

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

APRIL, 1856.

Wm. H. Green

No. II.

ARTICLE I.—*History of the Old Covenant.* By J. H. Kurtz, Ord. Prof. at Dorpat.* Vol. II. 1855. 8vo. pp. 563.

THE first volume of this work traced the history of Israel as a family to its close in the death of Jacob, their last common progenitor. The next period regards Israel as a nation, and, according to the epochs marked by our author, extends to the establishment of the kingdom. This period is divided into four unequal parts, severally represented by the residence in Egypt, the wanderings in the wilderness, the conquest of Canaan, and the residence in Canaan. Each of these has its own distinctly marked character and aim. First, the family was to expand to a nation and to attain a separate and independent existence. Secondly, they must receive their national form and constitution; they are not to be like other nations, but God's peculiar people. Hence he concludes a covenant with them and provides them with their code of laws. Thirdly, in order to realize the destiny thus set before them, and to develop themselves in their newly imparted character, they need to come into the possession of a suitable land. Fourthly,

* Geschichte des Alten Bundes, von Joh. Heinr. Kurtz, u. s. w. Berlin, New York und Adelaide.

this scheme thus constituted is set in actual operation. Hitherto the divine agency has stood in the foreground. Now the people are called upon to act their part, to make use of what God has imparted to them in his gifts, his revelations, his gracious leadings; to exhibit the spectacle of a nation in covenant with God, and living in subjection to his laws. But the people are unfaithful to their trust; they are perpetually forsaking the true path; and the history becomes the record of alternate acts of judgment and of grace. The people are now punished by being given into the hand of the heathen around them, now delivered by judges specially raised up on their behalf. The second of these parts, which covers the legislation of Moses, is by far the most important and the richest in the materials for its exhibition. Kurtz considers it under two divisions: 1. The historical basis of the law and the circumstances of its promulgation; 2. The subject matter of the law. This volume embraces the residence in Egypt, and the first division of the wandering in the wilderness. The contents of the Mosaic legislation reduced to systematic form are to occupy the next volume, or, as he prefers to call it, the second part of this volume.

Kurtz adopts and defends the chronology which understands Ex. xii. 40 in its most obvious sense, and makes the abode in Egypt to have been 430 years: although he seems to think it necessary to assume an error in the text, Num. xxvi. 59. Three centuries and a half of this period are passed over with the simple mention of the only fact which they presented of consequence to the sacred historian, the immense multiplication of the people. He then proceeds at once to the circumstances which paved the way for their leaving Egypt and entering upon their separate existence. The people must have amounted in the aggregate to two millions when they left Egypt, as they numbered 600,000 capable of bearing arms. These were not all sprung from the 66 lineal descendants of Jacob, who entered Egypt, but from their entire households and retinues, which no doubt amounted to several thousands. Abraham was able to summon from his household 318 men to pursue after the captors of Lot: and Jacob returning from Padan-aram had accumulated a sufficient retinue to divide them, on encounter-

ing Esau, into three bands. Their entire households were circumcised, and their condition was favourable to an easy fusion of their descendants. Even thus, however, the multiplication is unexampled: and it is necessary to have recourse in explanation, not only to the surprising fecundity of Egypt, celebrated in ancient and in modern times, but to the special operation of the divine blessing.

In Egypt also, Israel learned to exchange a nomadic for an agricultural life, and to practise the various arts which that involved, and many others, as is apparent from 1 Chron. iv. 14, 21, 23, where potters, weavers, and carpenters are mentioned, and especially from the construction of the tabernacle, which required skill in working various metals, in polishing and engraving precious stones, in weaving and embroidering costly stuffs, etc. They possessed themselves in fact of the civilization and refinement of Egypt, and God's promise to Abraham, that his seed should come out from the land of their oppressors with great substance, was fulfilled in a sense yet higher than in the gold and silver which they carried away with them. They preserved nevertheless their patriarchal form of government, and their ancestral religion and worship; although in itself a trifling fact, it is nevertheless interesting and worthy of note, how many of the proper names preserved from this period are compounded with the name of God. Yet even in religious ideas and usages it is evident that the people were not uninfluenced by the circumstances in which they were placed, partly to their injury, as is shown among other things by the affair of the golden calf; partly not, as is shown by symbols and institutions receiving the sanction of God himself, which contain elements that point to Egypt as the land of their origin. The barrier of a different nationality, language, and religion, kept them separate from the Egyptians: yet this did not wholly prevent intimacy of intercourse and even intermarriages to some extent. Lev. xxiv. 10. One of Pharaoh's daughters even was married to a man of Judah, 1 Chron. iv. 18, and, as appears from her name, was a convert to Jehovah's worship. That they constantly looked to Palestine as their future home is not only probable in itself, but receives positive confirmation from the fact recorded in Chronicles (if the passages

are correctly interpreted) that some of the people without waiting God's appointed time, sought prematurely at their own instance to take forcible possession of the promised land. 1 Chron. vii. 20—24 speaks of sons of Ephraim, who had established themselves in Canaan and made an unsuccessful predatory excursion against Gath, and of a granddaughter who built Beth-horon not very remote from Gath. Also, 1 Chron. iv. 22, some descendants of Judah made themselves masters of Moab.

The object of the residence in Egypt was thus accomplished. The servitude and the sufferings consequent upon the rise of a new dynasty, (so Exodus i. 8 is understood) effected the subjective preparation of the people for the exodus by awaking intense longings for release. Meanwhile God was training a deliverer first at the court of Pharaoh, then in the wilderness of Midian. When this training was complete and the proper time had arrived, Moses received his formal commission. God spoke to him upon Horeb, where subsequently the law was to be delivered, from the midst of a bush burning with fire but unconsumed. Upon this holy ground he is forbidden to tread with his shoes, which are designed to guard the feet from an impurity that could not there be contracted, and which moreover were themselves defiled by the common earth upon which they had trodden. Kurtz departs from the ordinary explanation of the burning bush, which refers it to Israel marvellously preserved in the furnace of affliction, and adopts that of Hoffmann. According to this, it is a symbol not of the past or present, but of the future, of the dispensation shortly to be inaugurated at that very mountain. Israel is the bush; God in his holiness is the flame that comes down into the midst of it; and it is only by a perpetual miracle that offering such fuel, as in their sinfulness they did, for this flame to fasten upon, they were not consumed. But this indwelling hallowed the bush and the very ground on which it stood. It might have been despised before in comparison with more stately trees; it might have been broken down and trampled upon with impunity; but now God is in the midst of it, and it must not be touched. It can only be approached with reverence.

The backwardness, carried to an excess, of Jethro's* son-in-law to undertake the task to which he is called, stands in striking contrast with the rash forwardness and vain self-confidence displayed by the adopted son of Pharaoh's daughter, and shows that a lesson of humility and patient waiting has been learned. It bears too, an incidental stamp of truth in its contrariety to all that is ever told of mythical heroes. God condescendingly removes, one after another, his misgivings and his objections; gives, as indicative of the character in which he was about to reveal himself, the sacred name Jehovah, not unknown indeed to the patriarchs, but the meaning of which was now to be unfolded by new and unheard of disclosures; furnishes him with miraculous signs; promises to be with his mouth; and not until he faint-heartedly declines without a remaining reason, is the Lord's anger kindled, and a peremptory command given him, to undertake the work in conjunction with his brother Aaron.

In the three miracles given to confirm his own faith and to accredit his commission to others, is found not only an evidence of supernatural power, but a farther significance; the first relating to himself, the second to the people, the last to Pharaoh. The shepherd's staff, which he held in his hand, was an emblem of the peaceful vocation which he had been hitherto pursuing. His casting it down to become a serpent, before which he flees, represents the threatening dangers in which he would be involved by laying down his present quiet occupation, for the task before him. His taking it boldly at the command of God, and its becoming once more a staff in his hand, showed that these perils might, by divine grace, be surmounted, if courageously met. This rod has now become the rod of God; not the simple shepherd's staff that it was before, but emblematic of his new vocation as shepherd, no longer of the flock of Jethro, but of the flock of God. With this rod in his hand, he shall chastise by heaven-inflicted plagues, the chastisers of God's people

* Reuel, or as it is spelled in our version, Num. x. 29, Raguel, is thought to be his proper name; and Jethro, a title of distinction equivalent to "his excellency." The apparent discrepancy of the account in Exodus with Num. x. 29, and Judges iv. 11, is explained either by making Reuel the grandfather of Zipporah, or Chobab by a different rendering of the Hebrew word, the brother-in-law of Moses.

and drive the gods of Egypt in their impotence before him. As performed subsequently in the presence of the people, the meaning of this sign was so far modified, as to represent the increase of peril and suffering, temporarily occasioned to them by the intervention of Moses, but from which they were soon to be delivered.

He next puts his hand into his bosom. The bosom is a place of protection, where the hand is warmed and cherished. Thus Israel went to Egypt to be protected under the favour of the Pharaohs. But they had been enslaved there, and treated as though they were utterly vile; this is the leprosy of the hand. But another bosom was preparing, in which it should be cleansed of its leprosy and purified to be a holy people to the Lord. As this action indicated the relation of God and his people, it was one with which Pharaoh had nothing to do, and it was not like the others exhibited before him.

The third miracle, of converting water into blood, was not to be performed until Moses reached Egypt, for its significance lay in the water being taken from the great river of that land. The source of blessing should be converted into a curse; the object of worship into loathing and aversion. This was to be performed upon a cup-full of the water as a sign to the people that God had the power; it was performed in the presence of Pharaoh, upon an immensely greater scale, on all the waters of the Nile, not as a sign but as a plague, to exhibit the reality of God's determination to smite the gods of Egypt.

Moses was the first man by whom miracles were wrought. The divine power which had in former times always been exerted independently of the agency of men, was brought down and placed in him to be exercised at his bidding, making him thus, in a sense never before exhibited, a type of Him in whom dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.

When Moses is directed to solicit for the people the liberty of three days' journey into the wilderness in order to sacrifice, it might at first thought be supposed that leave to go to Horeb was the thing intended, this having been already designated as the place where worship should be offered. But it was 140 miles from Suez, a distance which so immense a host could not possibly have traversed in that space of time. The thing asked for

could consequently only be permission to go just beyond the boundaries of the land. The request was presented in this moderated form for the purpose of showing to what lengths Pharaoh would carry his refusal. Not granting this, much less would he have granted them license to leave Egypt altogether. His refusal, which God foresaw, annulled any limitation as to distance, or any obligation to return which might have been involved in their acting upon his permission, had he given it. And when they finally left Egypt it was not under any conditions imposed upon them, but as conquerors dictating their own terms.

The request to leave the land for the purpose of worship seems in itself to have created no surprise; and it is probable from remains found in the Sinaitic peninsula, that pilgrimages of this kind were not unknown to the Egyptians. The reason assigned by Moses when subsequently making the request of Pharaoh, that if they sacrificed the abomination of the Egyptians they would be in danger of being stoned, cannot mean as it is frequently explained, that they would sacrifice animals accounted sacred in Egypt; for sacred animals could not be called an abomination, and the Egyptians themselves sacrificed the same animals that the Hebrews did. But as the Lord had not revealed what new regulations might be required in this grand national sacrifice, it could not be known how much there might be in conflict with Egyptian ideas and usages.

As Moses is now to be the champion of God's covenant with his people, his own negligence in respect to the seal of that covenant can no longer be tolerated. One of his sons, probably on account of Zipporah's opposition, had not been circumcised. For this the Lord sought to slay Moses on his way to Egypt, but on the performance of the omitted rite his life was spared, whence Zipporah called him a "husband of blood," one restored to her by means of blood.

Pharaoh refuses to let the people go, defies Jehovah, and summons to his aid not the material but the spiritual forces of his realm, the magicians clothed with the power and interpreters of the will of his gods. The contest therefore is one between Jehovah and the gods of Egypt. To the deities of heathenism Kurtz ascribes objective reality and supernatural

might: and he thinks it contrary to scriptural representations to regard them as non-existent and merely imaginary. Upon this subject he quotes with approbation the language of Crusius: "Sacrae literae a Mose usque ad N. T. constanter docent Deastros esse dæmones." Not that each heathen deity represents some particular demon, nor that every demon has his own distinct representative in the heathen mythology. But the worship paid by the heathen to their divinities does in fact pass over to a really existing, personal, supernatural power, by whom it is accepted and who enters into a real communion with the worshippers. Paul says, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils; and in thus sacrificing they have fellowship with devils, just as the Christian in partaking of the Lord's table has fellowship with him. When the same apostle speaks of an idol as nothing in the world, and when false deities are called by Hebrew words signifying non-entities and vanities, this is understood to be not a denial of the existence of such beings, but of their not being what they give themselves out to be, and what their worshippers suppose that they are. Such passages as Jer. x. 5, Ps. cxv. 4—8, are not referred to at all. The ground form of heathenism is stated to be pantheism, the forsaking of the one true and living God for the adoration of nature. The boundless variety of forms in which the powers of nature display themselves, the countless manifestations of the all-pervading Deity, lead next to polytheism. The different systems of mythology are the joint product of impressions from nature, speculative reasoning, and a lively imagination. The names and forms of the gods, with the functions and attributes ascribed to them, are in the first instance sheer figments of the imagination, having no objective existence; and the service paid them terminates on no real correspondent being. But these phantasms are taken possession of by spirits of wickedness, in whom they attain reality, and who make the scenes of this self-devised worship their special seat. And here they exhibit such powers of magic and divination as show them to be possessed of a real might, and as confirm the heathen still more in their delusion. It is equally erroneous, therefore, to regard the heathen deities as having originally and in them-

selves a distinct personal existence, and to suppose them to be, as found in the actual life of heathenism, non-existent phantoms.

With this view of the heathen deities in general, it follows of course that our author believes in the existence of supernatural magic, as a phenomenon pervading the pagan world. With this, there may be much imposture. There is also a native magical virtue resident in the human soul, which may be developed by occult arts, as in mesmerism, or by certain physical conditions inducing strange presentiments. But in addition, there is a supernatural power imparted by the spirits of darkness for the working of signs and lying wonders. This is the case with the magicians of Egypt, who wrought what they did, under demoniacal influence, as Moses acted with power given him from God. It would be expected from this that the magicians converted actual wooden rods into serpents, and that the superiority of Aaron's miracle consisted alone in his rod swallowing up theirs, annihilating thus the insignia of their office, and symbolically putting an end to their office itself. This Kurtz does not say, however: he regards it an undue pressing of the letter of the passage, to suppose the rods to have been actual rods of wood, though if that conclusion were forced upon him, he would feel no shrinking from the result. He nevertheless prefers upon the whole, the explanation which Hengstenberg and others have adopted, as illustrated by feats of snake-charmers at the present day, that the magicians who knew very well the purpose for which they were summoned, and had ample time and opportunity to make their preparations, brought with them seeming rods, which were in reality serpents stiffened by their incantations, but which resumed their life and motion on being cast to the ground. In this miracle, the victory was the greater, as it was gained on that territory in which the skill of Egyptian sorcerers chiefly lay.

The ten plagues, which with ever heightening intensity were inflicted upon the obdurate monarch, exhibit a striking relation to the natural characteristics of the land upon which they were sent. The miracle is in no case wholly dis severed from the analogy of what is proper to that region, as, for example, an irruption of polar bears, or the bursting forth of a volcano

would have been. Sceptical writers have made use of this circumstance to do away with the miraculous. They assume an extraordinary concurrence of calamities and in unwonted violence, where the calamities themselves are not unusual; the meeting at one point of what commonly do not occur in conjunction, is alone remarkable. All beyond this is figurative, or fabulous. To those who accept the historic truth of the narrative, the miraculous character of the events is too obvious to be questioned. The intensity, the extent, the multiplicity of these plagues, their coming and going at the bidding of Moses, and the marked distinction made in several of them between Egypt and Goshen, show beyond a doubt that they were sent by the immediate operation of God.

At the same time the natural features of these plagues are too obvious and too important in their design to be overlooked. One aim may have been to leave to unbelief, if it was determined at all hazards to resist the evidence of supernatural power, some shadow of a ground, to which to cling. But there were other and more direct bearings upon the issue of the conflict here carried on. Had these plagues possessed a character out of analogy with anything that ever occurred at ordinary times in Egypt, Pharaoh would have been compelled to accord to Jehovah a might and a supremacy in the land for the time being. But by using as his means of chastisement, scourges which in lighter and more restricted forms were of frequent occurrence, the Lord showed that these too were from him, that he was not temporarily but permanently God in Egypt; and not the present devastating judgments alone, but the ordinary evils which afflicted the land, were sent by him. The Egyptians also deified both the natural features and the natural products of their land: these were made to bring destruction upon their worshippers. The author of the book of Wisdom, says to this effect, (xi. 15, 16,) "For the foolish devices of their wickedness, wherewith being deceived they worshipped serpents void of reason, and vile beasts, thou didst send a multitude of unreasonable beasts upon them for vengeance; that they might know wherewithal a man sinneth, by the same also shall he be punished." Hengstenberg also makes the remark that their bearing this character is a voucher for the reality of

their occurrence, and that they were not pure inventions : as in this case the narrator would have been apt to exalt the miracle, by making it as little like natural events as possible.

The duration of these plagues cannot be certainly determined. Several writers who connect the first with an appearance that the Nile presents annually in July, assume that the whole occupied a period of nine months. According to the sacred record one week intervened between the first plague and the second. The seventh plague occurred when barley was in the ear and flax was balled, which in that climate must have been in March, about three weeks, consequently, from the time of the tenth plague, showing again about the space of a week, between each of the last four plagues. If the same interval be assumed as the average in the case of the remainder, it will yield in all nine weeks, or from about the beginning of February to the beginning of April.

The Nile, every year at the period of its inundation, assumes a reddish appearance from the earthy matter mingled with its waters. When the overflow first begins, it sweeps along great quantities of dried grass and filth of various sorts, which makes the water unfit for use. When it assumes a reddish colour, however, it is again potable ; after standing for a short time in jars, it deposits its sediment and becomes as clear as at any other season. This phenomenon has been thought by many to furnish the natural basis of the miracle of Moses. But that this cannot be so, is shown by several considerations. If the duration assigned above to the plagues as a whole be correct, that will furnish an argument ; for this redness of the Nile is seen, not in February but in July. This only occurs too, at the time of the annual inundation : but there is no hint of such an inundation in the narrative, while there are statements at variance with it, e. g. Pharaoh's going to the brink of the river, the Egyptians digging about the river, etc. The stinking of the river indicates stagnation, which is just the reverse of its inundation. The change was produced, not gradually but suddenly, and that, even in water already drawn and standing in their houses, in vessels of wood and stone, as well as in the river itself. The reddening of the water, in ordinary cases, so far from being deprecated, is eagerly looked for as a symptom

of potability. Kurtz suggests very plausibly, that the actual material phenomenon in this miracle, may have been the presence of immense quantities of microscopic *cryptogami* and *infusoria*, which gave the water a blood-red colour, and whose decomposition corrupted it and destroyed the fish that were in it. This explanation is based upon the scientific investigations of Ehrenberg, who found blood-like appearances in Egypt, Arabia and Siberia, resulting from this cause.

The question, whence the magicians obtained water for their enchantments, after Moses had already changed it all to blood, has sometimes been answered, by saying, that *all* is not to be taken in its most unlimited sense, or that the magicians waited till the plague had first been removed: a better explanation is, that it was the Nile, with the artificial channels and ponds, connected with it, and even water, previously drawn from it, which was the object of the plague, for the double reason of the great value of that river to Egypt, and the divine honours which were paid it. But that water from other sources was not affected, appears from the Egyptians finding it by digging about the river.

In the plague of frogs, the chief thing was its exceeding loathsomeness. There was no way of escaping the contact of these disgusting creatures. They could not set down their foot without trampling them. They filled even their chambers and beds, and ovens and kneading-troughs. The third plague was not lice, but gnats, or mosquitoes, whose stings are the complaint of every Egyptian traveller. The previous plagues had come from the Nile. This was from the land, which brought forth their food, and was also an object of worship. Hitherto, the magicians had maintained their credit. They had been able, on a small scale, to imitate the miracles of Moses, though they had thus only increased the intensity of plagues, which they could not remove. Here they give up the contest, and say to Pharaoh, "This is the finger of the gods;" which is not understood to mean what the common rendering implies, "here is an evident display of the divinity of Jehovah." If the victorious power of God were intended, the arm would be more appropriate. The finger warns, instructs. • That they cannot bring forth lice, they would represent as due not

to the weakness of their gods, but to their want of will. They are indisposed to sustain Pharaoh in refusing the demand of Jehovah, and consequently by ceasing longer to lend their aid, virtually bid him to desist.

The word which describes the fourth plague is derived from a root signifying *mixture*, and probably denotes all sorts of noxious insects. The Septuagint renders it dogfly, as one of the most tormenting. Aquila and the Vulgate, every kind of flies. The Targum of Jonathan and Saadiah, various kinds of wild beasts. Jarchi, every sort of evil beasts and serpents, and scorpions. Others have supposed it to mean devastating worms and caterpillars.

The furnace from which ashes were taken to create the plague of boils, is by some thought to have been a place where Hebrews were compelled to work in metals for their Egyptian masters; and the curse proceeding from such a spot would plainly indicate the reason of its infliction. Kurtz prefers an allusion to the religious rite of purification by ashes (comp. Num. xix. 9, Heb. ix. 13,) which is based, no doubt, upon its alkaline properties. These ashes from which they expected cleansing, should prove, instead, the source of defilement and disease.

The explanation of Hengstenberg and others, is adopted, though with some hesitation, in regard to the plague of darkness, that it was a violent sirocco, lasting not for a few hours merely, but for three successive days. Laborde says of this explanation, that it is comparing the crack of a pistol to the roar of thunder.

Egypt refused to release the first-born of the Lord, and her own first-born was the forfeit. Israel was Jehovah's son, not by virtue of their creation alone, nor of their formation into a numerous people, but by that spiritual and covenant generation which made them his own, distinct from all the nations of the earth, and by which they became not his only, but his first-born son; other nations to be subsequently brought within the same gracious covenant, are the later born members of the family. This plague was in an eminent sense, a judgment upon the gods of Egypt, Ex. xii. 12, Num. xxxiii. 4. The sacred animals, kept in the temples with the greatest care, and lamented

when they died, with the wildest demonstrations of grief, belonged mainly, no doubt, perhaps exclusively to the rank of the first-born. It may be imagined what a panic would be created, when to the private grief of every household, was added the sudden and simultaneous death of all the religiously venerated animals in all the temples, and thousands more that were deemed sacred besides. The first-born of the monarch, also regarded as an incarnation of the deity, was not exempt. These were put on a precise level with ordinary men, and ordinary animals; all were indiscriminately involved in the same catastrophe. The paraphrase of Jonathan is, therefore, gratuitous and unnecessary: "Against all the idols of the Egyptians, I will execute four judgments; the molten images shall be melted, those of stone shall be broken down, those of clay shall be dashed to pieces, those of wood shall be reduced to ashes, that the Egyptians may know that I am the Lord." This was no ordinary pestilence, following perhaps, in the track of the simoom, and in which it is not to be supposed that all the first-born, nor they alone perished. The inspired narrative is not consistent with the idea of its being originated, or guided by any ordinary laws of infection; it was an immediate and miraculous infliction by the destroying angel, directed exclusively and universally, upon all the first-born. Of these, there may have been more than one in the same family: for the first-born that were slain in Egypt, like the first-born consecrated in Israel, were reckoned by the mother's side, *primogeniti sanctitudinis*, as distinguished from those by the father's side, *primogeniti hæreditatis*.

The plagues thus ran their fearful round. God demonstrated his supremacy, by making the river, the land, the air, serve each in turn as ministers of his wrath; even surrounding lands were laid under contribution: Arabia sent her locusts, and the Sahara perhaps her simoom. Gods, men, beasts, plants, all were scourged. The last of these plagues, however, was the sorest of all: the others were but preliminary warnings of this, the real judgment. Ex. iv. 22, 23. But when the Lord arises to judgment, it must be executed with strict equity, and without respect of persons; and it must begin at the house of God. If there be sin in Israel, if any interruption of its covenant

relation, this sin must be put away, and the covenant relation restored, or Israel cannot be saved. Hence, before the judgment comes, the passover is instituted to secure the people's safety.

As the Lord's supper in a sense occupies the place of the passover, Romanists have argued, that the sacrificial character of the latter establishes that of the former. Some of the early Protestants took the ground in opposition, that the passover itself was not a sacrifice, but was simply commemorative and sacramental, inasmuch as *pascha* means not only a sacrifice, but a slaying for other purposes also, and there was no imposition of hands, no sprinkling of blood upon the altar, no burning of the animal, or any of its parts, upon the altar; whilst on the other hand, many of the prescriptions regarding the passover were such as had place in none of the various kinds of sacrifices. The atoning efficacy of this blood, however, which in the absence of an altar was sprinkled upon the door-posts, to shield from death all who had passed within that entrance, plainly distinguishes it as a sacrifice. That the Apostle Paul so regarded it, appears from 1 Cor. v. 7. It is called an offering, Num. ix. 7. And although in the first instance this could not be done, yet in after times it was to be slain at the place which God should choose, Deut. xvi. 5, 6; and its blood sprinkled on the altar, 2 Chron. xxx. 16. Although the imposition of hands is nowhere mentioned in connection with the slaying of the paschal lamb, its performance is unquestionably to be taken for granted. The passover was a special modification of the peace-offering, as the services of the great day of atonement were of the sin-offering. The true answer to the Romish argument is to be found in the typical character and inherent insufficiency of the passover sacrifice necessitating its constant repetition, and in the all-sufficiency of the sacrifice of Christ, which may be commemorated, but which need not and cannot be repeated.

The commands to roast (not boil, which would dissolve and disintegrate) the lamb whole, to break none of its bones, to eat it in one house, without carrying any part abroad, and to leave none till the ensuing day, were intended to give prominence to the idea of unity. The lamb was an undivided whole; so they

who partook of it were indissolubly united in communion with each other, and with God, whose guests they were, since it was his offering that lay upon the table: comp. 1 Cor. x. 17. The bitter herbs added relish to the meat, as the past servitude made the present deliverance more joyful. Leaven was forbidden, as fermenting and corrupting. Upon the first celebration of the passover, the solemnity lasted but a single day, and leaven was prohibited for that day alone: the haste and urgency with which they left Egypt, however, confined them to unleavened bread still longer, possibly until they had crossed the Red Sea, which Jewish tradition asserts to have been just seven days from the night of the passover. In later times, the commemorative celebration was expanded into seven days, during the whole of which leaven was interdicted.

That the children of Israel should, by God's command, borrow silver, gold, and raiment from the Egyptians, when they were leaving, never to return, has caused no small embarrassment among interpreters. Among the answers which have been given to the casuistical question, how this was consistent with truth and honesty, are such as these: that God, as universal proprietor, can take from one and give to another as he pleases; that Israel had a right to reprisals for the unrighteous and unrequited servitude to which they had been subjected; that they left their houses and lands in exchange; that God, as the author of the law, could dispense with it at his pleasure; that the Israelites borrowed these things with the honest intention of returning them, had not subsequent events rendered this impracticable; or that the Egyptians forfeited them by their treacherous and hostile pursuit. After all, however, the difficulty is not removed. How could the people honestly borrow, what they must have known they were never to return? But this difficulty lies only in a false translation. The Israelites were directed to solicit these things, not as a loan, but as a gift; and God gave his people favour in the sight of the Egyptians, that they lavished upon them all that they asked, without the thought or expectation of having them returned. The articles thus given, were not sacrificial vessels and priestly robes, to be used in the anticipated sacrifice, but undoubtedly jewels, and valuable articles of apparel. It was a matter of

divine decorum, that God should not lead his people out of Egypt a poor and starveling multitude, but laden with wealth and in festive array. The victory was complete, and the spoils immense.

The discussion respecting the locality of the passage of the Red Sea, as well as the geography of the various places mentioned in the journey through the wilderness, is very elaborate and thorough. Our limits admit of no more than this passing notice of what forms one of the most valuable features of the book before us.

The interesting but difficult question is here raised: to what period of Egyptian history, as this is known to us from profane sources, are the residence of Israel in Egypt, and their exodus from it, to be referred? The decision will be dependent upon the view taken of two brief extracts from Manetho, found in the treatise of Josephus against Apion. In the first, he speaks of an invasion of Egypt by a people from the East, of ignoble birth, but of great courage; who subdued the land, burned its cities, demolished its temples, and treated its inhabitants with the utmost barbarity. They made one of themselves king, by the name of Salatis, who lived at Memphis, exacted tribute of both upper and lower Egypt, and garrisoned several cities, particularly in the eastern portions of the land, as he was apprehensive of an Assyrian invasion. He fortified Avaris in the Saitic nome, east of the Bubastic channel, and garrisoned it with 240,000 men. Thither he came every summer, to provision the place, and pay his soldiers their wages, as well as to exercise them, and thereby terrify foreigners. This people, whom some regard as Arabs, were called Hyksos, or shepherd-kings; *hyk*, in the sacred dialect, meaning *king*, and *sos*, in the popular dialect, meaning *shepherd*. In another copy of Manetho, Josephus says the meaning of this word was given as captive-kings. After the Hyksos had kept possession of Egypt 511 years, the kings of the Thebais made an insurrection against them, and a long and terrible war ensued. By a king named Alisphragmuthosis, they were beaten, and shut up in Avaris. Here they were besieged by his son, Thummosis, who allowed them to capitulate, on condition of their leaving Egypt. They accordingly, with their families and effects, to the number

of 240,000, marched through the wilderness for Syria. But fearing the Assyrian power, they settled in Judea, and built a city which they called Jerusalem.

In the second passage, Manetho says that Amenophis, who was king 518 years after the departure of the shepherds, was desirous of seeing the gods. He was told that he might, if he would first rid the country of lepers and all unclean persons. This he did, sending them, to the number of 80,000, to work in the quarries east of the Nile. Subsequently he granted them the city of Avaris, which lay in ruins from the time of the shepherds. Here they appointed, as their ruler, a priest of Heliopolis, by the name of Osarsiph, subsequently called Moses, who gave them laws contrary to Egyptian usages. With 200,000 men sent to his aid by the shepherds, he made war upon Amenophis, defeated him, and ravaged Egypt for thirteen years; after which, Amenophis, and his son Rameses, returned from Ethiopia to Egypt with a large army, and drove the shepherds and the lepers out of the country into Syria.

Josephus identifies the Hyksos with the Israelites, and makes use of Manetho's account to establish against Apion the high antiquity and greatness of his nation. How he reconciles it with the Scripture narrative, he nowhere explains. The story of the lepers, which is drawn according to Manetho's own statement, not like the other from the sacred records of Egypt, but from popular tradition, he utterly discredits, as inconsistent with the former, in the origin which it assigns to the Jews.

Delitzsch adopts the identification of Josephus, and actually maintains the strange and paradoxical theory, that the Israelites really did what is ascribed to the Hyksos; that during the period over which the sacred historian passes in silence, they made themselves masters of Egypt, drove out the native princes, and held sway in the land, until they were subdued and enslaved in their turn.

Hengstenberg does not attribute the slightest weight to the testimony of Manetho. He charges him with the grossest ignorance and error on points of Egyptian mythology, geography, and language; with betraying a bias that can only have found place in the times of the Roman emperors; and with meeting no such confirmation from the monuments, as was

to be expected, if he were an honest and credible historian. Instead of being, as he has commonly been regarded, the head of the priests at Heliopolis, and preparing his history from the temple archives, by order of Ptolemy Philadelphus, B. C. 260, he considers him an intentional falsifier of much later date, in whom no confidence whatever can be reposed. The story of the Hyksos and of the lepers, he thinks to be purposely garbled accounts, caricatured from the Scripture history, in order to flatter the national vanity of the Egyptians.

Kurtz pronounces this judgment unjust, and expresses his belief that the statements of Manetho, though containing some errors, are yet in the main reliable. The Hyksos, he thinks, are evidently a different people from the Hebrews. The points insisted on by those who maintain their identity are, that they were shepherds from the East; that the name of their city, Avaris, is Hebrew; so is that of their king, Salatis, which is but a Greek form of the title applied to Joseph, Gen. xlii. 6; he is spoken of as provisioning (*σπιτομετρῶν*) or measuring grain; the oppressions alleged to be practised, are but distortions of his buying up the land, &c., during the famine; they finally marched through the wilderness to Syria, and founded a city, which they called Jerusalem. On the other hand, Kurtz maintains that the account given of the Hyksos is utterly irreconcilable with the supposition of the Israelites being intended. The former came in great numbers to Egypt, as enemies and conquerors; they murder, plunder, desolate the land, and rule it for 511 years, are then subdued, and forced to retire from the country. The Hebrews come, few in number, peaceably, and by invitation, but are oppressed, maltreated, enslaved; they crave permission to leave the country, but are refused. In the intention of Manetho, the lepers are the Israelites; and what he says of them, shows how the facts have been distorted by Egyptian tradition, from which alone this is professedly drawn. They are expressly distinguished from the Hyksos, who left the country 518 years before.

Among those who give partial or entire credit to Manetho, and who think the Hyksos to have been distinct from the Israelites, there is again a diversity of views.

Lepsius dates the Hyksos invasion, B. C. 2100, during the

12th (or second Theban) dynasty. At length, B. C. 1661, the native kings who had maintained their independence in Ethiopia, and partially also in Upper Egypt, penetrated farther north, and after a war of 80 years, succeeded in the reign of Thuthmosis III. in driving the Hyksos out of the country. With them, however, the Israelites had nothing to do. They came into Egypt in the 19th dynasty. Joseph was brought there, under Sethos I., the Sesostris of the Greeks, who, according to Lepsius's assumption, reigned B. C. 1445—1394. Moses was educated at the court of his son, Ramses II., Miamun the Great (1394—1328,) and his son, Menephtes (1328—1309,) was the Pharaoh of the exodus. The abode in Egypt, instead of being 430 years, was only about 90. The absurdities which follow upon this hypothesis, and the slenderness of the grounds on which it rests, are well exposed by Kurtz. The expansion of Jacob's family to 2,000,000 of people, must then have taken place in 90 years. Within the same space of time there must have been seven generations in the family of Judah, and ten in that of Ephraim. Moses must have been born about ten years after Jacob came into Egypt, and sixty years before the death of Joseph. Whoever, in the present inextricable confusion which reigns in Egyptian chronology, makes the merely conjectural identification of a few uncertain names, a ground for introducing such havoc into a history, certified like that of Moses, would sacrifice Bancroft to Gulliver. Egyptian scholars get so in the habit of giving free play to their fancy, deducing from the monuments what results they please, and constructing facts and dates *ad libitum*, that they really seem to forget that there is such a thing as solid, well attested history, which criticism cannot explain away, and where theorizing must yield to testimony.

Saalschütz supposes that the new king, under whom the oppression of the Israelites began, was the first of the Hyksos dynasty, and that the Pharaoh who perished in the Red Sea was the last. Bunsen has not fully explained his views as to the origin and history of the Hyksos, and their relation to the Israelites. He follows an account of Julius Africanus, which makes the period of their domination to have lasted upwards of 900 years.

The view adopted by Kurtz is essentially the same with that of Bertheau, Lengerke, and Knobel. He thinks them to have been Semitic tribes, possibly driven from their original possessions in Canaan, prior to the days of Abraham, by some invasion similar to that recorded of Chedorlaomer. Thus precipitated upon Egypt, they subjugated that country. At first they may have committed great enormities, but the result followed which is usual in the case of barbarian invaders of civilized lands. The conquerors adopted the language, manners, culture, and religion of the conquered. Hence, when Joseph was brought before one of the monarchs of this dynasty, everything wore the air of a native Egyptian court, more so than in the days of Abraham, when this assimilation had but imperfectly taken place. Such an alliance as Pharaoh contemplated with Abraham could not have been thought of at the time of Joseph, when Egyptian courtiers could not even eat with Hebrew shepherds. Still, some things, even at this later period, are thought to betray that it was not a native but an adopted civilization which prevailed at court. The introduction of Joseph, a foreigner of shepherd stock, into the highest office next the king, and his intermarriage with the priestly caste; the welcome extended to his shepherd-father and brothers; the rich portion of the land assigned them, and the wealth of Pharaoh in cattle, but not in lands, till Joseph's measures procured them, are alleged as showing that they had not even yet forgotten their Hyksos predilections and habits.

The new king, who knew not Joseph, was the first of the revived native dynasty, consequent upon the expulsion of the Hyksos. The Hebrews, now grown to a mighty people, as they had been favoured by the Hyksos, naturally fell under the suspicion of being friendly to them and favourable to their return; and, which made them the more dangerous, Goshen lay in the quarter from which the Hyksos would invade Egypt, if at all. Hence the apprehension, *Exod. i. 10*, and the measures adopted to reduce their strength. That the Hebrews were not expelled along with the Hyksos as their friends and allies, was perhaps, because the native princes lacked the power, and also, that they might be retained as slaves and helots, to be employed upon the erection of the vast public structures of the

period. Kurtz is of opinion, that numbers of the lower ranks of the Hyksos population were probably retained for a similar purpose, and that they may have constituted the great mixed multitude who left Egypt with Israel, attaching themselves to them in their deliverance, as they had shared the burdens of their servitude. Even the statement, that the expelled Hyksos built Jerusalem, is put into connection with the remarkable changes of name which that place underwent, at different periods of the sacred history. In the days of Abraham, it was called Salem. When we hear of it in the times of the Judges, its name was changed to Jebus; could the Jebusites have been a branch of the Hyksos? When Kurtz says, that the city was not called Jerusalem until its conquest by David, he forgets Josh. xviii. 28.

The period of the wilderness, which was one of instruction, trial, chastisement, and purification, falls into three divisions, each of which found the people in a distinct locality. They may be respectively described as Israel in the wilderness of Sinai, Israel in the wilderness of Paran, and Israel in the plains of Moab. To the first of these belongs the concluding of the covenant between God and the people; to the second, the consummation of the people's unbelief, and their doom to forty years' exclusion from Canaan; in the third, the new generation has reached the termination of its wanderings, and the border of the promised land.

The manna, which at the present day exudes from the Tarfah bush, in the vicinity of Sinai, offers some interesting analogies to that with which Israel was fed in the desert; but they are plainly not identical. It is not only the enormous difference in quantity, between five or six hundred pounds per annum, gathered from the entire peninsula in the most productive years, and two million of pounds per day. But the properties are so different, that they are evidently quite distinct things. The modern manna could not be beaten fine in a mortar, nor be made a substitute for bread, nor does it breed worms on being kept. It is only found during two or three months of the year, while Israel were supplied with it all the year round; and during thirty-eight years of the period that it was

furnished them, they were in parts of the desert where no Tar-fah bush now grows, and where probably none ever did grow.

That they did not subsist solely upon manna, during the entire forty years, is plain from the direct statements of the inspired record, and might, without such statement, have been inferred from the circumstances of the case. The wilderness now scantily supports less than 5,000 inhabitants, and these could not subsist, but for the aid afforded by travellers and caravans. It must in the days of Moses, however, have been better furnished with springs and oases than at present. History makes it certain, that it once contained a far more numerous population than it does now. The flocks and herds, which Israel possessed, would supply them to some extent with milk and flesh. After the sentence had been announced to them, that they were to remain in the wilderness, they would no doubt cultivate all such spots as were capable of tillage. They purchased provisions in passing along the border of Edom, and they may have done the same from trading caravans which traversed the desert.

The posture of Moses, holding in his uplifted hand the rod of God, in the battle with Amalek, is thought to represent, not the attitude of prayer, but the gesture of command; just as when, with the same rod, he divided the sea, or turned the waters into blood. The direction given to Moses, to write the doings of that day in the (not *a*) book, shows that he had either then commenced, or had in contemplation, the history which he wrote of Israel's journeyings. Jethro's visit, though paid to Moses at the mount of God, is related before mention is made of Israel's removal from Rephidim to Sinai, in order that when that is mentioned, the way may be clear to proceed at once and uninterruptedly with the divine communications there given.

Arrived at Sinai, Moses goes up into the mount to God, and the stipulations of the covenant about to be formed are given him, to be laid before the people. These terms being accepted, preparations are forthwith made for its solemnization, and for the establishment of the theocracy.* Here, at the outset of

* This technical designation of the Hebrew state is borrowed from Josephus, who first employs it, Cont. Apion. ii. 16. Some legislators have committed the power of

the Mosaic economy, as in the promises to Abraham, are found intimations that this temporary restriction is in order to an ultimate diffusion. The stipulation on the part of God, "Ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people, for all the earth is mine," is the farthest possible from the narrow notion of a national god, interested only in this single people, and doing what he does for their sakes alone. And the constituting Israel a kingdom of priests, indicates it as their vocation to be the mediators of mankind, and to dispense to the world the blessings of God's grace—a vocation, which not being itself an end, but only means to an end, is in its nature temporary, and must, when its aim is accomplished, cease of itself.

The fundamental law of the covenant proclaimed from Sinai, is called "the ten words;" but the precise limits of each of the commands is nowhere indicated in Scripture. Three different modes of enumeration have been proposed. According to the first, "I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt," is the first commandment; the prohibitions of the worship of false gods and of images, are combined to form the second; and the prohibition of coveting is the tenth. This division is found in the Targum of the Pseudo-Jonathan, is mentioned but disapproved by Origen, was accepted by the emperor Julian, George Syncellus, and Cedrenus, and is universal among the modern Jews. A sufficient proof of its incorrectness is, that the first commandment will then be no commandment at all. According to the second mode, the first commandment respects the worship of others than the true God; the second, the worship of images; the tenth, coveting. This is the division of Philo, Josephus, Origen, and the Greek fathers generally, and of the Latin fathers until the time of Augustin. It has always prevailed in the Greek Church, was adopted by Calvin and the Reformed Church, and though not accepted by the Lutheran Church, its propriety is admitted by not a few modern Lutheran theologians. The third mode, in which the prohibition of other gods, and of images, is the first

their states to monarchies, others to oligarchies, and others to the government of the masses; but our legislator had no regard to any of these forms; he ordained our government to be what may be termed a theocracy, vesting the power and authority in God.

commandment, and that of coveting forms two, the ninth and the tenth, is first found in Augustin. He was led to it by the desire to find three commandments in the first table, "quia Deus trinitas." He does not, however, consistently adhere to this division in all his writings, but in his *Epistola ad Bonifacium* and elsewhere adopts the second mode. It has sometimes been alleged that Clemens Alexandrinus favoured this last mode of division. But a simple inspection of the passage adduced in evidence is sufficient to show that there is an error in the text. The prohibition of image worship is included in the first commandment; taking God's name in vain is made the subject of the second, and the sanctification of the Sabbath the subject of the third; the fourth is omitted entirely; the injunction of obedience to parents is called the fifth, and it is expressly said that *all* coveting belongs under the tenth. Augustin found the ninth commandment in the first clause of the prohibition of coveting, as it appears in Deuteronomy, "Thou shalt not desire thy neighbour's wife." But as the form of the decalogue given in Exodus is obviously the original one uttered by the mouth of God, and engraved on the tables of stone, the Romish and Lutheran Churches assign to the ninth commandment the words "thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house," leaving the coveting of the wife, man-servant, maid-servant, etc., to constitute the tenth. It is obvious that there is no ground in reason for such a division as this; and that the distinction made by the old Lutheran divines of concupiscence into original and actual, the former without and the latter with the previous consent of the will, does not relieve the difficulty. Kurtz adopts Augustin's division, in spite of his admission that the different arrangement of the clauses in Exodus and in Deuteronomy absolutely precludes it, provided the text in Exodus is correct. Its correctness, however, he ventures to call in question, although not the semblance of any evidence of error is furnished by the manuscripts, and although it would be more reasonable to suspect an error in any other part of the Scriptures than here. The fact that the Septuagint names the wife first in Exodus, is balanced by the Samaritan placing the house first in Deuteronomy: and instead of this showing that there was any doubt about the true reading, it shows precisely the

reverse, that the text was then just as we have it now, and that the authors of these versions sought to reconcile the seeming discrepancy of the two books, and produce uniformity each in his own way. The chief motive of Kurtz in this unwarrantable assumption seems to be, that thus the ten commandments, as divided into the two tables, will exhibit the significant numbers 3 and 7. It was a motive of like character which induced Hengstenberg, who follows the Reformed Church in his numbering of the commandments, to assign five to each table, obedience to parents as the representatives of God being classed with our duties to him.

The curious fancy of Hitzig, copied without acknowledgment from a juvenile production of Goëthe's, that the tables of stone contained not the ten commandments but the series of laws, *Exod.* xxxiv. 12—26, scarcely deserves the serious refutation which Kurtz and Hengstenberg have given it.

Terrified at the voice of God, the people request that Moses may be their mediator, and further commands and directions are given to him, *Exod.* xxi.—xxiii. These he repeated to the people, and upon their solemn engagement to perform them, the covenant was ratified by sacrifice; the sprinkled blood by its atoning virtue removing the obstacle to communion, and the communion itself being set forth by seventy elders, as representatives of the entire people, going up into the mountain where God was, and there in his presence and as his guests feasting upon the flesh of the offerings.

The direction to make the altar of earth or of whole stones, is thought to signify that it should be what Mount Sinai was, in miniature. It was to be constructed of materials ready furnished from the hand of God; expending upon it the workmanship of sinful man could only pollute it. The altar was the place where God recorded his name, and where he came to bless his people. The twelve pillars surrounding it were the twelve tribes assembled around their heavenly king. The altar of burnt-offering subsequently erected for the tabernacle and the temple, was most likely composed of the same materials with that just spoken of. The frame of wood and brazen plates was merely to enclose the earth and stones, which formed the real altar.

The promise to send hornets to drive out the Canaanites, has been understood by most interpreters in a figurative sense, as designating the various inflictions which were employed for this purpose. A few, however, have understood it literally; so the Book of Wisdom, xii. 8, Theodoret, etc. Bochart, who adopted this view, brought his vast erudition to its support, and has adduced from ancient authors a multitude of passages, showing that even such diminutive creatures as frogs, mice, snakes, wasps, etc., have forced whole tribes of men to emigrate. And he finds a direct confirmation of the scriptural account, as he understands it, in a statement of Ælian, that the Phaselites, who dwelt in the vicinity of the Dead Sea, were driven from their homes by wasps.

As God was henceforth to dwell in the midst of his covenant people, a dwelling-place was needed for his reception. Moses was, therefore, called up again into the mountain, and the necessary directions given him. His forty days' absence put the constancy of the people to a test, which they were unable to bear: and God's just anger at their apostasy furnished an occasion to prove Moses' fitness for the office of mediator, with which he had recently been invested. In the language used of Aaron, Exod. xxxii. 4, commonly rendered "he fashioned it with a graving tool," Kurtz follows the translation of Jonathan and Bochart, based on a comparison of 2 Kings v. 23. They translate the verse, "And he received the ear-rings at their hand, and *bound*, or collected *them in a bag*, and made of them a molten calf."

God's refusal to go with the people, though consenting to send an angel before them, Exod. xxxiii. 2, stands in contrast with his previous promise to send the angel in whom his name was, Exod. xxiii. 20, 21. The evident distinction here made between a created and an uncreated angel, between one whose presence was identical with that of Jehovah, and one whose presence was consistent with Jehovah's absence, is properly regarded by most interpreters as intimating that mysterious relation of Persons in the divine Being, which was subsequently unfolded in the doctrine of the Trinity. In the first volume of this work, Kurtz had maintained in the first edition, that the angel of the Lord was the uncreated Logos. In the second

edition he abandoned that ground under the leadings of Hofmann, and assumed that a common created angel was meant. This view he endeavours to carry through this passage, in the face of what appears to us to be its obvious meaning.

The tabernacle which Moses pitched without the camp, to symbolize God's removal from the midst of it, was a provisory tabernacle made for the purpose, and designed to serve as a sanctuary, until the one which he had been directed to build should be prepared.

By the intercession of Moses, the breach between God and the people is healed: the sanctuary is then constructed and set up, the priesthood consecrated, the ceremonial service instituted, and the various regulations given which are contained in the book of Leviticus. The camp is next organized into a military host preparatory to the conquest of Canaan; the tribes are numbered, the order to be observed in marching and in encamping specified, and the signals to regulate their movements arranged.

Israel had now been at the foot of Sinai almost a year. They had been organized into the people of God, and had received his laws. It was time for them to proceed to their destination. Three days brought them into the great and terrible wilderness of Paran. From this time onward there is a constant succession of murmurings on the part of the people, and of judgments on the part of God. Their weaknesses and discontent before arriving at Sinai were borne with patience and long-suffering; but the case is altered now, and fearful penalties avenge the violated covenant. The burning at Taberah, the plague at Kibroth-hattaavah, and Miriam's leprosy at Hazeroth were followed by the sentence at Kadesh, that that whole generation should die in the wilderness. This place was probably the scene likewise of the rebellion of Korah, Dathan and Abiram. The narrative leaves the children of Israel at Kadesh, in the second year after their departure out of Egypt. When it is resumed in the first month of the fortieth year, they are again at Kadesh, Num. xx. 1. Over this interval, in which no progress was made toward realizing their mission, the sacred historian passes in silence. Kurtz supposes that the people were allowed to scatter over the wilderness and to settle in all

the oases and productive spots they could find, until near the close of their sentenced term they were summoned again to Kadesh. The stations summarily recorded in Num. xxxiii. 19—36, between Rithmah (the same with Kadesh) and Kadesh, are thought to indicate the movements not of the entire congregation, but of the head-quarters of Moses and the sanctuary, as he visited the various sections of the people to prevent their total dismemberment.

The statement in Ezekiel xx. 25, relating to this period has given no little trouble to commentators. The Lord there says: "Because they despised my statutes I gave them also statutes that were not good, and judgments whereby they should not live; and I polluted them in their own gifts, in that they caused all their first-born to pass through the fire." Not to mention the Manichees, who used this passage to justify their rejection of the Old Testament, these "statutes that were not good" have been supposed to mean commandments of men, such errors and superstitions for example, as those which fill the Talmud—laws imposed by victorious enemies into whose hands God delivered them—threatenings denounced by Moses in the name of God—the law itself as opposed to the gospel—ceremonial as opposed to moral law—heathenish and idolatrous statutes and practices to which they were given up, in punishment for their ungodliness. This last, which is the one adopted by Calvin, Vitringa, Hävernick and others, is without doubt the correct view of the prophet's language. It finds parallels in Acts vii. 42, God gave them up to worship the hosts of heaven; Rom. i. 24, etc., God gave them up to uncleanness—to vile affections—to a reprobate mind; 2 Thess. ii. 11, for this cause God shall send them strong delusion. Kurtz adopts this view as modified but not improved by Umbreit, and supposes that the statutes referred to are the ceremonial enactments given by God himself, but which the people perverted in the performance, fulfilling them only in a sinful, heathenish manner. They perverted, for example, the law of the consecration of the first-born by making of it a command to sacrifice their children, as was done by the heathen, to Moloch. As far as this view is correct, it is already involved in that of Calvin before given: and as far as it would base itself upon the lan-

guage of the prophet that God gave these statutes, it is not true either that they were not good in the sense in which God gave them, or that they were given in punishment of the wickedness of Israel. It is not surprising that in their dispersion and separation from the sanctuary many corruptions should have found place among the people. And yet the language of Ezeziel must not be unduly pressed, as though the people had universally, or prevailingly abandoned themselves to idolatrous or anti-theocratic practices. It was sufficient that such practices did exist, although at the same time the mass of the people may have been faithful to their duty.

The difficult and much disputed passage, Amos v. 25—27, also bears upon this period. After the Lord had expressed in the previous verses his aversion to the self-righteous and hypocritical services of the people, he proceeds, "Have ye offered unto me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel?" To this question Kurtz assumes not an affirmative reply, contrasting the pious past with the idolatrous present, but a negative; and this not as censuring Israel in the wilderness for offering sacrifices, not to God but to idols, but to exhibit how little consequence attaches to the outward performance compared with the inward state. When set over against the abundant and multiplied sacrifices of his own day, those which the circumstances of Israel admitted of their offering in the desert were as nothing. And yet that was a period of marked divine favour; so little does the mere quantity of external service have to do with its procurement. The next verse is then referred, not to the past, as descriptive of idolatry practised in the wilderness—nor to the future, as a punishment, "ye shall in flight before your enemies carry your miserable idols, unable to protect either themselves or you"—but to the present, as giving the reason why their multiplied sacrifices were detestable, while the meagre sacrifices of the past were accepted. It is because the abominations of idolatry co-exist with the outward pomp of God's worship. "Ye bear the tabernacle of your king, the stand of your images, the star of your god which ye have made to yourselves: therefore will I cause you to go into captivity beyond Damascus."

The translation given is no doubt the true one, saving the

tense of the first verb. But we do not see that this view of the passage, though preferred by several modern scholars, is any improvement upon the old interpretation of Stephen (Acts vii. 42, 43,) and the Seventy. There is no difficulty in admitting an extent of ungodliness in the desert, which the Pentateuch does not expressly assert but allows us to suppose. The apostasy rebuked by the prophet is not of recent origin. His cotemporaries have followed their fathers in sin, and they shall perish by a like judgment. Their fathers were prevented from entering the holy land, they shall be driven from it.

The omission to circumcise the children born in the wilderness, Josh. v. 4—9, was, in the opinion of Kurtz, due, not to a temporary suspension of the covenant during the period of the sentence, which is an explanation frequently given, but simply to the circumstances of the people; the rite could not be performed with safety when they were incessantly liable to be on the march.

We pass to what our author says respecting Balaam and his prophecies. The view taken of Balaam corresponds in the general with that of Hengstenberg in his treatise devoted to this subject. It is an attempt to mediate between the extreme views of regarding him as a prophet of the devil, an ungodly and idolatrous enchanter, and a true and real prophet of the living God, seduced to his fall by an inordinate love of wealth and honour. He is supposed to have stood upon the border line of these two antagonistic territories, with one foot as it were upon the soil of heathen magic and sorcery, and the other upon the soil of religion and true prophecy. He is a soothsayer, Josh. xiii. 22, and makes use of enchantments, Num. xxiv. 1, and yet, on the other hand, he has some correct knowledge of God, makes confession of him, inquires after and receives his will, obeys it, though but with half his heart, is possessed of a real inspiration and utters actual prophecies. This half-way character is thought to make a transition period in his history, from which he must either rise to a full declaration of himself on the side of God, or fall back to absolute heathenism. Analogies are found in the history of modern missions, as well as in the New Testament, e. g., in Simon Magus, Acts viii. 13, 21, the seven sons of Sceva, Acts xix. 13, 14, and the children of

the Pharisees casting out devils in the name of Christ. (So Matth. xii. 27 is explained, comp. Luke ix. 49.) Balaam's knowledge of God was chiefly attributable, no doubt, to the reports which had been spread of the recent displays of his power and grace in Egypt, and in the wilderness; though it need not be denied that some feeble remains of the true religion may have been preserved in the region of Abraham's ancestry. That Balaam had addicted himself to the service of this new and potent deity was the grand reason why Balak courted his services. He thought by this seer's potent incantations to withdraw from Israel, and secure for himself the aid of their God, whom he saw to be mightier than his own. Thus Pliny relates, on the authority of older writers, that it was the practice of the early Romans to solicit the gods of cities which they attacked, by the promise of equal or greater honours than they now enjoyed; and they concealed the name of the deity under whose guard Rome was placed, lest he should be enticed from them by similar means.

It is a natural sequence from the views of Kurtz already given in relation to heathenism and Egyptian sorcery, that he supposes the charms of diviners to possess a real and not a merely pretended or imaginary potency, by means of which the gods are in a measure subjected to the control of their worshippers. The deities of the heathen, though real, personal and powerful, are created beings; and as such, subject to the limitations and laws of creatures. Their priests and magicians are not only their servants, but in a sense also their lords. To them it is that they owe their credit and standing as gods: just as the priests and magicians again owe their credit and standing to the supernatural powers imparted by their deities. The gods and their worshippers stand thus to each other in a relation of mutual dependence; and the demons of heathenism are obliged for the sake of their own interest to subject themselves to the incantations employed upon them. Besides which, there may be some inherent power in these spells and enchantments, which such spirits are unable to resist.

Apart from these more doubtful notions, however, the stress laid by the sacred writers (Deut. xxiii. 5, and elsewhere) upon the benefit conferred by God in changing Balaam's anticipated

curse into a blessing, is justified by the fact that Balaam was not only a heathen diviner, but a prophet of the Lord; and it was in this latter capacity, as the organ and representative of Jehovah, that his curse was desired. A curse uttered in the name of God, and by his authority, which was what Balak wanted and Balaam hoped to effect, would have been as efficacious for evil, as the blessing he was compelled to pronounce was for good.

The speaking of Balaam's ass, Hengstenberg had endeavoured to explain away, as having taken place only in vision and in impressions supernaturally made upon the prophet's mind, without any sound audible to others proceeding from the mouth of the beast. Kurtz stands upon the only tenable ground of the literal occurrence, as it appears upon the face of the narrative, and refutes in the most ample and satisfactory way all the arguments and objections which have been alleged against it. He lays down the canon that "a dream, vision, or ecstasy is never to be assumed in the scripture history, unless it is distinctly and unequivocally indicated in the narrative."

Balaam's desire to die the death of the righteous is not thought to involve any clear knowledge on his part, of the rewards of the future state. It only designates the death of a true Israelite, as happier in his esteem than that of a heathen, which it will be, even though it be regarded less as the opening of a new life, than as the close of the present. He asks for himself a death surrounded by the tokens of the divine favour and love, with the retrospect of a happily spent life, and the prospect of continued blessings to be vouchsafed to his posterity, although, whatever views were dimly possessed of that futurity, when he should be "gathered to his fathers," need not be excluded. Num. xxiii. 23 is translated, "For there is no enchantment in Jacob and no divination in Israel; at the (proper) time, to Jacob and to Israel is told, what God performs." They do not practise arts of divination, and they do not need them. God himself reveals to them his purpose regarding the future as far as they have occasion to know it.

The most remarkable of Balaam's prophecies is the fourth and last, Num. xxiv. 15—24, in which after Balak had ordered him away in a rage, at his utterance of a three-fold blessing, he

volunteers to advertise him what should befall his people in the latter days. In v. 15, "the man whose eyes are shut," (Eng. Ver. marg. v. 3,) is thought to refer not to Balaam's failure to see the angel, on his way to Balak, nor to his previous ignorance of the future, now disclosed to him, but to the physical condition in which he received, or uttered his prophecy, with the eyes of his body closed and all disturbing sights shut out, perhaps in a swoon, or state of unconsciousness as to all external objects, but the eyes of his spirit, v. 16, open. This is put in connection likewise, with his falling into a trance, or rather to the ground, under the might of the spiritual influence which had seized upon him and overmastered his strength.

The star and the sceptre that shall rise out of Jacob and smite the corners of Moab, are in the view of Kurtz, an individual ruler. They meet a preliminary fulfilment in the person and conquests of David. But as the spirit of the prophecy requires not only the reduction or subjugation of the particular nations named, but of all in whom the hostility to Israel, which characterized them, shall be perpetuated, it must have a higher fulfilment in Christ, by whom all the foes of his people shall be finally destroyed or changed to friends. In the mind of Balaam, however, these are not accurately distinguished. It is not given to him to see them apart, and to separate what shall be done by the one from what shall be done by the other. The event, however, teaches that such a separation must be made. The view of Hengstenberg that the prophecy is generic, and intended to apply to the kingdom in Israel as such, of which David and Christ stand out as the two main representatives, the culminating points, Kurtz strenuously resists—all the more strenuously, as it would seem, because Hengstenberg has maintained it. The star of Balaam was prophetic of Christ's future coming, as the star of the wise men was symbolic of his actual appearance. "The children of Sheth," whom this star and sceptre shall destroy, are not all mankind as the descendants of the patriarch Seth; but the word is taken in its appellative sense, "children of tumult," the tumultuous foes of Israel.

Amalek is called the first of the nations, not in the sense of the oldest, nor the chief, most distinguished, most powerful, but

as the first which displayed that character in which the heathen nations are here especially contemplated—that of hostility to Israel. The Kenites are supposed not to be the same with those mentioned Gen. xv. 19, here put for the Canaanites generally, but a branch of Midian put for the whole nation. The prediction which follows, of the invasion by Assyria, of Western Asia, and the subsequent extinction of Assyria and Eber (the trans-Euphratic power) by an invasion from the West, shows what a far-sighted gaze into futurity was granted to the Mesopotamian seer. These discourses of Balaam present an insoluble puzzle to those who hope by feats of critical legerdemain to escape the admission of prophetic foresight. For though with the contempt of historical testimony belonging to this school, they could by the magic of their art transfer the composition of this passage to any point of time they choose, the trouble is, that no time can be found which will answer the conditions required. The plain references to the conquests of David would make its composition in his reign, or shortly after, very convenient. But on the one hand this is much too early, for the predicted spread of the Assyrian power will yet remain to be accounted for, and especially that precipitation of the West upon the East which could not have been conjectured even in the days of Malachi. And on the other hand, it is already too late; for “his king shall be higher than Agag,” xxiv. 7, had already lost its meaning from the days of Saul, by whom the power of Amalek was for ever broken.

The prediction, Deut. xviii. 15—19, of a prophet like unto Moses, Kurtz understands not of the prophets collectively, Christ the seal of all included (Hofmann;) nor of each of the prophets individually (Hävernick;) nor of the ideal prophet, embracing both the imperfect and the perfect realizations, (Hengstenberg;) but specifically and solely of Christ.

The most unsatisfactory thing in the volume before us is what is said of the authorship and composition of the Pentateuch. While insisting rigidly upon its inspiration, canonicity, the authentic character and Mosaic origin of its contents, the consistent and well-ordered plan of the whole, and its forming the undoubted basis of the entire after history, literature, and religion of Israel, the ground is taken that Moses, although the

author of considerable portions of it, could not have written it all as it now stands; that its present form was attained in the lifetime of Joshua, or shortly after. It is astonishing upon what slender and precarious grounds some men can persuade themselves to dismiss, as of no account, such a unanimous and unvarying testimony as tradition gives to the authorship of the books of Moses, confirmed as it is by so many internal considerations, and sanctioned by the explicit language of our Lord himself. Our surprise is heightened in the case of Kurtz, from its opposition to his general tendencies, and even to his previously published views in relation to this very subject. He has, however, taken Delitzsch as his leader, who in his Commentary on Genesis seems to have made trial of his ingenuity to see how far he could adopt the arguments and conclusions of the "higher criticism," and yet hold fast whatever was essential to faith and orthodoxy. So far it may possibly be of use in disarming the school, whose weapons he has borrowed, by showing that even if their arguments and deductions were legitimate, faith in the Scriptures could be maintained. But as a rational account of the origin of the Pentateuch, it is no better than ingenious, we cannot even say specious, trifling.

ART. II.—*History of the Protestant Church in Hungary from the beginning of the Reformation to 1850: with special reference to Transylvania.* Translated by Rev. J. Craig, D. D., Hamburg. With an Introduction by J. H. Merle D'Aubigné, D. D., President of the Theological School of Geneva, and Vice-President of the Société Évangélique, author of "The History of the Great Reformation," &c. Boston: Phillips, Sampson and Company. New York: James C. Derby, 1854.

SINCE the noble but unsuccessful struggle of Hungary for her political independence, every item of information about her past history, or present condition, has been received with the deepest interest by the American people. All classes have asked and read and talked about Hungary.