

THE  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JULY, 1851.

No. III.

by John W. Prudden

ART. I.—*Lettre de Démission à la Faculté de l'École de Théologie de Genève.* Par Ed. Schérer, Professeur de l'Exégèse, &c. Genève, 1849.

“AN old error often disguises itself under a new name.”\* There is something so attractive in the sheen of novelty, something so flattering to human pride in the idea of progress, that, “ye shall be as gods *knowing*” is still the gilding of the bait, whether it be addressed to sense or reason. The pithy observation we have quoted above, may be supported by examples from every century of Church history, and from none more copiously than our own. Certain “old errors” which have worn out not a few suits of phraseology in the course of the last eighteen centuries, have of late appeared in new attire complete, cut after the latest fashion; and with the help of rouge and patches, and other rejuvenating appliances, are seeking to palm themselves off as the youngest-born of truth. A searching glance, however, quickly detects through all their finery and affectations the wrinkles of age, and the deep scars of repeated refutations, received at the hands of those who in old time were “valiant for truth.”

\* Dr. Livingston.

W<sup>m</sup> H. Green

ART. III.—*History of the Old Covenant.* By J. H. Kurtz.  
Vol. I. Berlin, 1848, 8vo. pp. 301.\*

AMONG the most interesting and important questions arising in connexion with the study of the Old Testament is that which concerns its relation to the New. This too is confessedly one of the most difficult and disputed questions in Biblical interpretation; and upon which as various and conflicting theories have been entertained as upon any other. The difficulty lies in the details, and in the attempt to give accurate definitions and lay down precise rules. In the general it is very plain that the Old Dispensation was preparatory to the New, and prophetic of it. But there is much that is vague and intangible about such a statement. And it is when we come to ask after its limits, and to fix with exactness its meaning, when we come to inquire definitely to what extent, in what sense, and in how large a part of it the Old Testament is prophetic of Christ, or preparatory for his coming and work, that we begin to discern the difficulties with which the subject is encompassed.

That there are in the Old Testament both predictions and types of a coming Messiah is very clear. That it awakened among the Jews long before the advent expectations of his coming—expectations, which were shared wherever the Scriptures were circulated, is matter of history. The unquestionable authority of the New Testament too, both by express declarations and by frequent implication, requires us to believe that Moses and the prophets wrote of Christ. The general position, therefore, that Christ is spoken of in the Old Testament is impregnable. But how far is he to be found there?

If we admit nothing to be written respecting Christ, but those specific statements of the prophets made *ex professo* respecting a personal Messiah, we shall find indeed only scattered intimations of him here and there. He will not even thus be banished from the Old Testament; but he will be confined to comparatively a very small compass in that portion of Holy Scripture.

\* Geschichte des Alten Bundes von Joh. Heinr. Kurtz. u. s. w.

Some works,—able and useful works, too, and carrying the weight of invincible demonstration with them,—which have been written to show how the prophecies have been fulfilled in our Redeemer, have yet we fear to some extent weakened the cause, which they undertook to maintain, by allowing the impression to be silently left upon the mind, that it is only or mainly in isolated predictions scattered here and there, that Jesus is to be found. It ought to be brought distinctly out that these are only a part, and a very inconsiderable part of the testimony there contained, that the doctrine of the Messiah does not rest merely upon disconnected proof-texts, however numerous or explicit; but only that in them there comes more prominently into view what the whole drift and current of Old Testament Scripture equally conspires to teach.

The student of the Old Testament, from reasons which have already been alluded to, cannot be long engaged in its study before arriving at the conviction that Christ is foretold there. There are predictions and types which are so clear as upon their bare inspection to compel instantly this conclusion. But after reaching this point it will not be long before he is compelled to take another step, and admit that these explicit predictions of a Messiah and these manifest types are not the only things which speak of him. He will find it impossible upon any satisfactory and consistent principles to limit the Messianic content of Scripture exclusively to these. All the reasons which will constrain him to forsake this ground, need not be here detailed. We shall single out two, which are of themselves sufficiently stringent.

One is the exceeding abruptness and the isolated character, which would thus be attributed to these acknowledged Messianic paragraphs. The dying patriarch, Jacob, is describing to his sons the portion their descendants shall respectively possess in the land of Canaan, when suddenly, with nothing to indicate a transition, he speaks of the coming of Shiloh, and then as suddenly returns to his original theme, and goes on with the partition of Canaan. Isaiah is giving to Ahaz a sign, that the two kings warring against him should not accomplish their hostile purpose, and he tells him of the virgin's son. In the prediction which occupies the last twenty-seven chapters of his book, all

is so intermingled, and so apparently spoken of the same subject, that while of some parts Jerome has well said that it seems more as though we were reading a gospel than a prophecy, it is yet impossible to make a separation, and say with accuracy which verses refer to Christ and which to the time of the Babylonish exile. An announcement is made to David of a son, who shall sit upon his throne and build a temple for the Lord, which runs imperceptibly into a prediction of Him, who is the greatest of his descendants, and the most glorious of his successors. The Psalms appear to be describing the kingdom of David or of Solomon, and almost before we are aware, certainly without advising us of any change of subject, we find attributes ascribed to it of universality, perpetuity, &c., which are the standing characteristics of Messiah's reign, and which never pertained and never can pertain to any other. Again, David or some other suffering saint seems to be describing in his own person the sorrows he has endured, and his abandonment of God, when suddenly, with no intimation that the same description is not continued, we light upon passages which are among the most evident predictions of Christ anywhere to be found. Now, it is impossible to refer these explicit predictions to Christ, and at the same time assume that the context, with which they are so intimately united, has no reference, bears no relation to him, without a violence of procedure which would be tolerated in the exposition of no other book. Verses must be rent out of their connexion, and applied to an entirely different subject, without anything on the face of the passage to justify it. If no principle be laid down, no rule established, but only whenever anything is said by a sacred writer that can be applied to Christ, (no matter what the immediate subject of which he is speaking,) this is assumed to be a prediction of him, and the rest of the discourse to relate to something wholly different, what is this but to make the Scripture the mere plaything of a capricious fancy, and to obtrude upon it as its meaning, not that which the scope of the writer would indicate, but whatever any interpreter may choose?

The same is true of the types of Scripture. There are here and there in the history and institutions of the Old Testament, types so clear and manifest, that their reference to Christ will

not be denied by any believer in revelation. But if it be affirmed that these stand alone in their reference to him, they present themselves in a strange isolation; and the question instantly arises, to which no satisfactory answer can be given, By what right are these considered predictive of Christ, when no allusion to him is found in all by which they are surrounded? Are we at liberty to go through the history of Israel, and pick out all that bears a real or seeming analogy to the history of Christ, and discarding all the rest as irrelevant, erect out of these random and violently sundered fragments a figure of him that was to come? To whose mind can such a course of procedure carry conviction? or, in the interpretation of what book except the Bible would such trifling be accepted as its just sense? If the Bible be an intelligible book, with a fixed meaning of its own other than that which any interpreter may at will fix upon it—if it be the product of a rational mind and addressed to rational minds, all such capricious dealing with it must be discarded. It is by such an arbitrary mode of not only departing from all just principles, but of acting irrespective of any settled principles whatever, that such incongruous and extravagant senses have been forced upon Scripture as have in some quarters brought the very name of types into disrepute, and made the whole idea of their existence an object of ridicule and contempt.

The other argument, which we shall here mention as constraining to the belief that Christ is to be found elsewhere than in the express Messianic predictions and the manifest types, is drawn from the authority of the New Testament. The Holy Spirit is surely the best expositor of his own mind. The Spirit, which guided the apostles and evangelists, is the same that spake through Moses and the prophets. He can tell us with infallible authority, what was his meaning in any thing that he inspired the holy men of old to say. Now we find the writers of the New Testament quoting the language of the Old, or alluding to it as applicable to Christ, declaring that it was fulfilled in him, drawing from it inferences as to his character and work, and that not only from its explicit predictions and types, but equally from such parts as on the theory of those who find Christ nowhere but in these, have no reference to him whatever.

And after all the deductions that can be made on the ground of the Old Testament being used in the New by way of accommodation rather than of explication, it is yet impossible for him who examines the inspired interpretations given of the Old Testament with any candour, to avoid the conclusion that Christ is represented as spoken of in many passages where no distinct mention of him lies upon the surface; and if their authority be admitted as infallible, of course he must be there.

Here, then, we come to be pressed by the difficulty of finding that certain rule, those settled principles, which shall approve themselves as sound before an enlightened judgment, by which to decide where references to Christ are to be assumed, and how far they are to be pressed; so that we may not on the one hand deny to the Scriptures what they actually contain, nor on the other bring in upon them what has no existence but in our own imagination. There must be some rule besides mere conjecture or caprice. The point of perplexity in the whole subject, is the determination of what that rule is. And it is in the endeavour to fix upon it that such various and conflicting theories of interpretation have been broached. Aside from all examination it would seem to be the most obvious and simplest rule to refer to Christ only such predictions as are explicitly made of him, and such types as manifestly point to their fulfilment in him. But from reasons which have just been adduced, the finding of a Messianic content in these, and limiting it to them, must be given up as untenable. The authority of the New Testament is against it. The structure of the Old Testament itself, and the context in which these predictions and types stand, is against it. They cannot be torn from their connexion, and referred to a totally different subject from that to which all around them refers, but by the most violent and arbitrary procedure. Either then these types and predictions themselves have no direct relation to Christ, or else the entire passages in which they stand cannot be separated from all relation to him. Some, who were unbelievers in a supernatural revelation, have not scrupled to take the first horn of this dilemma, and have maintained that no direct prediction of Christ, or which is tantamount to the same thing, no prediction of him at all properly so called, is to be found in the Old Testament; that its language invariably

referred to some other subject as indicated by the connexion, and if it is applied to Christ, it can only be in the way of accommodation, and altogether apart from the real scope of the writer. When they are confronted with the manifest incongruity of the language with any other subject than Christ, they make a shift to explain it away as a figure of speech, hyperbole, oriental imagery, or something of the sort. Some have even pushed their consistency to the still more absurd length of denying that the Jewish people entertained any expectation of a Messiah's coming. Our readers, however, would not thank us for proving either that the Jews entertained expectations of a Messiah's coming, or that such expectations were founded on their sacred books. If then we are compelled to admit this, there is only one other horn to the dilemma stated above, and it must be acknowledged not only that Christ is to be found in the Old Testament in its plain predictions and its evident types, but that he is to be found in it elsewhere also.

It is not our design here to enumerate all the methods which have been proposed of solving the question before us, nor to enter upon the merits and demerits of each in detail. Several of the early fathers and others assumed an allegorical sense of Scripture different from its plain and obvious meaning, and always underlying it, often indeed in their expositions superseding it. Others have employed every variety of method in dealing with scripture types. One class in order to make out a type everywhere has assumed the most fanciful and grotesque analogies. Another has affirmed with positiveness that nothing should be admitted to be a type, for which there cannot be adduced the express warrant of the New Testament writers in so many words. While another still has been willing to admit a type there also, where it would be natural to conclude that one was contained by proceeding on the same principles, which the inspired writers of the New Testament appear to have followed. The fault of both the allegorical and the typical methods just referred to, lies in assuming that there is either everywhere or at least in certain parts of the Old Testament, what has been called a double sense, one obvious, one concealed; one designed by the writer, and lying within his immediate scope, the other designed by the Holy Spirit to refer to

an entirely different subject from that which was intended by the writer, or which would be understood by his immediate readers. Thus it is supposed that an Old Testament writer might be speaking of David, or Solomon, or Judah, and mean nothing more, and those of his own day see nothing more in it; whereas we in New Testament times, might see that the Spirit designed in this language to describe Christ and the Christian Church.

The objection to this theory is not to be found perhaps in the fact that it interprets the Bible differently from all other books; for the uniqueness in the mode of its composition, in that it has a divine and a human author, certainly renders it conceivable that it might contain such distinct senses. A more serious objection is found in the want of any certain or satisfactory criterion to tell us in what passages the Spirit designed a different sense from that which the human penman had, and what the sense of the Spirit was. Who is qualified to decide this point? And is it not apparent that the assumption of such a sense with no rule to determine where it is, or what it is, leaves every thing to vague conjecture, deprives us of all certainty in the interpretation of Scripture, and makes it in fact whatever any interpreter may choose to make it? A more serious objection still is, that it mistakes entirely the position and design of this portion of God's revelation, and its relation to the people and the age to which it was given as their instructor and guide. It disregards the significancy of the Old Testament for Old Testament times, as though it could not be explained by itself, and had no meaning for them for whom it was primarily and especially designed. It assumes that in the sense of the Spirit it was unintelligible to them; and in fact that this was never unveiled, until it was rendered comparatively unnecessary by the superior clearness of the New Testament. The revelation made to any age, though significant for all coming time, was specially adapted to the wants and capacities of that age. A hidden sense of the kind spoken of above, would be of no use to the Old Testament saints, for it was undiscoverable by them; nor is it of use to us, for we have the same things which it is supposed to teach, taught more plainly in passages where that sense is obvious.

The double sense of which we have spoken, must not be confounded with that interpretation which assigns to the same prophecy a two-fold or even manifold accomplishment. Nor must it be supposed, that in saying what we have of the former, we have meant in any wise to discredit the latter. It is very frequently the case, that the same prophecy, after having been fulfilled in a lower, is fulfilled again in a higher subject; sometimes there is a series of fulfilments of ever increasing magnitude and extent, until in the last the acme is reached of perfect correspondence with the prophetic picture. But this is a very different thing from the assertion, that there is in the words of inspiration a concealed sense, which the Spirit of God intended, but which no rule of explication could ever evolve out of them.

The views of our author upon this subject are these. God's eternal purpose of redeeming fallen man is laid at the foundation of all human history, at least as that is viewed in the Bible. The sacred history of the world is from first to last nothing more nor less than the history of redemption; a history which is not yet fully unfolded, and will not be, until the curse shall be entirely done away, and the last ransomed of earth raised to the complete inheritance of the children of God. This work in its gradual progress to the consummation, has its successive stages, through which it has passed or has yet to pass; and it rests for its accomplishment upon another purpose, that of the incarnation. God assumes human nature in order to raise man to a participation of the divine. The incarnation thus becomes the central point in human history, as it is the hinge on which the destinies of the world are suspended. All things converge to bring it about, that its effects may then diverge over the earth. Every thing is bent first to prepare the way for the coming of the Son of God, as that which shall provide salvation and spread it over all mankind. His coming, as the salvation which he effects, is not a thing by itself, unlooked for, with no previous preparation, and nothing to induce it, flashing suddenly and unaccountably upon the world as a meteoric phenomenon, but the end of a long process, the termination of a series which had it from the first in view, and was framing its steady progress towards its accomplishment. This is no mere growth of nature, no product of natural causes, either acting of themselves

or under superior control. The result is due to God's almighty agency, yet not exerting itself in the way of some sudden unexplained intervention of bare omnipotence, but gradually maturing the fruit, whose seeds had ages before been cast into the soil of human history. This, which was true of the history of the world in general before the advent, was true in a very special manner of that portion of the race which was under particular divine conduct with reference to this very thing, which was made the depository of divine revelation, and from the midst of which the salvation of the world was to go forth. The incarnation of the Son of God with a view to the salvation of man is thus made the capstone of the Old Testament pyramid, the apex towards which all was converging, and as each successive course was laid from the foundation up, it was so placed as to indicate what the whole would be when completed, and to awaken the anticipation of what was yet to come. In this sense the whole of that history is predictive of the future. It bears in itself the evidences of a plan, unfinished indeed, but so regular in its structure and so evident in its design that from any stage whatever of its advancement, there may be derived data sufficient on which to base a conception more or less accurate of the whole.

Now this plan of God not left for human sagacity to discover and figure out, but revealed, and under such gracious superintendence as secures that it shall not be ultimately defeated, but be ever advancing to its accomplishment, renders sacred history, which is the field of its development, predictive in two ways, both from its positive and its negative side, both by reason of its possessions and its needs, what has been gained, and what is still lacking, what it has, and what it has not.

This plan is furthered to its completion not so much by aggregation like the successive courses of a building, as by what more resembles an organic development; not so much by superposition from without as by an unfolding from within. That is from the first given to man in embryo, which is destined for him in its perfection. At any period in this progress, then, what is possessed is nothing for itself, it is not the end but only a step towards the end, and as such a sign of what is yet to come. It

has ever in it the germ of a succeeding future, waiting for its season to be unfolded. Just as the seed reveals to the observer the future plant wrapped up in itself, or as the bud holds in it the flower, and the flower the fruit, and this again is but the seed of a new growth, so each stage of the history has that in it, which marks it as preparatory to a succeeding stage—that which it would not have were it the end beyond which nothing is to be looked for. Each fresh advance grows out of that last preceding, and is itself prognostic of the next.

The negative side of the sacred history is equally predictive with the positive. A perfect Saviour and a complete salvation is the end designed. It is only necessary, therefore, that a deficiency or a want should make itself felt in order to furnish an indication of something to be provided as its supply. The partial is predictive of the complete, the limited of the universal. Every thing imperfect, every felt necessity which is not as yet adequately met, reveals a new constituent which will be required to make up that which is to come in which there shall be no imperfection.

While, however, all the history is thus tending to its ultimate goal, and is every where predictive of it, it is not so equally in every part. It does not flow with a steady, uniform current throughout; but there are premonitions of the sublime cataract, in which it is to have its issue, in the many antecedent waterfalls scattered along its course. Before it reaches the end it passes through several crises, as it were, in which the characteristics of the end come more evidently out, are brought more prominently into view; which are in a more eminent sense preliminary, a foreshadowing of what is yet to come. As in climbing a mountain we rise by a succession of steep ascents followed by a level space or even slight declivities, each of these ascents being in brief what the mountain is on a grander scale; so in the history we find some characters and some events, in which he for whose coming all is a preparation, is more plainly imaged forth. While all is typical, these are types *par excellence*. It is as though the history were a living thing, and were endowed with an instinctive struggling to bring forth the like of that which is its grand and ultimate product. Abraham, David,

Solomon, clearly foreshadowed Christ, and the period of the Exodus overflowed with typical references to him; while in other men and other times the prediction was often faint.

The preparation which was going forward on Old Testament ground for the coming down of God into the flesh, had both its divine and its human factors. The plan was of God, the efficiency was of God; yet its unfolding was to take place upon the arena of human history, the product in a measure of the free agency of man. Hence the possibility of an abnormal as well as of a normal development. The plan being of God, could not be endangered as to its ultimate success; yet for a season, through the culpability of man, it might seem to stand still, or even to go backward, and there be nothing to point to the destined end. The men, to whom the process was confided, might betray their trust; and for that season the type would go wholly out in darkness. Only those who act the part assigned them, and in some good measure correspond to the ideal pattern of what they ought to be, are predictive, and only in so far as they do this are they predictive. All the rest are excrescences on the plant, not part of its natural healthy growth, not belonging properly to it. Thus the kings of the theocracy, as a whole, are emblems of Messiah the Prince; but among those kings, pious princes such as David and Hezekiah are to be reckoned specific types of Christ, while in wicked princes such as Ahaz and Jehoiachin, the type is almost, if not quite obscured. Solomon reigning righteously is predictive of Christ, but not Solomon building high places for the abominations of the heathen.

That this development, which God is conducting amongst men, may not be on the one hand as respects them a violent or an unconscious one, but that they may be free, intelligent, and responsible actors in it; and that it may on the other hand be raised above all possibility of failure through their ignorance or perverseness, two things were necessary—they must be enlightened, and they must be controlled.

In the first place, they amongst whom this plan is unfolding, must be made acquainted with the end toward which all is tending, and with the place which each advance as it is made holds in the general scheme. The plan did not originate with them. The grace and wisdom of God projected it. It is not any thing

springing from them, but solely the presence of God in the history, which renders it predictive. As a general rule men never understand their own age; much less could they detect this supernatural plan, and discover its real nature, unless it were revealed to them from heaven. This revelation is the aim of prophecy. It is addressed to them who live when it is spoken, for their benefit, to solve the problem of their own times, to make known their present duty, to give them the encouragement, the consolation, the warning, the direction they require. Hence with this as its task, prophecy cannot reveal every thing at once, nor every thing indiscriminately. It would be out of place, useless, and injurious; would retard instead of furthering the development, or shape it out of due proportion. Merely to give a proof of the Divine omniscience to future generations, or to authenticate the claims of the Messiah when he should come, is not its aim. The Messiah had independent testimonials in himself sufficient to convince; and it would be strange, if so large a part of divine revelation were intended to be a sealed book, and answer no valuable end for centuries after it was communicated. It was intended primarily and mainly for the prophet's contemporaries; and that not with the view of gratifying a vain curiosity in its passion to pry into the future, but to throw light upon the present, and to set it in its true relation to what is yet to come. It draws its lessons of duty, encouragement, or warning, from the whole plan of God, that which remains to be unfolded as well as that which has been unfolded already; yet only such lessons as are appropriate to the present. Consequently, though without being absolutely bound to this, it yet prevailingly looks upon the future as it is the product of the present, sees it through the medium of the present. What prophecy shall disclose is not a question as to the extent of God's omniscience, but as to man's capacities and wants. The language of the Saviour regarding his own teachings is equally applicable to the teachings of his Spirit, as he spoke by the prophets. "I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." He spake as they were able to receive it. Every thing in its proper place, order, and measure, is the universal law of the divine procedure and distribution. The plant is not created before there is a soil in which it may root itself.

Nor does the fruit attach itself to the stem until the bud and the blossom have first preceded it. God might have revealed to Adam, (whatever infidels may say to the contrary,) every event that has ever occurred, or is yet to occur, upon this world's surface. But prophecy would thus be degraded to mere sooth-saying. And is it not apparent that such random, uncalled-for predictions, having only the doubtful merit of disclosing a distant future, but with no particular end in view, and of no particular use to the times when it was made known, would have been vastly inferior to the wisdom and goodness of that system of disclosure which pervades the prophecies, by which the present is made the mirror of the future, and the future is made to educate the present?

Thus is produced what may be called an organic connexion ✓ of the Old Testament prophecy and its history. One grows with the other, and they are inseparably entwined together. As the plan of God in the history advances to its completion, prophecy is unfolded with a corresponding ratio. At the outset its announcements are made chiefly in general outlines, then become gradually more full and distinct. With every fresh want that makes itself felt, prophecy draws a new trait in the coming Saviour by which that want shall be supplied. With every image of the future good which the grace of God brings into the history, prophecy points again at the great original of whom this is the imperfect foreshadowing. To anticipate the progress of the history, and hold him up as a remedy for evils which had never yet been experienced, or to describe him by images which have no type in the present, and no significancy, no felt reality for it, would be unseasonable and unwise. At each point of time what the people needed to know just then was revealed to them; future necessities were left to be supplied as they should arise. A prophecy, which was required by the condition of things in the time of Isaiah, would have been wholly out of place delivered to Abraham. Prophecy has thus its historic aspect, as the history has its prophetic aspect. They are closely linked in together, and correspond ever in their advances; the prophecy keeping pace with the history as its interpreter, or outrunning it as its guide.

Such was the end to be answered by one of the divine func-

tions of the sacred history—one of the modes in which God interfered to conduct it to its destined end. Prophecy was to enlighten man. It has been already said that in order to prevent failure and ensure a happy issue, it was needful that man, though free and acting freely, should nevertheless be controlled. This required another mode of divine interference, and introduces a new divine function into the history. God dwells indeed in all history, conducting it to the end which he has purposed shall be accomplished by it. But the history of that people, among whom the salvation of the race was to unfold itself, he pervaded in a very especial manner. The purposed result was not one of natural ability but of divine grace. Left to the conduct of men there would have been a perpetual degeneracy and a certain failure. There was needed, therefore, constant strengthening and correction from above to set it right, and keep it so, and push it forward to completion. God not merely presided over it, superintending, directing, overruling, but was ever in it, pervading, vivifying it by his sovereign almighty agency, and ensuring that the result should be brought about. This supernatural agency of God in the Old Testament history is more or less distinct according to circumstances, and to the exigencies of each particular case. Sometimes these call for immediate, direct, almighty intervention, or what is ordinarily called the miracle in the proper sense; at others it falls more into the back ground, and accomplishes all its ends without being so distinctly perceived. The history is miraculous throughout, *i. e.*, it is ever under supernatural control, though what are strictly termed miracles are not found on every page. They never appear uncalled for; yet they are never lacking when needed.

Both the divine functions of the history, therefore, the prophecy and the miracle co-operate throughout to strengthen and to direct it to its appointed end of paving the way for the incarnation of the Son of God. Yet they are not equally manifest upon the surface of the history in all its parts. Both may at certain periods, and even for long periods cease entirely as to their external manifestation, though not as to their actual existence, and real though concealed operation. Light and strengthening are first given, and then the history is left to itself for

a while, receiving no additional communication, but subsisting on that furnished in the past, until new necessities call once more for fresh supplies.

Thus viewed, all appearance of isolation or abruptness is taken from what is supernatural in the Old Testament. Its miracles, its prophecies, are not mere arbitrary phenomena, without any particular necessity or appropriateness, or connexion with what goes before or follows after, but are integral functions of the history, necessary to its proper unfolding according to a preconceived plan. They are God's hand in history, visible indeed in every portion of it, but more prominently displayed, whenever the occasion demands it.

Christ is thus presented in the volume before us as the end of the whole of the Old Testament; not the subject of a few scattered predictions merely, or shadowed forth in a few isolated types, but every thing that it contains meets its accomplishment in him. As far as the Old Testament is a consistent scheme, of which all the parts harmonize to one common result, he is the completion of the whole.

The manner in which the progress of things in the heathen world stood related to the coming Saviour, presents an interesting topic for investigation which our author rather indicates than enters upon. Even here he finds that which is predictive of Christ. There is a development here also; but it is a hot-bed growth, and abnormal. The deep-seated and ever-clamorous wants of human nature made themselves felt; but men sought to supply them for themselves having no revelation from heaven; and things shot up into monster shapes, because the heathen world was not, like Israel, under supernatural conduct. The nations were suffered the while to walk in their own ways. A recent and popular English writer has taken up this idea, and to some extent unfolded it in a treatise on the Unconscious Prophecies of Heathendom.\* But there is much ground yet to be explored, and much rich fruit yet, we doubt not, to be gathered. We look with no common interest upon the researches which are now making into the mythologies and the religions of the ancient heathen world; and we are persuaded that the

\* *Christ the Desire of all Nations, or the Unconscious Prophecies of Heathendom*, being the Hulsean Lectures for the year 1846, by R. C. Trench, M. A.

result in every case will be, as it has been strikingly already, to demonstrate not only how immeasurably superior Christianity is to every form of Pagan superstition, but also how these last are ever monstrous and abnormal growths adhering about those very truths, which Christianity presents us in their purity and in their genuine development. In general, Kurtz assigns to heathenism both a negative and a positive work in preparation for the coming of Christ. The negative was to reveal men's moral and spiritual necessities, and the impossibility of their supplying them themselves, that after an experience of the total failure of all their own devices, they might the more readily accept of God's plan when made known to them. The positive was to develop an intellectual culture and refinement, and whatever lay within the sphere of men's native abilities, which might be turned over to the uses of the Christian Church, when the time for its establishment should arrive. And it is remarkable how, when heathenism had accomplished this its appointed task, it sank away itself to barbarism, and has produced only the most stunted and valueless intellectual growths since.

✓ The history of the Old Covenant as defined in the volume before us forms one section of the history of Redemption, and is in a measure complete in itself, having as the common aim to which it all tended, the incarnation. The history of Redemption stretches from the creation and the fall to the consummation of all things, and the complete deliverance of the sons of God. The history of the Old Covenant though linked with what precedes as the conditions in which it had its origin, and contributing to what follows by the results which it unfolds, is yet in strictness limited by the call of Abraham as its commencement, and the coming of Christ as its close. Two schemes of development had been started previously, and though a valuable purpose had been answered by each of them, they were without a successful result as to effecting the redemption of man. The first had from the excessive wickedness which overspread the world, to be violently broken off, and all mankind destroyed. One godly family was saved, and another unfolding took place in the line of its descendants. But the same depraved tendency was not slow in manifesting itself again; and it became apparent that if effective measures were not taken to stay

the progress of corruption, it would speedily become incurable and there would be another failure. It was then that God selected one among the descendants of Shem to be the starting point of a new development, to be the germ of a race in the midst of which salvation might unfold itself, not for his individual benefit merely, nor for that of his offspring, but that thus the redemption of the world might be effected. Abram was called to be the father of a people who should be severed from all others, fenced in by a restrictive economy so framed as to shut out as far as possible all unfriendly influences, trained up amidst divine interpositions and communications of the divine will, and kept in constant expectancy of the future good. When Christ should come, then first might these barriers be thrown down, which had served their purpose of preventing the incursions of an ungodly world from destroying the infant Church, but which must no longer be permitted to remain after it has attained to full age, to trammel its strong arm, or to limit the sphere of its manly operations.

The history is thus divided: From the creation to the call of Abraham is preliminary. The 1st period contains the history of the chosen family to its descent into Egypt. The 2d, its establishment as a people, embracing the times of Moses, Joshua and the Judges. 3d. The kingdom. 4th. The exile and return. 5th. The period of expectation, whose task it was to prepare for the salvation now on the eve of appearing. 6th. The period of fulfilment, whose object is the salvation exhibited in Christ, its reception by the covenant people, the dissolution of the Old Covenant in the judgment upon them, and the hopes and prospects which, on the ground of prophecy, yet await them in the future. The volume before us is occupied with the book of Genesis, and includes therefore the preliminary and the family periods. Passing by the former, we shall follow our author sufficiently in the latter to give some idea of his views and his method of treating his subject.

The family period was in the strictest sense a preparatory one; it was the foundation stage of a dispensation, which was itself preparatory. It belonged to this age to provide a people and a land for the unfolding of the promised salvation. So long as the chosen seed consisted of but one or two individuals

or a single family, and that wandering from place to place with no fixed habitation, the redemption that was to overspread the world could not be introduced through them. The first thing to be done, then, in preparation for the salvation that was to come, was to provide a nation and a land. This was the end after which the patriarchal age was striving; this was the prime want, which was awakened in their minds; it was this to which the leadings of God were conducting them. When this should be accomplished the first stage would be passed. It was with reference to this, therefore, in particular, that they needed to be assured that it should be effected, that what in their times seemed primarily to obstruct the entrance of the promised good for the world should be taken out of the way; their descendants should grow to a mighty nation, should be settled in Canaan, and the world should be redeemed. It was not until after this first step was taken, and Israel had become a nation and Canaan was theirs, that it was made apparent that not the time of complete fulfilment had arrived, but only that the first stage of approach to it had been traversed. A sense of fresh wants was awakened in the chosen seed, and there was needed the assurance of God that these too should be supplied, and should not be permitted to stand for ever in the way of the expected deliverance. To conclude, therefore, from the prominence assigned to a large posterity and the inheritance of Canaan in the revelations made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that this was all they looked for, that their expectations were wholly of a temporal and earthly nature, and that they had no idea of a spiritual redemption, is not only to run counter to the authority of the New Testament, which in repeated passages declares the reverse, but to mistake all the aims and tendencies of the history itself. The end ever held before them was the blessing of God upon all nations; and a multiplied seed and the promised land were regarded ever not as temporal advantages, not as an end in themselves, but as opening the way to the salvation of the world, which was through this medium to be effected.

The call of Abraham was grounded in both an objective and a subjective necessity. On the one hand it was necessary in order to sunder him from the idolatrous influences to which he was exposed in the land of his kindred, and to make of his

descendants an independent people instead of a mere co-ordinate branch of a larger stock; and on the other it was necessary to his training in faith, obedience, and self-denial, that he should be required on the bare command of God to renounce the good things of the present in hope of a better future. The promise made to him that in his seed all nations should be blessed, is Messianic in as far as it points to the coming salvation; but it contains no definite and clear intimation of a personal Redeemer, through whom this should be effected. It is the seed of Abraham in its entirety, and collectively that is presented as the bearer of the blessing. The hopes of the patriarchs were all connected with the expansion of the individual into a great people. Not until this expansion had first taken place was the hope of salvation concentrated, as in the predictions from Moses onward, upon an individual from amongst this seed. The promise made to Abraham is an advance upon that made to our first parents, inasmuch as it limits to a single race what had before been predicted as arising out of Eve's descendants, and inasmuch as what was barely negative there, the crushing of the tempter, has become positive here, a blessing upon all the families of the earth.

In what befell Abram in Egypt is seen how God delivers his chosen out of the embarrassment into which his own culpable conduct had thrown him, and how even the monarch of Egypt must bow before him, and restore what he had taken from him. Lot is separated from Abram as the last remnant of his kindred that still adhered to him; and the promise of Canaan and of a large posterity is repeated with more fulness than before. The land is given to him and to his seed for ever—a grant which remains good, says Kurtz, though Israel be exiled from his inheritance for seventy, or even for eighteen hundred years. Abram next appears as the defender of the land from foreign violence and the chastiser of its foes, having in the victory which by God's help he gains over Chedorlaomer, a pledge of divine aid and protection against all its future enemies. On his return Melchizedek meets and blesses him. This mysterious personage has been taken respectively for Shem, for Ham, for Enoch, for a man created directly of God just for that juncture, for an angel, for the Son of God appearing antecedently to his

humiliation in human form, and by one sect of ancient heretics for the Holy Ghost. He was, however, a pious Canaanitish prince. The Salem, of which he was king, was a real place, and not merely a significant title, and that not identical with a supposed Shalem near to Shechem, (Gen. xxxiii. 18) nor with Salim on the banks of the Jordan, (John iii. 23) but with Jerusalem; as is proved by the testimony of Onkelos and of Josephus, by the identity of the names ("peace" and "possession of peace"), by Ps. lxxvi. 2, where incontestably Salem means Jerusalem, by the hereditary name of the king (Melchizedek, king of righteousness, identical with Adonizedec, lord of righteousness, Josh. x. 3), by its vicinity to the king's dale (Gen. xiv. 17) the spot where Absalom afterwards reared his pillar (2 Sam. xviii. 18), now known as the valley of Jehoshaphat, and by its lying directly upon the route from Damascus, whither Abram pursued the flying kings, to Hebron where he had fixed his residence. At this point, where the roads to Sodom and to Hebron diverge, the king of Sodom comes up the valley of the Kidron to greet the victor, while Melchizedek descends from his royal citadel to bless him. The last surviving flower of the Noachic covenant thus gives its sanction and its blessing to the representative of the covenant that was destined to succeed them.

Thus far the record speaks of promises given to Abram; now a covenant is made (xv. 18,) and ratified on the part of God by the passage between the sundered parts of a sacrifice, of a symbol of the divine presence akin to that which appeared afterwards to Moses in the burning bush, or to the people in the pillar of fire and cloud, or in the tabernacle in the glory above the mercy-seat. For ten years Abram had been waiting in vain for his expected offspring, until he was almost ready to conclude that the steward of his house was destined to inherit his promises and his hopes. But his faith is reassured by the express declaration that a child of his own body should be his heir. In all that had thus far passed, no mention had been made of Sarah, and in her impatience she concludes that she can be the mother only by adoption of the promised seed, and hopes to find in the child of Hagar what she sought. The event soon shows the vanity of all expedients of man's devising to hasten unseasonably the fulfilment of what God had promised.

Thirteen years more of longing and expectation pass away for the fuller trial of the patriarch's faith, and more completely evidencing the barrenness of Sarah. The time was now approaching when grace would give what could no longer be hoped for from nature. Now first, there was required the ratification of the covenant on the part of Abraham, by the circumcision of himself and all the males of his household.

As to the origin of this rite the same controversy has been waged as about many others belonging to the Old Testament ceremonial, which resemble those found in Pagan worship. Were they adopted by the Pagans from the Jews, or by the Jews from the Pagans?—and, if the latter, how is this consistent with their forming part of a divine revelation? Kurtz has no hesitation in admitting that its practice in Egypt or in other lands may have preceded its adoption by Abraham; and this not because he assigns much weight to the testimony of Herodotus, that the inhabitants of Palestine borrowed this rite from Egypt, with which *Jer. ix. 25, 26,* and *Ezek. xxxii.* may be reconciled by the consideration that the Egyptians were not universally circumcised, but only the priests, and those who were admitted to the sacred mysteries. He places his admission rather on the ground of the relation found to subsist between the symbols of the Old Testament and of heathen worship generally, the embodiment of religious conceptions being to a large extent the same in both, while in many cases the priority is evidently not on the side of Israel. Without giving any decided opinion in this individual case, we yet agree so far with our author in his views, that we are not startled in the least to find in the outward forms of Pagan nations generally, or in the rites of Egypt in particular, much that bears an analogy to the ceremonial of the Jews. The peculiarity of Judaism is not that it employs a different kind of outward symbols from all the varieties of Paganism, but that its teachings through those symbols are the reverse of theirs; it teaches what they never knew, a true God and a holy religion. There is no copying of Pagan institutions, and introducing them with their Pagan errors attached, into the worship of God; but symbols, which were used in these institutions and profaned to idolatrous ends, are set in new combinations, purged of their profane ideas, and made to point to God and holiness. It would

be just as reasonable to demand that when God makes a verbal revelation, he should not do so through the medium of a language known and understood before, but should coin an entirely new tongue for the purpose—or that he should have it written in characters unused and unintelligible by man, as that when he makes a revelation in symbols he should employ such as none had ever used. It would be just as reasonable to insist that God should not make known his will through the Apostles in Greek, because that was the language of a profane, idolatrous nation, as that he must not make it known to Abraham or to Moses in Egyptian symbols, because they likewise were employed for idolatrous purposes. The writings of Paul are not reduced to a level with those of Plato, because they wrote in the same language, and used many of the same words; nor are the institutes of the Old Testament placed on a par with those of Egyptian priests, because there may be symbols common to them both. Everything turns not on the occurrence of similar outward forms, but on the ideas which they are set to express. Paul and Plato used the same language; but Paul used it to teach the revealed truths of God, Plato human philosophy. Moses used symbols in common with the Egyptian priests; but there cannot be a more absolute contrast than between the truths of the holy religion which he inculcated, and the falsehoods and delusions propagated by them. Yet while we speak thus, we feel bound to enter our protest against the course of those interpreters, who seem determined to deny to the Old Testament ceremonial not only the possession of anything divine, but even of anything original, and who affect to have discovered that all its institutions were copied either from the Egyptians or from other heathen nations. In the dress of the priests, and the day of atonement, and the plan of the tabernacle, and everything else we have some Egyptian analogy proved upon us by that wonder-working dilemma, in which Spencer led the way. Either the Egyptians did the same, and then it was borrowed from them; or they did differently, and then it was established for the sake of creating a distinction. In either case, the ground of the institution lay in Egypt. We have the Cherubim likened to the Sphinx, and we regret that Hengstenberg, in what we cannot but esteem an incautious zeal for Egyptian

analogies, lent this his sanction. We have the Hebrew ark paraded with cuts from the monuments of the Pharaohs, to prove an identity (Kitto's Cyclop., I. pp. 216-7), when Bähr has long ago demonstrated that there was nothing whatever in their fundamental structure or design in common; and that the ark bore actually more resemblance to a chest found by Captain Cook among the South Sea Islanders, carried by them on poles and called the house of God, than to anything discoverable in Egypt; when he has proved, too, that the rites of Israel contain analogies in many cases quite as striking with those of the remotest nations, and who had no possible intercourse with them, as with those of Egypt and other countries with which they were brought into immediate contact. Wherever it can be shown, therefore, that a particular rite of the Old Testament had its parallel among the heathen, or wherever it can be made probable that it had its origin in Egypt, we feel no difficulty in the admission, and think that in doing so we do not derogate in the least from its divine enactment and authority. Still we conceive it to be due to historic verity as well as to the just claims of religion, not to allow every casual resemblance to be straightway converted into a proof of identity, and to assert the originality of the inspired ceremonial, not only in the truths and ideas which it teaches, and which are everywhere original, but also in such outward forms as are in fact peculiar to itself.

We pass to the last and severest trial of Abraham's faith. The child of the promise has been born; the command of God comes, that he must be offered in sacrifice. It is needless to recite here even for the purpose of refuting them, the malignant misrepresentations which have been made of this, as though human sacrifices were offered by the Hebrews, or as though their God required them. Still the question is one which needs a solution, How could the Lord issue such a command? How could the same God, who, repeatedly in the law, expressed his abhorrence of such sacrifices, (Deut. xii. 31,) here enjoin them? It is to evade the difficulty, not to meet it, to say with Hengstenberg, that Abraham mistook the intention of the Divine command, which was not to *slay* Isaac, but to *offer* him to God; and that he committed the error of understanding that in a literal

and outward sense which was intended to be carried out in a figurative and spiritual sense only. The explanation given by our author is undoubtedly the true one, that the command was intended only as a trial. God never designed to allow it to be carried out to full accomplishment. It was his purpose from the first, to interfere just as he did interfere in the decisive moment. It was to discover the strength of Abraham's faith and the steadfastness of his obedience. And as soon as this was evidenced, and it was seen that the patriarch's faith did not stagger, and his unflinching obedience was made to appear, then the trial was complete. Isaac was already sacrificed in purpose; to slay him could have answered no further end.

But why was exactly this trial selected? Kurtz answers, it was that Abraham might be taught by his receiving Isaac back as it were from the dead, yet more than by the long delay of his birth, that he was the child not of natural descent but of the gracious promise. It was that he and Isaac might both be taught that all their possessions, even a dearest and best-loved child, and life itself are the Lord's, and must be surrendered at his bidding; and what was thus inculcated upon the first father and first son of the chosen race, was through them impressed upon all their posterity. But there was a deeper reason for it than these. The Canaanites, on every hill and under every green tree sacrificed their children in the service of their idols; and now it should be made to appear both to the patriarch and to others, whether he had as earnest an attachment to the true God as they to their miserable idols; whether he would make such sacrifices for the cause of the God he worshipped, as they for their cruel superstitions. There was a truth too, obscured and mingled as it was with horrid error, in the human sacrifices practised by the Canaanites, and indeed to a greater or less extent by almost every ancient heathen nation. This should here be sifted out and handed over to Abraham and his posterity to be a seed, whence might spring anticipations and longings after that, for whose full and complete revelation the world was not yet prepared. Human sacrifice was the convulsive effort of heathenism in its despair of finding an adequate mode of appeasing the anger of God. Men felt, and rightly felt that some expiation was necessary. They felt, and

this too, rightly, that the sacrifice of animals presented no adequate atonement for offences, in which man's life was the forfeit. They felt, and rightly again, that nothing in the wide world was too dear, nothing too precious, to give for regaining the favour of God. And in their desperation they offer up a human life as the costliest thing they knew, not heeding that they are offering to God an unwilling and therefore valueless victim, and a life which, itself sinful, cannot atone for sin, besides bringing on themselves the guilt of murder. This was man's solution, false and inhuman, as it was offensive to the Most High, of that dread question which agitates every conscience, How shall I be just with God? The true solution was not yet given to the world. It should not be, until the time appointed in the divine plan of saving mercy had arrived. Meanwhile it should be intimated that such a solution would be given, though for the present it was withheld. In the direction to offer Isaac it was evidently implied that the dearest and the best must be given unto God—that something more valuable than the life of an animal is needed as an atonement for human guilt; while in the staying Abraham's hand from giving the fatal stroke, it was declared that Isaac was not the sacrifice which was demanded; it was something more precious, something more pure than that beloved child; what it should be was left for God to reveal. And in the pointing out of the ram to be placed upon the altar in the stead of Isaac, it was declared that until the true sacrifice should appear, animal sacrifices, though in themselves inoperative and insufficient to wash away sin, received the divine sanction and would be admitted as prefiguring that which was to come. The disclosing, therefore, as is here done, of the imperfection that inhered in animal sacrifices, and that there was nothing then adequate to take their place was equivalent to a pledge on the part of a gracious God, that there should be a perfect sacrifice provided and offered, and that its sovereign efficacy should even then be reckoned unto those, who in faith and pious fear offered up what was temporarily and until its appearing admitted in its place. And now it is easy to see why Abraham was directed to go to the mountains of Moriah to offer up his son, where subsequently in the temple, were to be offered those animal sacrifices, which here received a divine

legitimation for their temporary purpose, and where, too, that offering the end of all sacrifice was in the fulness of time to be presented unto God on behalf of a guilty world.

We shall not pursue the history further; but we cannot pass by the blessing of Jacob without presenting our author's views upon that most interesting and important passage.

This is the last instance of a patriarchal blessing, because Jacob was the last single head of the chosen race. And this paternal blessing is not, as those of Abraham and Isaac had been, repeated and confirmed to the sons by God himself, probably because none were to be set aside here as Ishmael or Esau, that there was needed a fresh divine investiture for the rightful heir. Since all the sons were together partakers of the promise, the divine ratification of this already made to the parent was valid for all coming generations.

The patriarch's time had come to be gathered to his fathers. He had summoned his sons around his bedside to see their father die; and as he looked upon them, his eye ranges forward in prophetic vision to the time when all would be fulfilled, which God had promised to Abraham, and to Isaac, and repeated likewise to himself. The departing seer beholds in faith and by the spirit of inspiration, all accomplished which he had been taught to expect, and all those hindrances and evils removed, in which the present came sensibly short of its realization. Israel, no longer a single family, or a few families, is swollen to a great nation; the period of their wanderings and their exile has given place to the confirmed possession of the promised land; and the expected salvation has come, and makes its victorious way of blessing over all the earth. Enraptured by the sight, he feels impelled to tell his sons what shall befall them "in the last days."

The period thus fixed in the outset as the one traversed by the prediction, is not the future indefinitely. The same expression occurs in fifteen other passages in the Old Testament, and one corresponding to it occurs several times in the New. Its meaning invariably is the ultimate future, the period of complete accomplishment, in a word, the Messianic period. It must mean the same here. That the prophecy is principally employed upon the occupation of the promised land, is not

ineconsistent with this interpretation. That was to Jacob's view the time of the end. The promises of God, and the leadings of his providence, Jacob's expectations and hopes, were all directed to this, a numerous posterity possessing the land of Canaan as a medium of blessing to the race. The point of Israel's settlement in Canaan was presented to the eye of the patriarch as lying precisely on a range with the salvation of the world; and without marking the chronological interval which separates them, he sees them both together. This representation is imperfect, but it is not false. It does not disclose all that God's omniscience might have revealed about the times and the periods. But all that it does disclose, finds its complete and accurate fulfilment either in one event, or in the other of those contemplated, or perhaps in both. These events do not synchronize in actual fact, it is true; but there is a bond which links them together sufficient to justify the intimate connexion in which they here appear. The possession of Canaan by a great nation of Israel's descendants, was in order to the salvation of the world. The former was an important step in the unfolding of that gracious plan, by which the latter was to be secured. Yet when that step came to be taken, it would be found that the point of ultimate accomplishment lay still far in the distance; other necessities will have to be met, and other obstacles to be taken out of the way; much will still remain to be done in preparation before the blessing on all nations can be realized. But this interval is not revealed to Jacob. The salvation of the world lies to him immediately behind the possession of Canaan, and the two things appear to coalesce. Without being conscious, apparently, of any abruptness of transition or of intermingling separate events, he passes readily from one to the other, or speaks indifferently of either, or even of both at once.

The passage of most interest in this prophecy is the blessing pronounced upon Judah. That we have here a prediction of the peaceful dominion of the Redeemer to be established over all nations, has almost the united weight of all the interpreters of Scripture in its favour. This is the ancient Jewish understanding of the passage, and the one which has always prevailed among Christian writers. That it is in fact Messianic,

and was so intended by the patriarch himself, appears not only from the way in which it has been commonly understood, from the scope of the entire prophecy in which it stands, from the introductory words, which distinctly mark it as having in view the last days or the Messianic period; but also from the impossibility of inventing any other meaning, which can, with even tolerable plausibility, be put upon it. The one which has most pretensions in its favour, understands by Shiloh, (v. 10,) the place of that name, where the tabernacle was pitched by Joshua, and where it still abode in the days of Eli, and so translates the verse as to read, "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, &c., until he comes to Shiloh." But besides the grammatical difficulties which might be urged, and besides the fact that there is no evidence that such a place as Shiloh existed in the time of Jacob, and that it is highly probable that it derived both its origin and its name from the host of Israel encamping there temporarily after the subjugation of the land was completed, there would be a great incongruity in connecting this prophecy with a place, which even if it existed, was so inconsiderable as never once to be mentioned in the sojourning of either Jacob or his fathers in the land of Canaan, and that too while the rest of the prophecy enters into no such minute detail, but spends itself rather upon the great outlines of future destiny. But without delaying to mention other grounds, by which this interpretation may be shown to be untenable, there is one farther consideration, which is of itself sufficient to establish its unsoundness, and that is, it absolutely divests the prediction of all its meaning. What sense would there be in saying that the sceptre should not depart from Judah until he comes to Shiloh, when in fact he had never then received the sceptre at all? The only thing which can in that case be pointed out as its fulfilment is, that Judah went first in the order of the tribes as they marched through the wilderness. But that was no such pre-eminence as is here asserted. The sceptre and the law-giver belonged to a different tribe from that of Judah. It was first Moses a Levite, and then Joshua an Ephraimite, who led them. And although there were things which might be gathered under the general head of the fulfilment of this prediction before the days of David, it was not until in him Judah attained the

sovereignty, that the superiority here assigned that tribe received any marked accomplishment. The denial of the genuineness of the prophecy even, furnishes no escape from this difficulty; for no one in the time of David or of the Judges, could have written this supposing it to describe what had in his days already occurred. Nor does Tuch mend the matter, by translating "as long as they shall come to Shiloh" in their annual festivals, *i. e.* in the writer's intention, for ever; for besides violating the grammatical construction, and giving to the words a sense wholly inadmissible, he obtrudes upon the writer the expectation that the sanctuary would be for ever without a fixed place of abode, and makes the future rule of Judah dependent on the continuance of a state of things, with the cessation of which, Asaph on the other hand, links the commencement of the sovereignty of that tribe, Ps. lxxviii. 60, 67—72.

What, then, does Shiloh here mean? Calvin follows some Jewish interpreters, in supposing it to be an obsolete word meaning *his* (Judah's) *son*. But of the existence of such a word, or of its having this sense, there is no evidence. A large number of the ancient and most valuable versions render it "he to whom it belongs," or "for whom it is reserved." This passage would then find a parallel in Ezek. xxi. 27, "until he come, whose right it is." The chief, in fact the decisive objection against this explanation of the word is, that it not only assumes an unusual grammatical form, and an unusual and harsh ellipsis, but it requires an unwarranted alteration of the text. The true meaning of Shiloh, according to its derivation, is *rest* or *peace*. This is, by the majority of commentators, taken as the abstract for the concrete, and understood as a personal designation of the Messiah, equivalent to the *Peace-maker*. To this Kurtz objects that Shiloh must, for grammatical reasons, be the object, and not the subject of the verb; and that the expectation of a personal Messiah was foreign to the patriarchal period. The promises and hopes of that period, and the immediate wants that were felt, all related to the expansion from one to a great people. The introduction of the future good was as yet revealed only in the indefinite form, which made this people in their totality the medium of blessing, the

bearer of salvation to the world. It was only after this expansion had taken place, and the necessity began to be felt of concentration, of deliverances effected for the people by an individual head and ruler, that there was a basis in the history on which to ground the expectation that redemption should be by one raised up from among the people. It was not until a necessity arose, which called forth a Moses, a Joshua, or a David for its temporary supply, that the idea could attain consistency and shape of their antitype in an individual, personal Messiah. The Mosaic period furnishes the first and still somewhat indefinite prediction of an individual Redeemer (Deut. xviii., 18, 19); the history of David first brings his personality clearly and distinctly out. On these grounds, which he certainly puts with much ingenuity, Kurtz defends his rendering: "Until he (Judah) comes to rest, (a state of quiet, peaceful possession,) and the obedience of the peoples is yielded unto him." The "until" marks not the limit or cessation of his dominion, but the entrance of that period when every disturbing power shall cease, and all that could threaten its perpetuity shall be at an end. The sceptre shall not depart from Judah until his victory is universal and complete, and then, of course, it never shall depart. \*

\* Some interpreters of note and ability have understood this prophecy simply to declare that the temporal government of Judah should be continued until Shiloh's coming, and that then it should be broken up and destroyed; and this coincides so remarkably with the actual event, that it seems at first view to have a strong recommendation in its favour. But this appears to be a very mechanical mode of interpretation. There is an outward, superficial cleaving to the letter; but the spirit is lost sight of. Whoever duly considers either the analogy of Scripture or the scope of the prophecy before us, must be satisfied that there is here promised to Judah a sceptre and a lawgiver in all time to come; not one that should endure until Shiloh's coming and then be irretrievably lost, but one which should then first be fully and firmly established. To raise the hopes of God's chosen people, and encourage them in all times of despondency, they are assured of a sovereignty in Judah which shall not be overwhelmed till the last victory is gained, and the last foe is destroyed, and it is set in triumph over a submissive world; and beyond that the most timid and doubting need no assurance of its continuance. It is the universal testimony of the prophets that the kingdom of Judah and the throne of David were destined to stand, not for a limited period, but for ever. The kingdom of Judah is never, either in the Old Testament or in the New, put in contrast with that of the Messiah, as though the former were to give place to the latter, but they are invariably spoken of as coincident, the latter being the legitimate continuation of the former. Christ is not the founder of a new dynasty, but the culminating point of the old, in whom all that is completely realized which appeared faintly and imperfectly in them that preceded him. This being the unvarying representation

Judah appears in this passage as a resistless warrior, a lion capturing his prey, and whom none might venture to provoke. He wins his victorious way through conflict and strife, to universal empire and undisturbed repose. Then, when every foe is vanquished or destroyed, he sits down to enjoy in peace the fruits of victory. He rides upon the peaceful ass, and feeds on wine and milk. These blessings, which he wins as the prince and champion of his brethren, are for them as for himself; and even over the nations now willingly subject to him must the benefits of his peaceful dominion be expected to flow.

This blessing is Messianic in its character, but not exclusively so; and it is Messianic only because that is true of the Messiah alone in its full sense, which is here attributed to the tribe from which he sprang. It had several imperfect fulfilments before Christ came, as at various periods of the national history the portrait here sketched of Judah corresponded more or less with his actual character and condition. The part Judah took in the conquest of the land, the elevation of David to the throne of Israel, the extent of his dominion, and his victories over surrounding nations, the peaceful reign of Solomon, all fall legitimately within the range of this prediction, and are justly to be regarded as its partial fulfilments. And yet neither these nor any other events in the past fortunes of Judah are adequate to the language here employed. It meets its full accomplishment only in him to whom we have the authority of the New Testament for applying the symbol here given of the tribe, the Lion of the tribe of Judah.

The following passage, relating to the accomplishment of this prediction, we give almost in our author's own words: "In its most immediate application, it has respect to the same time with

of all the writers of Scripture of the perpetuity of the kingdom of Judah, its identity with the kingdom of the Messiah, and its elevation to the highest pitch of glory and prosperity in his person, it would be extremely strange if in the passage before us alone, the very one which we should expect to lie at the foundation of all the others, and give character to them all, a contrary view prevailed, and it was here declared that the sceptre of Judah should be of limited duration, and should be abolished in favour of another which should rise up after it. This view of the perpetuity of Judah's dominion, while it includes within itself the same historical fulfilment which is claimed on behalf of the more restricted understanding of the passage, includes likewise vastly more.

all the rest of the blessing of Jacob, the time of complete possession of the promised land. To Jacob's eye this moment marked the beginning of the last days, the time of the end. The relative rest, with which the pilgrimage of his seed ceased, is undistinguished from the absolute rest, the end and conclusion of that whole movement, which commenced with the call of Abraham. What, in the actual event, proves to be a long line, stretching from its commencement in the relative rest under Joshua, to its termination in the absolute rest under Christ, appears to him coincident with its initial point, behind which it all lies, and which as the commencement of a development already includes in itself potentially the end, and is its prefiguration. The rest here promised found its first preliminary and imperfect exhibition in the time of Joshua; but that this fulfilment was only preliminary, was speedily shown by the still existing disquiet. Whilst, therefore, in the entrance of this relative rest the prophecy of Jacob enters upon its fulfilment, it continues in consequence of the yet remaining disquiet to be still prophetic, until in the introduction of the absolute rest it finds its highest and ultimate fulfilment.

“It is Judah's princely rank and bearing in his sovereignty over his brethren, and in his victorious conflict with his foes, which has won the rest and peace which he enjoys. Just in that measure, therefore, in which the time of Joshua exhibits the predicted repose, must the time before Joshua verify Judah's princely character. Had the rest under Joshua been the true, absolute rest, the pre-eminence of Judah must have revealed itself before that time in its most perfect form. But if, as we have seen, Jacob's prophecy of a future rest continues still prophetic, even after its first preliminary and imperfect exhibition under Joshua, the prophecy of Judah's distinction can in the time before Joshua have met with only a preliminary and partial fulfilment (his precedence in the order of march through the desert.) It must after this still continue prophetic, and point to a sovereignty of Judah, which should be constantly more and more unfolding itself, until its highest manifestation should rise as far above its earliest, as the absolute rest under Christ surpasses the relative under Joshua.

“This prophecy of the rest into which Judah as the prince,

representative, and champion of his brethren should enter with them, relates to the time of the end. Subjectively to Jacob the time of Joshua was the end; for then all the wants and needs of the patriarchal period which had pressed themselves on Jacob's consciousness, and all the requisites which Jacob knew as conditions of the coming salvation were supplied. But there were still other wants and needs, still other requisites and conditions of the coming salvation of which Jacob yet knew nothing, and which, in the time of Joshua, were not yet supplied. Objectively, therefore, this is not yet the end; and Jacob's prophecy, as the product not of his inward state alone but of the illuminating Spirit of God, points every future observer to a higher form of Judah's sovereignty than the precedence of that tribe in the desert, and to a higher rest than that which the possession of the promised land brought with it."

The genuineness of this prediction of Jacob has been most violently contested, but in a manner which plainly shows that the secret of the opposition made to it lies in the palpable proof of inspiration which it affords. The discord, which prevails in the ranks of its opposers with respect to the real date of its composition, affords no very favourable presumption in the outset as to the certainty of those criteria on which they rely. Heinrichs confidently refers it to the time of David, Tuch to that of Samuel, and Ewald with as much positiveness as either to that of Samson. Fortunately we are able to furnish as thorough and conclusive a demonstration of genuineness in this instance, as we can in the case of any disputed passage of the Bible whatever. Kurtz sums up the argument under four heads, which, for convenience, we arrange in a different order.

1. The blessing is as a whole too indefinite, deals too much in general outlines and too little in individual forms to be a *vaticinium post eventum*. It has no such merely external, accidental congruence with the events of any period, as a feigned prediction, put into the mouth of Jacob by one living in that period, would necessarily have. Many of the blessings were suggested by the names of Jacob's sons, or by some incident in their history, or some peculiarity in their temper, which the patriarch had marked; and they are in

some cases at least (a remark made by Hengstenberg, which may be worthy of attention) rather true of them as branches of the chosen people, than characteristic of them as individual tribes.

2. The contents of the prophecy and its form agree entirely with the views and expectations of Jacob, and have nothing in them that would be at all surprising as coming from him on the supposition that he were really endowed with prophetic foresight. The proof of this has been sufficiently exhibited already.

3. The blessing contains positive data, which compel us to refer its composition to the ante-Mosaic period. The dispersion of Levi here appears as a judgment upon him for his misconduct. But this was accomplished, after the unholy zeal of the parent had been succeeded by the pious zeal of his descendants, *Exod.* xxxii. 27—29, and the curse had in consequence been converted into a blessing, by his being honoured to be the priestly tribe, and receiving in consequence as his inheritance cities selected from all parts of the land. But nothing is here said of the dignity of Levi as invested with the priesthood, or as being in any wise distinguished above his brethren. There is only the language of rebuke and malediction. It is impossible, as even critics of the most destructive school have been compelled to acknowledge, that language, such as we find here, could have been used after the priestly succession was fixed in the line of Levi. Tuch indeed endeavours to escape this conclusion, by referring its composition to the period when the misconduct of the sons of Eli had brought the priesthood into disrepute, *1 Sam.* ii. 17, and when Levites wandered through the land homeless, and ready to enter the service of any who would give them wages. *Judg.* xvii. 7—12. But we cannot say much in praise of that candour which thus extends without evidence the misconduct of a single vagabond Levite, or of Eli's two profligate sons, to the whole tribe to which they belonged. Nor, however low the sacerdotal tribe may have sunk in character or influence, would any writer of a truly theocratic spirit, as the author of this prophecy manifestly was, have represented that in such unqualified terms as a curse, which was the direct consequence of their investiture with the priesthood. And then the very instances referred to, show the opposite of that for which

they are adduced, and how high an estimate was set upon a connexion with the priestly tribe even in the case of one least worthy of such consideration. Judg. xvii. 13. Now, if this passage could not have been written after the priesthood was established in the tribe of Levi, and if, according to Tuch's own admission, this is as certain as any thing can be in the early history of Israel, that the priesthood was conferred upon Levi by Moses, the ante-Mosaic origin of this prophecy is indisputable. And if that be granted, it has now been carried back so near the time of its reputed origin, that no one would longer hesitate to admit its having been really uttered by Jacob.

4. There is no time after the fulfilment under Joshua, when all these various blessings could have had their origin. If with Tuch, on the ground of what is said of Levi, we refer its composition to the time of Samuel, or with Ewald, give the preference to the blessing of Dan, and fix it in the time of Samson, the blessing of Judah will stand plumply in the way. For how does the superior honour put upon this tribe accord with its miserable faint-heartedness in the time of Samson, Judg. xv. 9, etc., or with the insignificance of that tribe in the time of Samuel, which was such that it is but once or twice mentioned during the whole course of his ministry until the rise of David, and then not in a way calculated to make an impression of its prominence over other tribes? And besides, how do the other parts of the prophecy, which depict in such glowing colours the happy lot of the various tribes, agree with their wretched disorganized condition, their frequent apostacies, and the frequent oppressions to which they were subject in the times of the later judges, a period which our opponents delight in representing as one of even greater disorder than it really was?

Or if, to escape these difficulties, the composition of this prophecy be referred with Heinrichs to a still later date, the reign of David or Solomon, Charybdis will be cleared, but it is only to fall into Scylla. The blessing of Judah is provided for, but what is said of Levi presents a fatal obstacle. For from that time forward the sacerdotal tribe enjoyed the highest consideration; and the last faintest possibility has vanished of bringing the language of this malediction into any thing like harmony with the period assigned for its origin.

Now, if the tone of the whole prophecy, and particularly the blessing pronounced upon Judah, forbid our assigning it to the period of the judges, and on the other hand, the utterance respecting Levi excludes it from the time of David and Solomon, and this is the utmost limit to which it can by any possibility be carried, we are forced back again by this route also to our previous conclusion of its ante-Mosaic origin, or which is equivalent, its genuineness as a production of Jacob—a conclusion, which there is nothing to oppose, except the rationalistic dictum “there can be no real prophecy.”

ART. IV.—*Panslavism and Germanism.* By Count Valerian Kransinski. London, 1846.

*Historical Sketch of the Rise, Progress and Decline of the Reformation in Poland,* by do. London, 1840. 2 vols.

*Lectures on the Religious History of the Slavonic Nations:* by do. London, 1849.

UNTIL the outbreak of the recent revolution in the old world, we presume that comparatively few among us were aware that that the population of Europe included so many distinct and hostile races as were then engaged in fierce conflict for new rights, or old privileges. Yet it would seem that even the lapse of centuries has not effected a fusion of these diverse social elements, such as we see accomplished in our country in the course of a few years. On the contrary, their antagonism appears to be as vigorous as it was a thousand years ago; and those best acquainted with the subject, do not hesitate to affirm that unless the mighty power of the gospel is brought to bear upon the discordant and heaving mass, we may look for a more terrible explosion than any that history has recorded.

Of the Celtic race only a few remnants survive, and these (unless in Ireland) are politically considered of no great importance. But the Teutonic and Slavonic races number, each of them, many millions; are spread over vast regions, and still retain in undiminished strength the antipathies generated by