernacle. There is indeed a question, among the symbolical interpreters themselves, as to the general principle which ought to govern the interpretation of these minor points. One theory regards it as the only safe or practicable rule to attach a distinct meaning to every distinguishable part of the symbol, except where it is evidently only an appendage or indispensable accompaniment of something else, as for instance in the case of the golden snuffers, or the tongs and shovels, which are natural attendants of the candlestick and altar, and need not therefore be supposed to have any separate meaning of their own. Another theory reduces still further the number of significant particulars by assuming that the ceremonial system was intended to be, not only instructive but impressive, and, in some of its parts at least, attractive. With a view to these collateral or secondary ends, costly materials, brilliant colours, symmetrical forms, and picturesque arrangements may have been preferred to coarseness and unsightliness, without intending to convey a distinct doctrine or idea by each of the particulars. But however these points may be settled, it is plain that the idea of God's dwelling among men, in some extraordinary sense, would be spontaneously suggested by the very sight of a tent erected expressly for him, in the

midst of the encampment of his chosen people, without any forced refinement or the necessity of any accompanying oral explanation.

If we now turn to the Priesthood, we are met at once by disingenuous attempts, upon the part of unbelieving writers, to confound the sacerdotal institutions of the Ceremonial Law with the analogous arrangements of the Egyptian and other forms of ancient heathenism. For this unworthy purpose, the points of actual resemblance are exaggerated, combined, and pressed into the foreground of the picture. We are told that in both cases, a defined portion of the people was set apart for sacred duties; that in both, this body was perpetuated by hereditary succession; that in both, it was sustained by the appropriation of a definite proportion of the national property; that in both, it was distinguished from the body of the people by costume and other outward indications; that in both, the idea of a priesthood involved that of mediation between God and man.

The same pains, as might have been expected, are not taken to present the essential points of difference, by which these coincidences, striking as they are, are more than neutralized. We must go to other writers, or inquire for ourselves, in order to discover that, although hereditary succession was the prescribed form by which the Levitical priesthood was continued, there is no recognition of hereditary right independent of a special divine choice and designation, which is constantly supposed as an essential requisite to sacerdotal functions, so that the Hebrew Priests were not a *caste*, like those of Egypt. We are not told that, although a certain part of the national property was set apart for the support of the sacerdotal tribe, they merely had an adequate subsistence, instead of absorbing almost all the wealth of the country, as in Egypt. We are not told that the Levites, unlike the Egyptian Priests, were deprived of all political superiority, and permitted to exercise civil authority, only in well defined and guarded cases. We are not told that their mediation, instead of reconciling man to Nature and initiating him into her secrets, as in the case of the Egyptian Mysteries, was a moral and spiritual mediation, bringing him near to a personal and holy God. We are not told, lastly, by the writers now in question, that the Law, and indeed the Bible, is without a trace of the distinction, so cherished by the heathen priests, between an

esoteric and an exoteric doctrine, but that on the contrary, whatever the Levitical priests knew of sacred things, they knew for the benefit and as the official instructors of the people. Their grand function was in fact to teach the doctrines of religion to the people, both symbolically and orally. (Lev. x. 11.) These differences draw a line of demarcation not to be mistaken, we might rather say, they fix an impassable gulf between the priest-hoods of the heathen world and that of the Mosaic Law. As to the fact, which some have used to lower the Levitical priesthood beneath every other, to wit, the exclusive requisition of corporeal qualifications, it has really a contrary effect, as showing, that the institution was significant, and is to be explained upon the principle of representation.

This principle, so far as it is applicable here, may be stated thus. Out of the mass of fallen men God purposed to save some in Christ. Until this Saviour actually came, the body of the saved was represented by a chosen people, who might therefore be collectively regarded as a kind of mediator, and correctly represented as a nation of priests. (Exod. xix. 6.) But in order that this same great doctrine might be kept before the minds of the representatives themselves, a single tribe was set apart from among them, to represent the whole, and as it were to mediate between God and his people. By a further application of the same symbolical idea, a single family was chosen from this chosen tribe, as if to represent it; while in this family itself, a single individual, its natural, hereditary head, represented his family, and through that family his tribe, and through that tribe his people, and through that people the elect of God. In the High Priest, therefore, the entire representation was concentrated and completed. At the same time, this symbolical representative of the Body was a typical representative of the Head, the promised Saviour, the two functions being not only consistent but inseparable, on account of the peculiar and most intimate relation of the Head and the Body to each other. In no other system upon record, whether civil or religious, has the great principle of representation been so fully embodied and distinctly carried out as in the sacerdotal system of the ceremonial law. An important corollary from this statement is, that even under that economy, the Jewish race was not so much the people of God as its appointed representative.

If this view of the Priesthood be correct, it explains the absence of all moral and religious requisitions in describing the incumbents of the office, as well as the want of philosophical mysteries, which formed an essential feature of the sacerdotal system in Egypt and in other countries. As the God of the Hebrews was not Nature or the Universe, their religion could not be a system of Natural Philosophy, or their Priests professors of that science, and the total difference, in this respect, between the faith of Jews and Gentiles, is a strong proof not only of the independence of the former, but of its divine authority.

To the general views which have been now presented, it will not be necessary to add any inquiry into minor points, such as the minutæ of the High Priest's dress, or to refute Philo's notion, that this too was a symbol of creation, or the later rabbinical opinion, that each part of the costume was expiatory or denoted the expiation of a particular sin. Under the same category fall the attempts, made by some of the older typical interpreters, to explain every portion of this dress, however trivial, as distinctly significant of something in Christ's person or his work. As to these minor points, much must be left to individual taste and judgment. One man may derive edification from a mode of viewing these things which to another seems absurd. The grand error of the earlier typologists consisted in forcing every possible analogy of this sort on the text, not as an allowable subjective use or application, but as a part of its essential meaning. Let us see to it, however, that in shunning this extreme, we do not rush into the opposite, and let go the principle of typical significancy altogether, though so natural and reasonable in itself, and so expressly recognised in the New Testament.

If the Ceremonial Law has been correctly represented as the centre of the old economy, the centre of the Ceremonial Law must be the rites themselves, for the sake of which the other parts exist; the priests being the performers, the sanctuary the place, and the festivals the time of the performance. This is perfectly compatible with the assumption, that the Priesthood and the Sanctuary, in themselves considered, conveyed a distinct part of the symbolical instruction, although they would probably have not existed, independent of the rites. The significant rites of the Mosaic Law may be reduced

to two great classes, Offerings and Purifications. Of these the former is the more important, the other being really supplementary to it and dependent on it. The Offerings themselves may again be divided into Animal and Vegetable, or, as some prefer to call them, Bloody and Bloodless. The latter had no substantive or separate value, but were primarily used as appendages to the other, the mutual relation being the same as that between Offerings in general and the Levitical Purifications. The elements or materials of the sacrifices were essentially the same in every case. It was their different combinations, and the different occasions upon which they were presented, that afforded the ground of their classification, under the names of the Burnt Offering, the Sin Offering, the Trespass Offering, and the Peace (or Requit) Offering, with its subdivisions, Thanksgiving, Vow, and Free-will Offerings. In all these the material of the animal sacrifice consisted of the larger and smaller cattle, the latter including sheep and goats, with a substitution, in the case of poverty, of doves or pigeons for the more costly victims otherwise required. The materials of the Vegetable Offering were the three great staples of subsistence, Corn, Wine, and Oil. To both may be added, as subsidiary substances, Frankincense and Salt, which last was an indispensable addition to all animal oblations, while Honey and Leaven were expressly excluded.

As the rites are the centre of the ceremonial system, and the offerings of the rites, so the animal offerings are the central point of these; and of the animal offering itself, the blood. The solemn presentation of the victim, the imposition of hands, and the act of slaughter, were performed by the worshipper himself. It was not until the blood was to be disposed of, that the priestly functions properly began. The prominence thus given to the blood would be sufficient of itself to refute the anthropopathic notion, that the sacrifices of the Jews, as well as of the heathen, were originally looked upon as feasts or entertainments offered to the Deity. If this were so, the flesh would have been treated as more precious than the blood, and the arrangements of the sacrifice would certainly have borne more resemblance to the customary mode of feasting, not to mention the taking back of the victim or a part of it in certain cases, which, on this supposition, would be wholly unaccountable.

The only hypothesis which solves all the phenomena is that

which attaches to these rites a moral and religious significance. And this hypothesis is common to the typical and symbolical theories. The difference is, that the former explains everything about these rites as prophetic symbols of something in Christ's person or his expiatory work. The objection to this mode of interpretation rests, as in the other case, on its arbitrary character and the diversity of its results, together with the want of any obvious resemblance, tending to suggest the truths conveyed at once to the observer by a natural association. However clear they may be now to us, they cannot be supposed to have conveyed the same ideas to the ancient worshippers, without a special inspiration or an oral commentary, either of which would have made the symbolical instruction quite superfluous.

The symbolical interpreters admit the existence of specific types of Christ among these symbols, but deny that they were all such types, alleging, on the contrary, that some of them were intended to teach doctrines properly belonging to the ancient dispensation and appropriate to the actual condition of the people. In answering the question, what were these doctrines, we must bear in mind, that the whole system pre-supposes God's existence, unity, sovereignty, and natural perfections, and proclaims his holiness and his requisition of it in his creatures; that the very existence of the chosen people taught the doctrine of election, the priesthood that of mediation, and the sanctuary that of God's abode among his people, and the possibility of near access to him. But how was this to be effected as the whole system rests upon the supposition of human apostasy and guilt? The answer to this question was afforded by the sacrifices, considered not merely as prophetic types of Christ, but as doctrinal symbols of truths which had already been revealed.

The two great doctrines symbolized by sacrifice were that of God's sovereignty over us and propriety in us, his absolute right to ourselves and all that we possess; and that of expiation or the removal of guilt by an atonement. In all sacrifices, even those of heathendom, these two ideas are embodied. Opposite errors have arisen from their separation. The worst is that which leaves atonement wholly out of view and makes the sacrifices mere oblations. A no less real but less hurtful misconception, while it holds fast to this cardinal doctrine, loses sight of the other. On this hypothesis, it is not easy to explain the Ritual

in all its parts. But put the two together and the explanation becomes easy.

Why were these particular substances, both animal and vegetable, offered in sacrifice? Not merely on account of natural qualities, by which they were fitted to be types of Christ; for although this analogy is sometimes obvious enough, as in the case of the paschal lamb, it can only be made visible in others by a forced interpretation, as in that of the goat, or not at all, as in the case of the vegetable offerings, unless we admit, as Mr. Bonar seems disposed to do, that the meal and the bread, for example, were intended to suggest that Christ was to be *ground* by suffering and *baked* in the fire of persecution, &c. But did bread or flour ever suggest these ideas, even in their vaguest form, by virtue of a natural association? In the Lord's Supper, it is not the grinding or the baking that suggests the idea of his passion, but the breaking of the bread by the officiating person in the presence of the worshipper, and that too accompanied by an explanatory form of words, to which there is nothing corresponding in the ancient ritual. It is indeed worthy of observation as a general fact, that the Mosaic ritual contains so few liturgical formulas; a strong proof, in the first place, that it furnishes no ground for the use of verbal forms at present; and in the next place, that the ceremonies of the law were meant to speak for themselves and be their own interpreters, an effect which could not be secured without an obvious resemblance and a natural association between type and antitype. But this analogy does not exist, as we have seen, between the person or the work of Christ and all the substances required in sacrifice.

Another explanation of the choice of these particular materials, both animal and vegetable, is, that they constituted the ordinary food of the people to whom the ritual was given, and by whom alone it was to be observed. It is a fact somewhat remarkable that, while the catalogue of animals allowed for food was far more extensive than that of animals admitted to the altar, the latter were identical, so far as we can learn, with the species actually used in common life. This correspondence cannot be fortuitous or wholly without meaning. It establishes the fact of some designed connexion between the offerings of the people and their ordinary food. If, however, we should acquiesce in this as a sufficient explanation, it might furnish some support to

the offensive doctrine, that the sacrifices were required and offered as mere feasts to the divinity. This abuse may be precluded, and the whole truth disclosed, by assuming that these animal and vegetable substances were singled out, not only as the ordinary food, but as the substance, property, or wealth of those who offered them. A vast proportion of the wealth of Israel might be included under the descriptive heads of oxen, sheep, goats, corn, wine and oil. The offering of these was therefore well adapted to express the truth, that all belonged to God, and that his claim to them must be acknowledged by the solemn presentation of a part. Even when taken back by the offerer, it was taken back as a gift from God.

But if this were the whole meaning of the sacrifices, those of a vegetable nature would have been sufficient, and the waste of life might have been spared, as in the offerings of Cain. And yet we find animal sacrifice not merely added to the other, but set over it, as first in value and importance. This shows that something was to be symbolically taught, which could not be expressed without the sacrifice of life. For the essence of the animal oblation, as we have already seen, was in the presentation of the blood, regarded as the vehicle or seat of life. (Lev. xvii. 11.) There is no physiological question here involved, at least so far as to jeopard the credit and authority of scripture, which is fully sustained, even if we look upon this representation of the blood as wholly arbitrary. The blood, whatever be its place or function in the animal economy, was, for sacrificial purposes, to be regarded as the seat of life.

The cardinal act of sacrifice was not that of slaying the animal, nor even that of burning on the altar, but the offering of the blood, the various modes of doing which were not necessarily significant, but all alike expressive of the forfeiture of life. The doctrine taught therefore by this class of sacrificial rites was the necessity of expiation by the offering of life, and more specifically still, by the offering of life for life. The solemn rite of imposition could mean nothing, if it did not mean the transfer of the offerer's guilt to a substituted victim. Its explanation as a symbol of the transfer of the property is wholly inadequate, although it may be comprehended, just as the vegetable offerings by themselves might have meant nothing more than the solemn dedication of men's wealth to God, whereas, when placed in a

subordinate connexion with the animal oblations, they taught, in a most expressive manner, that no offering of a man's possessions could be made acceptably without an expiation of his guilt.

The sacrifices, then, continually kept before the minds of the people the necessity of expiation, and the only way in which it could be wrought, by the sacrifice of life for life. But they did not necessarily, and by a natural association, suggest to all who saw them, who or what was the true victim thus prefigured. This was a New Testament doctrine, to reveal which formed no part of the design of the Levitical symbols as such. So far as it was intimated at all, it was by special types, the existence and meaning of which must be determined by New Testament authority.

As to the meaning of the various kinds of animal oblation, the main fact seems to be this, that the Olah or Burnt Offering contained in itself the symbolical import of the whole sacrificial system, as it had done in the days of the Patriarchs, who seem to have known no other. To this general expiation the others stood related, as applying the same doctrine of atonement to particular occasions and emergencies, and keeping the same constantly before the mind, in connexion with the various events of life. This view of the matter is confirmed by the remarkable fact, that the Olah is the only sacrifice which could be offered by itself, and which was necessary, as an accompaniment to all the rest. This defines its position as *the* sacrifice, of which the others were mere special variations. The objection drawn from the use of the same rites in cases of thanksgiving and of free-will offerings, really confirms the view which has been taken, as this whole arrangement taught the important truth, that no religious service could be rendered acceptably without atonement, and that no atonement could be efficacious without bloodshed. The various theories which have been proposed with respect to the difference between the sin and trespass offerings, as having reference to moral and ceremonial faults, or to sins of omission and commission, or to sins of inadvertence and presumption, are all extremely dubious; but the main fact is clear enough, that both these kinds of offering bore the same relation to the Olah, that particular offences bear to sin in general.

All that has now been said has reference to the symbolical import of the sacrifices, as significant of spiritual things, and

not to their intrinsic and immediate effect in removing ceremonial disabilities, which were themselves symbolical of something altogether different. The same remark applies to the non-sacrificial rites of the Mosaic Law, which may all be comprehended under the general description of Levitical or Ceremonial Purifications. These, like the sacrifices, had an immediate efficacy, symbolizing that belonging to the change which they prefigured. The occasions of these ceremonial cleansings arose partly from the state of the body, under which head the leprosy may be included, and partly from external contact with dead bodies, or participation in the rites of burial. The purifying rites themselves were always partly sacrificial. The additional ceremonies consisted chiefly in sprinkling with water, either pure or mixed with the blood of the victim, or with its ashes, or with those of cedar-wood, scarlet wool, and hyssop, to which may be added the letting go of living birds on a particular occasion. The officiating person was required to be clean, that is, ceremonially undefiled, but not necessarily a priest. With respect to place, it is characteristic of these rites, that some of them could only be performed without the camp, while others were begun there and completed within. These last peculiarities, in reference to place and the officiating person are clearly owing to the singular fact, that the purifying rites were themselves defiling. They are also interesting, in connexion with the fact, that although there was no sacrifice without bloodshed, a vegetable offering was received instead of a victim in case of extreme poverty, as a proof that the law ascribes no magical virtue to the *opus operatum* of its rites, and that Christian ritualists greatly err in forming their extreme views of sacramental grace upon the model of the Ceremonial Law.

The symbolical import of the purifying rites is for the most part very clear. There is still some dispute as to the use of scarlet wool and the colour of the red heifer; but water is everywhere familiar both as a means and an emblem of purification; the same idea is associated with the use of ashes, which served at the same time to connect their rites with those of sacrifice; the hyssop was extensively employed among the ancients as a means of cleansing; and cedar wood was not only a costly species, but considered incorruptible, and therefore significant of antiseptic virtue. All these then would seem to be natural emblems of purification.

A more important question is the one in reference to the general design of this whole ritual and the selection of the cases to which it was applied. The lowest ground that can be taken is that of J. D. Michaelis, who maintains, that all these regulations had a view to health. The attempt to carry out this paradoxical idea has rendered his great work a prodigy of misplaced ingenuity and learning, some parts of which cannot be read without disgust by any person of religious feeling or good taste. The grand objection to this doctrine is that it destroys the religious character of the system, except as a mask for mere prudential sanitary regulations. It may also be objected, that some of the cases would not answer the supposed design at all, while others which would have been far more appropriate are overlooked. The same objections lie against a modified form of this opinion, namely, that the purifications were intended to secure external cleanliness and neatness, such as became the people among whom Jehovah condescended to reside as king. It may moreover be alleged as a certain fact, that ceremonial ablutions and personal cleanliness by no means always go together. A third opinion is, that these were arbitrary forms, designed to separate the people more completely from the heathen. But in no part of the system is the resemblance of the Jewish and the Gentile ritual more striking than in this. A fourth explanation is, that these expurgatory rites have reference to a natural repugnance and sense of defilement. This is so far true, that it looks to something higher than the attainment of a mere external end, and is also founded on a physical truth; but it is still inadequate, because it does not explain why the existence of this natural repugnance rendered these rites necessary.

The insufficiency of all these explanations has led to the conclusion, that these rites are symbolical of moral and spiritual changes. A fifth hypothesis accordingly supposes each particular rite to have a reference to some specific form of sin. But no one has succeeded in determining, with any plausibility, the meaning of the several cases of defilement and purification upon this hypothesis. The best explanation therefore is, that these purifying rites were intended to keep constantly before the mind the idea of sin as a defilement, and the necessity of sanctification, just as the sacrifices rendered prominent the idea of guilt and the necessity of expiation. Thus the two great doc-

trines of atonement and sanctification were embodied in these two distinct but parallel systems of expiatory and expurgatory rites. To the question why these particular cases were selected for the purpose, it may be answered, in the first place, that a choice was necessary, and that some degree of arbitrary discretion must have been expected. In the next place, all the cases are connected more or less with a natural feeling which adapted them to serve this purpose. It was not necessary for this end, that they should all be immediately connected with actual sin. A leper, for example, might be a good man; but this only served to prevent misapprehension, and to show that the whole system was symbolical. Another theory, proposed by an ingenious living writer, is, that these ceremonial regulations were intended to connect the idea of man's fallen state with those of birth, disease, and death, to which all the cases of defilement may be more or less immediately referred. As this is by no means inconsistent with the explanation before given, they may be combined, and the entire system of ceremonial defilement and purification be described as intended to keep constantly before the mind, by natural association no less than by arbitrary symbols, the loathsomeness of sin, the innate corruption of mankind, its hereditary propagation, its connexion with the sufferings of life, and its tendency to death, both in the lowest and the highest sense; while the complication of these purifying rites with those of sacrifice perpetually taught the fundamental doctrine, that without atonement moral renovation is impossible. All these were Symbols, as distinguished from prophetic Types, and as such suited to prepare the way for the Christian system, without confounding the two dispensations by an anticipation of the gospel light amidst the shadows of the law.

We have not left room for a proportionate examination of the fourth great division of the Ceremonial system, namely, its Calendar or Sacred Times. Nor is so minute an inspection necessary, from the very nature of the subject. To complete in some sort what we have begun, we may advert to two false notions with respect to sacred times, neither of which is contained or countenanced in the Law of Moses. The first is a belief in the intrinsic holiness of certain times, that is to say, the peculiar virtue of religious acts performed then. The other is the still more prevalent and practical mistake, that by appropriating cer-

tain times to God, we make the rest exclusively our own. The doctrine taught by the Mosaic festivals was just the contrary, to wit, that the observance of particular times is a solemn recognition of the fact, that all our time belongs to God and should be spent in his service. The grand distinctive feature of the Mosaic calendar is that its festivals are associated with remarkable junctures in history and providence. This is especially the case with the great yearly celebrations.

The weekly Sabbath, which is the basis of the whole system, was symbolical of rest, rest from labour, rest from suffering, rest from sin. As a historical symbol, it commemorated God's rest after the creation, and Israel's rest after the Egyptian bondage. As a prophetic symbol, it prefigured rest in the promised land, the rest of the soul in Christ and God, the rest of the church in the new dispensation, and the rest both of the church and individuals in heaven. The Sabbatical Year symbolized besides the rest of the land from cultivation and the rest of the debtor from his creditor's exactions. The great Sabbath of the Jubilee suggested the ideas both of rest and restoration; the restoration of the land to its former possessors, and the restoration of the slave to freedom.

The great yearly feasts were associated with remarkable conjunctures in the history of Israel and in the constant revolution of the seasons. Thus the Passover marked the beginning of harvest, and recalled to mind the doctrine of dependence upon God for the fruits of the earth, while, as a historical symbol, it commemorated the deliverance from Egypt, and as a type, prefigured Christ. Pentecost marked the conclusion of the harvest, and, according to the Jewish tradition, commemorated the giving of the law at Sinai, while as a type it may be said to have prefigured the outpouring of the spirit and the organization of the Christian church. The Feast of Tabernacles marked, in the natural calendar, the vintage and ingathering of other fruits, while it historically kept in mind the journey through the wilderness and the happy arrival in the Promised land. From these associations, both historical and natural, as well as from its relative position at the close of the festal year, it became the most joyous and at last the most frequented of the feasts, and in all these ways was signally adapted as a type to signify the ul-

timate salvation of God's people and their safe arrival in the heavenly Canaan.

The one great day of humiliation in the Jewish year, though followed by the feast just mentioned, that the cycle of observances might yearly have a joyous termination, was itself placed very near the end of the whole series, most probably because it was designed to be a summary and concentration of the expiatory rites of the entire year. This presumption is confirmed by the otherwise extraordinary fact, that the Great Day of Atonement is connected with no such historical or natural associations as distinguish the three festivals. That it was meant to recapitulate and sum up all the rest, may likewise be inferred from the unusual solemnity of all the rites, as well as from the fact, that the officiating priest was the highest in rank, that he wore a peculiar dress on the occasion, and that on this day and this only he was suffered to pass the inner veil and stand within the Holy of Holies. The distinctive rite of the Great Day of Atonement was the presentation of the two goats, one of which was slain and the other sent into the desert "to (or for) Azazel." Into the old dispute as to the meaning of this name we have neither inclination, time, nor space to enter. We regard it indeed as a question of comparatively little moment. Whether Azazel be the proper name of a particular place, or an appellative meaning "desert," or a title of the Devil, or an abstract term denoting removal, rejection, or repudiation, matters little as to the essential import of the solemn rite with which it stands connected. Even this, however, we shall only mention, as affording an additional and final sample of the difference between what we have called the Symbolical and Typical hypotheses. Those who proceed upon the latter, taking it for granted that in order to be really significant, this ceremony, like the rest, must be directly typical of Christ, are under the necessity of finding some antithesis in the person or the history of Christ himself, of which the two goats may be looked upon as emblems. Among the various ingenious answers to this puzzling question, may be mentioned that which supposes one goat to denote our Saviour's deity, the other his humanity, the consequence of which assumption is, that the divine nature is exhibited as either dying or as going away loaded with the sins of men. Another theory, still less felicitous, supposes the antithesis to be between

our Lord's humiliation and his exaltation, but without being able to determine which is which. A third makes one goat symbolize his personal sufferings and death, the other the contempt and scorn which he endured; an explanation anything but obvious or founded on a natural association. Induced by these and such like difficulties, some have been led to acknowledge only one goat as a type of Christ, while the other represents the Jews, or something still less likely to be readily suggested by the sight of this mysterious ceremonial.

All this confusion and uncertainty arises from assuming, in the first place, that the significant rites of the ceremonial law must of necessity be types, that is to say, prophetic symbols; and in the next place, that they must necessarily be types of Christ. As soon as we admit, that it is equally consistent with the honour of the Saviour, and still more consistent with the general purpose of the old economy, as a preparatory dispensation, to explain a large proportion of its forms as doctrinal symbols, teaching general truths of great importance, suited to the actual condition of the people, and tending to prepare them for a clearer revelation, several obvious interpretations of this rite spontaneously suggest themselves. Of these we shall propose but one, which seems to us to furnish a complete and satisfactory solution. It rests upon the general supposition, which has been already stated, that this whole observance was intended to concentrate and epitomize the ceremonial method of atonement. It is natural therefore to suppose that the two goats were intended to be symbols of the same great doctrine, that of expiation, as consisting of two parts, substitution and removal, one of which is represented by the death of the first goat, and the other by the exile of the second, both together constituting, as it were, a single undivided symbol of atonement, such as we know to have been wrought by Christ, but which the ancient worshipper, except in case of special inspiration, could only see through a glass darkly.

In this protracted disquisition, we have not been drawing on our own resources in the way of original speculation, but have stated the conclusions reached by many wise and learned men of various schools and countries, with such modifications and additional suggestions of our own, as seemed to make the statement clearer or to approximate still more to a complete and satisfac-

tory solution of this interesting problem. If anything has been suggested tending to a clearer and a more correct appreciation of the general subject, this may serve to excuse the crude and superficial form in which it has been here presented, and the slight attention which we may have seemed to bestow upon the valuable work before us.

ART. VI.—*The Twenty-fifth Chapter of the Confession of Faith of the Westminster Assembly. Of the Church.*

1. "THE Catholic or Universal Church, which is invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect which have been, are or shall be gathered into one, under Christ, the head thereof, and is the spouse, the body, the fulness of him, that filleth all in all.

2. "The visible church, which is also catholic or universal under the gospel, (not confined to one nation as before under the law,) consists of all those throughout the world, that profess the true religion, together with their children; and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation.

3. "Unto this catholic visible church, Christ hath given the ministry, oracles and ordinances of God, for the gathering and perfecting of the saints in this life, to the end of the world; and doth by his own presence and spirit, according to his promise, make them effectual thereunto.

4. "This catholic church hath been sometimes more, sometimes less, visible. And particular churches, which are members thereof are more or less pure according as the doctrine of the gospel is taught and embraced, ordinances administered, and public worship performed more or less purely in them.

5. "The purest churches under heaven are subject both to mixture and error; and some have so degenerated as to become no churches of Christ, but synagogues of satan. Nevertheless, there shall always be a church on earth to worship God according to his will.

6. "There is no other head of the church, but the Lord Jesus Christ, nor can the Pope of Rome, in any sense be head thereof