

(53)

Period 1575
v 4
1890

ANDREW HARVARD
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

NO. 11. — JANUARY, 1890.

I. THE LATEST INFIDELITY.

A REPLY TO INGERSOLL'S POSITIONS.

THE phase of infidelity most current among those who do not profess to accept the gospel is marked by two qualities: It is aggressive, and it is extreme. It refuses to stop short of that last result, blank atheism, or, at least, blank agnosticism, from which even the skepticism of previous ages recoiled with abhorrence. This ultraism of the present adversaries is in one aspect very shocking; but in another it is promising. They are practically teaching the world that conclusion, on which James Mills justified his atheism, that when once a man's sense rejects the gospel theory, he finds no stopping place between that rejection and atheism; because, as Bishop Butler has forever established, every difficulty which besets the old gospel plan equally embarrasses the deistic plan. This disclosure is useful. Our atheists are teaching people that there is no decent middle ground for them to stand on; but the voice of nature and conscience never permits decent people to stand long on the ground of atheism. This outrages both head and heart too horribly. Were a son to insist, contrary to sufficient evidence of the fact, upon denying and discarding the very existence of his father, we see plainly enough how his position involves every phase of filial transgression, because it involves the absolute neglect of every filial duty. The position may involve, in the form of a sin of omission, the crime of parricide. The atheist discards the very existence of his heavenly Father; so, unless he has justified his denial by sound evidence, he includes in that

and bride might be made to end with a more cheerful word than "death." How would "*as long as you both shall live*" answer? The preceding chapter on the burial of the dead contains a directory and a service. This chapter on marriage is almost a service. Would it not be just as well to have both of these simple directories, and place the *forms* of service for marriages and funerals in the appendix? If this book be accepted as it now stands, and the forms for marriage and funeral services ordered to be prepared by the committee be also adopted and added, we will find ourselves provided with a Directory containing two funeral services and one and a half for marriage.

There is no danger to be apprehended from the adoption of the proposed forms. Such a conservative and able committee as the one which has the work in hand could well be trusted to do nothing un-presbyterian. The church is practically unanimous as to the propriety of our having optional services for funerals and marriages, as it is also that we should have a form for the admission of members. It would be well to make the form for the baptism of infants a little more complete, and to place that, together with the others, in the appendix.

There seems to be every reason for our having well prepared, but optional, forms for funerals and marriages. It is evident, too, that the mind of the church is prepared for it. It is a question, however, whether it is wiser to adopt the revision in its present form, and then add an appendix in subsequent years, or to wait until it can be made as near perfect as possible before it becomes a part of the constitution of the Presbyterian Church.

ROBERT P. KERR.

THE ORIGIN OF PSALM LXVIII.

It is an amusing conceit of the Jewish poet, Immanuel Romi, which represents King David as summoning before him in Hades the commentators upon the Psalms, that he may award the prize to the most successful; and then, when they eagerly rush forward with their commentaries, confounding their hopes by assigning them Psalm lxviii. as their task. But the Christian expositor of the psalm has a difficulty unknown to the Jewish, for, besides the inherent difficulties of the psalm itself, he must account for the Apostle Paul's unexpected application of it, as well as his alteration of its language. (Eph. iv. 8-10.)

And yet, is the poet right? Because subsequent generations find

difficulty in the interpretation of a writing, is there any reason to suppose that its author would recognize in it any peculiar difficulty? Does not our difficulty grow out of our ignorance of the circumstances under which it was composed, and the historical allusions that it contains, the knowledge of which made all perfectly plain to those for whose use it was composed, and would make all plain to us if we could find the key to unlock the whole? And in the case of this psalm, if we had the key that the inspired apostle must have had, is it not likely that his use of it would become equally as plain to us as the psalm itself?

It is because the writer believes that he has found such a key that he invites his readers to a discussion of the origin of this psalm. To put forth such a claim as this may seem presumptuous, in view of the vast array of learned research that has been expended upon it. But the question concerning a key is not, "Who found it?" but, "Does it fit?" Of that his readers must judge, but for himself he must say that, having found it when he was not searching for it, he applied it to the psalm, and it opened before him, revealing in the sphere of the typical, line for line and feature for feature, just that succession of events, just that combination of ideas, that in the epistle we find in the sphere of the antitype.

The modern critics of our psalm are divided into two principal classes. The more fashionable view at the present day is that which ignores the title לְדָוִד and assigns the psalm to a later date. Yet there are critics of the highest authority who maintain either its Davidic authorship or, at least, its composition in the Davidic age. Where the critics are divided we may, without entering into the discussion,¹ conclude that there is no convincing reason compelling us to accept the later date, and that we are free to accept the earlier date if we find independent reasons for so doing. This position is strengthened by the fact that the advocates of the later date differ very greatly among themselves, varying in the date they assign as widely as from the age of Hezekiah to that of the Maccabees.

Accepting the Davidic age for the date of the psalm, the next question that presents itself is the occasion of its composition.² Here,

¹ To do this would be merely to repeat Delitzsch and Perowne, who may be consulted with great advantage by the reader desiring to pursue this discussion.

² Into the question of authorship I shall not enter. For while the Davidic authorship will be assumed in accordance with the title, the argument would be in no way affected if it were composed by Asaph (as Delitzsch hints) under the direction of David.

again, we find two groups of interpreters—the one placing it among the processional hymns on the removal of the ark to Zion, and the other regarding it as a triumphal hymn in celebration of one or another of David's victories. With regard to the first view, while it unquestionably meets many of the requirements of the case, yet the psalm seems to regard God as already in his holy habitation (vs. 5), and the procession at the removal of the ark is described as a past event (vs. 24–27). If, on the other hand, it was a mere hymn of victory the prominence of the ark, and of the choice of Zion as God's dwelling-place, could hardly be accounted for. True, as we are reminded, the ark was taken to the field in the Syro-Ammonitic war (2 Sam. xi. 11,) and would be brought back in triumph with the spoils of war on the conclusion of the campaign (2 Sam. xii. 26–31); but the exalted strains of this psalm seem entirely out of proportion to the extent of this victory (especially in view of the painful events associated with the campaign); and the absence of all specific references to any of the persons, peoples or places involved in this war would be inexplicable in a psalm otherwise so graphic in its details. This last objection becomes more apparent by a comparison between our psalm and the song of Deborah (Judg. v.), which it so much resembles. Who could doubt after reading that song what victory it was intended to celebrate?

Is there any occasion in the life of David which would combine the elements found in these two hypotheses, which would call for a psalm that would be at once a pæan of victory and an outburst of praise for the ascent of the ark to Zion and Jehovah's choice of Zion as his permanent sanctuary? If such an occasion can be found, and if, while satisfying the conditions of the psalm, it should explain also the apostle's use of it, this psalm and the passage in Ephesians should no longer be numbered among the *cruces interpretum*. The writer believes that all these conditions are met in the occasion so graphically described in 1 Chron. xxviii. and xxix., when the spoils of war and the fruits of all David's victories were dedicated to God for the building of the temple. And the clue to this idea he finds in the last clause of the verse, that is acknowledged to be the core and heart of the psalm:

“Thou hast ascended to the height; thou hast led captive captivity;”¹

¹ At the risk of differing from the majority of the best critics, I retain this translation, as does the R. V. (though inserting the word *thy* rather unnecessarily). The fact that *שָׁבִי* is concrete, and construed as a cognate accusative in a prose passage like Num. xxi. 1, is not sufficient reason for so rendering in a highly poetic passage like this and Judges v. 12. In the latter passage the rendering *captives* seems to be

Thou hast taken gifts among men; ¹

Yea, even [among] the rebellious, *for the inhabiting of JAH ELOHIM.*"—vs. 18.

It is these last words, which have been found most difficult or most meaningless by commentators,² that the writer finds most full of meaning. While the critics contend over their connection and significance, and the expounders of the passage in Ephesians ignore them altogether (because not included in the apostle's quotation), taken in their most simple sense and natural connection, they contain the solution of the whole problem. *He has taken gifts, that he may dwell in them. The spoils of victory were for the building of his temple.*

excluded by the fact that none were taken—all were slain (Judges iv. 16). The idea seems to be the *reversal of captivity*, and it is so taken by some who render "thou hast led captives captive." So Briggs (*Messianic Prophecy*, p. 434,) speaks of the "train of *rescued captives*," and refers it to the return of Israel from exile. This idea, I submit, would never be suggested by the expression "led captives captive."

¹ "Among men," as the sphere in which the gifts were taken. The rendering of Luther and the A. V., as a dative, is an indefensible attempt to harmonize with Eph. iv. 8. Yet more unjustifiable is the attempt to read the doctrine of the incarnation into this passage by rendering "in the [person of] man." The rendering "of men," as the material of which the gifts consisted, is forced and unnatural.

² It is not too much to say with Perowne (*Psalms, in loc.*) that (on the ordinary hypotheses) this clause, taken in the connection given, is meaningless, or, as he puts it, "stands very lamely," and it is just where we should expect a climax. Delitzsch (*Psalms, in loc.*) supplies "there" (*i. e.*, in Zion,) as in vs. 16, but the connection between the receiving of gifts and dwelling in Zion is not close enough for this to be the climax of such a passage. On the other hand, the supply "among them" of J. D. Michaelis (as cited by Perowne), in which he is followed by the Authorized Version and (substantially) by the Revised Version, while giving a good sense in itself, (he has received gifts among men and among the rebellious, as tokens of submission, that he may dwell among them,) ignores the idea that is evidently central, the choice of Zion as his dwelling-place. Perowne connects the last clause with אֱהָיִה סוֹרְרִים, and renders, "Yea, even the rebellious, [shall be] for Jah God to dwell [among]"—a rendering open to the same objection. Briggs (*loc. cit.*) criticizes this on grammatical grounds, and makes סוֹרְרִים the subject of the infinitive, rendering, "And even the rebellious are to dwell with Jah Elohim." Delitzsch regards this as grammatically admissible, but regards the expression as "too grand" to have the rebellious as its subject. In confirmation of this, note (a) that שָׁבַן has just been used with יְהוָה as subject in verse 16; (b) the original idea is that of *sinking* or *settling down*, so of the glory of Jehovah on Sinai (Ex. xxiv. 16), of the alighting of a dove (Psa. lv. 6; *Heb.*, vs. 7), of the lying down (or crouching?) of an animal (Deut. xxxiii. 20); this idea, while appropriate for man's dwelling on the earth, or God's dwelling with man, is not appropriate for man's

For the development of this idea a brief historical summary may be useful. The tabernacle of Jehovah was now in Gibeon; how or under what circumstances it had been removed thither we are not informed. But the ark of the covenant had not been within it since it had been taken to the field in the days of Eli. After it had found rest in Kirjath-jearim it had remained undisturbed until it was removed by David, first to the house of Obed-edom, and then to the tent he had prepared for it on Mt. Zion. Asaph, with other Levites, was then appointed to minister before the ark in song and praise, while Zadok, with other priests and Levites, was to offer sacrifices on the brazen altar before the tabernacle in Gibeon. This divorce between the ark and the altar, so essentially connected in the Mosaic ritual, can only be understood when we remember how complete had been the prostration of the whole Mosaic system in the years of disorder that preceded this period, and that the arrangement of David was only temporary and provisional, looking to the complete restoration of the rites of the ceremonial law, when the ark should find a permanent abode in the temple that was to be built.

To this end all his arrangements are directed. The elaborate organization of the Levites was entirely beyond the present needs of the ministry before the ark, and was designed for the more complex requirements of the temple service. And among the officers thus appointed there were certain Levites whose duty it was to receive and have charge of all the treasures that were dedicated to Jehovah for the building of his temple, one officer having special charge of the dedicated spoils of war. (1 Chron. xxvi. 20-28.) David, having been forbidden to build the temple himself, gave himself zealously to the work of preparation; so that around the ark were collecting all those rich treasures that were to adorn the neighboring hill to which the ark was to be transferred, and with it all the associations, prerogatives and glory—yea, practically, the name itself—of Zion; associations, preroga-

dwelling with God; (c) usage is in the same direction; it is used of God inhabiting eternity, the lofty place and the humble (Isa. lvii. 15), the burning bush (Dent. xxxiii. 16), Jerusalem (Psa. cxxxv. 21), of his dwelling in the midst of his people (Ex. xxv. 8; xxix. 45; Zech. ii. 10, *Heb.*, vs. 14); *cf.* also Rev. xxi. 3; where it is man dwelling with God, *שׁוֹכֵן* is used (Psa. ci. 6); (d) the term is specially appropriated to God in the derivations *פֶּשֶׁת*, *tabernacle* (i. e., *the dwelling*), and the modern Hebrew *שְׁכִינָה*, *the (Divine) presence*. In addition to these reasons, verse 6 seems to show that the word "rebellious" is used of the obdurate enemies of Jehovah.

tives and glory that became irrevocably linked with the name of Zion by the sacred muse of David, so that when all that gave glory to Zion is removed to Moriah, the name is carried with it in the songs of Zion, and Zion becomes for ever the name of God's dwelling-place.¹

In the last two chapters of First Chronicles we have a graphic account of David's last acts in connection with his preparation for the temple. He gathers to Jerusalem all the representative men of Israel (xxviii. 1), rehearses before them the history of his desire to build the temple, and God's command concerning it (vs. 2-7); exhorts the leaders and Solomon to be strong and carry out God's will (vs. 8-10); delivers to Solomon the pattern of the buildings, courts and vessels (vs. 11-19), and encourages him by showing the organization of the Levites and workmen that would be at his command (vs. 20, 21). Then, turning to the congregation, he reveals the great preparations he had been making, on account of the magnitude of the work and the youth of Solomon, the treasures he had dedicated out of the public resources (chiefly the spoils of war, cf. xviii. 1-13), and those he had given from his private store, calling upon the people to imitate his example (xxix. 1-5). To this the people respond willingly and joyously, and David pours out his heart in thanksgiving to God, and in prayers for the people and Solomon that they may carry on the work committed unto them (vs. 6-19). Then, at David's command, all the people worship God and offer sacrifices to Jehovah that day and the next, eating and drinking with joy and gladness before the Lord, and before dispersing re-anoint Solomon king and Zadok priest (vs. 20-23). Is it likely that a great national festival like this, the crowning event of David's reign, would be allowed to pass without a celebration of Jehovah's praise in sacred song? And what would be the theme of this song? In view of the present glory and prosperity of Israel, as manifested in the rich treasures that had been offered, the psalm would take the form of a thanksgiving to God as the source of this prosperity (cf. 1 Chron. xxix. 10-16), and might naturally touch upon the events of their history by

¹ It is evident that the tent for the ark was not pitched on the site afterwards chosen for the temple, for at this time the summit of Moriah was occupied by the threshing-floor of Ornan the Jebusite. It is equally evident that it was placed in the "city of David" (1 Chron. xv. 1, 29, and xvi. 1), and that Zion and the city of David are identical (2 Sam. v. 7). The application of the name of Zion was naturally extended, so that the removal of the ark to Moriah was not regarded as a removal beyond the limits of Zion. But the effort made in Smith's Bible Dictionary (Art. *Jerusalem*) to show that Zion was strictly and originally the eastern hill (on which the temple stood) cannot be successful.

which he had led them into it. In view of the fact that these treasures were chiefly the spoils of war, it could hardly take any other form than that of a song of victory (cf. 1 Chron. xxix. 11, "the victory"); as the whole demonstration had reference to the settlement of Jehovah in his permanent abode, the choice of Zion must needs be a prominent idea in the psalm, in the expression of which we should naturally find allusion to the removal of the ark thither, seeing that it had been a great national festival calling for songs of praise at the time (cf. Ps. xxiv. and xlvi.), and remembered as ground of petition in after years (cf. Ps. cxxxii.); and finally, inasmuch as David was about to lay down the reins of government, and Solomom was young and inexperienced, there could not but be an anxious glance at the future, and a committal of all into the hands of God as the sole dependence of his people (cf. 1 Chron. xxix. 18, 19). All this we find in Psalm lxviii., expressed under a figure in the highest degree striking and sublime. We may entitle the Psalm "Jehovah's triumphal march into his sanctuary."¹

The psalmist begins with almost the very words used by Moses when the ark was lifted for the journeyings of Israel in the wilderness (Num. x. 35), and the idea contained in these words is expanded in the following lines (vs. 1-4). In the remainder of this stanza (vs. 5, 6), God is celebrated as the father and advocate of his widowed and orphaned people, bringing them forth from bondage into prosperity, leaving only the rebellious to perish in the desert.² The next stanza³ (vs. 7-10), expands this idea by describing God's march through the wilderness before his people, the trembling of the earth at his tread, the refreshing of his weary and afflicted people by provision for their wants. The third stanza (vs. 11-14), describes the victorious entry into the land of promise, the women's songs of victory following immediately upon the Lord's word of command, by which their enemies are scattered and Israel brought out into the sunlight of prosperity and peace. The fourth stanza (vs. 15-18) describes God's choice and ascent of Zion; passing by the great and lofty mountains of Bashan, he chooses as his permanent abode the little hill of Zion, which thenceforth becomes the envy of the mountains of the earth; into the sanctuary the Lord enters with his innumerable chariots, the unseen defences of Israel. In invisible procession he has come with all his hosts from Sinai,⁴ and has ascended with the ark to the height of Zion,

¹ Cf. Briggs' *Messianic Prophecy*, p. 429.

² The historical standpoint of the psalmist is shown by the expression "in his holy habitation." The ark was already on Zion.

³ Perowne's arrangement of the stanzas is adopted.

⁴ I follow Perowne in the emendation of the text.

and having reversed the captivity of his people, he receives the spoils of his enemies for the building of his habitation.

At this point, the psalmist pauses to ascribe glory to God for his innumerable deliverances. He will not suffer the enemies of his people to escape by flight, and so continue their trespasses against them, but will bring them out from their fastnesses and deliver them over to their conquerors.¹ (Vs. 19-23.)

The sixth stanza (vs. 24-27) takes up again the subject of the ascent to Zion, and describes the visible² as the fourth stanza had described the invisible procession, giving a vivid description of the removal of the ark. The choice of Zion was no fiction of the poet, because men *had seen* the goings of God, Israel's King, into his sanctuary.

The seventh stanza (vs. 28-31) begins with an address to Solomon,³ "Thy God has commanded thy strength," (cf. 1 Chron. xxviii. 20,) followed by the prayer, "Strengthen, O God, that which thou hast wrought for us," *i. e.*, "Bring to completion that which thou hast begun." The ark had found a resting-place, and the materials for building it a permanent habitation were provided; but the work of building was yet to be done. (Cf. 1 Chron. xxix. 19.) The prayer is followed by a glimpse of its fulfilment in the future—Zion crowned with the temple, and kings bringing presents because of it.⁴ But that

¹ So Perowne, who refers to Amos ix. 1-3, as the true parallel.

² Perowne, *in loc.*

³ Delitzsch, supposing this to be addressed to David, regards it as indicating another poet than David. The point is significant as justifying the application made above. There is no need, then, for textual emendation, to read with the LXX. and others, "O God, command thy strength."

⁴ The rendering "Because of thy temple" is perfectly justifiable, and hence there is no need for connecting מְהִיבֶלֶךְ with the previous line, as Briggs and Perowne. "Because of" is a sufficiently familiar rendering of מִן, but consult, in proof, Briggs, *Messianic Prophecy*, p. 97, note. It is difficult to see why Perowne should pronounce it inadmissible. With regard to the word הַיֵּבֶל, its use here and in other psalms has been regarded as decisive against their Davidic origin. True, the word is used of the structure in Shiloh (1 Sam. i. 9; iii. 3), but this seems to have been something more than the tabernacle, including the high priest's residence (explaining the "doors" of 1 Sam. iii. 15), and making the term "palace" more appropriate. It would seem very unlikely that David would use this term, or the term הַיֵּבֶל of the "curtains," which he contrasts so sharply with the "house" of cedars in which he dwelt (2 Sam. vii. 2); but if we hold this we would have to give up as Davidic Psalms v., xxiii. and xxvii.; and xxvii. 5, shows conclusively

this may be accomplished, the psalmist again lifts up his heart in prayer that God would rebuke the brutal nations that delight in violence, until the riches of Egypt be brought to Zion, and Cush shall stretch out her hands to God. The last stanza (vs. 32-35) is an exhortation to the nations to join in the praises of God, who rideth on the heavens, whose voice is strength, whose majesty is over Israel, whose strength is in the clouds, who is terrible from his sanctuary, and who giveth strength and power to his people. (Cf. 1 Chron. xxix. 12.) The closing words, "blessed be God," suggest the opening of David's prayer and his exhortation to the people. (1 Chron. xxix. 10, 20.)

To sum up our conclusions, the examination of the psalm reveals not a single point inconsistent with our theory; there are several details that find in this theory their best explanation; there are numerous points of minute correspondence with the circumstances of the occasion in question; while the general outline is just what would be expected on this occasion, and the dignity of the occasion is in accord with the exalted strain of the psalm.

But to the reader who believes that Paul was not a rabbinical juggler, but an inspired apostle, that interpretation will be most satisfactory which, while meeting the conditions imposed by the psalm itself, will at the same time explain the application of it in Eph. iv. 8-10. Having applied our key to the psalm, let us now apply it to the epistle. The difficulties in the apostle's use of the passage may be reduced to three: (1), He applies vs. 18 of the psalm to Christ, when the psalm presents no evidence of having a Messianic character; (2), He argues from the ascension to an implied previous descent, or humiliation, when the reference in the psalm is to the pre-incarnate Elohim; and (3), He makes a point (and his chief point) out of the giving of gifts, when the psalm speaks of the receiving of gifts or taking of spoil.

With reference to these difficulties, Ellicott (Eph. *in loc.*) clears away some false explanations, and places us upon firm ground: "Remembering that the apostle wrote under inspiration of the Holy Ghost,

that the term is applied to the tent. It is probable that David, from the time that he conceived the idea of building the temple, applied the terms "house" and "temple" to the abode of the ark by anticipation. It was to him the palace of the king, because the king was there. I freely admit, therefore, that the use of the word does not of itself add anything to the argument of this paper, as would have been the case if it were not used in other Davidic psalms, but it is especially consonant with the theory that this psalm had a special relation to the future temple.

we recognize here neither imperfect memory (Rückert), arbitrary change (Calvin,¹ Theodore Mops.), accommodation (Morus), rabbinical interpretation (Meyer), but simply the *fact* that the psalm, and especially vs. 18, *had* a Messianic reference, and bore within itself a further, fuller and deeper meaning. This meaning the inspired apostle, by a slight change of language, succinctly, suggestively and authoritatively unfolds." This principle, thus clearly stated, is sufficient for the believing mind so far as the *fact* is concerned, but does not satisfy our proper desire to know *how* the meaning unfolded by the apostle is involved in the psalm. On this point Hodge (Eph. *in loc.*) lays down three principles—the typical character of the old dispensation; the identity of the Logos, or Son, manifested in the flesh in the new dispensation with the manifested Jehovah of the old; and (what is really involved in the first) that the historical and prophetic descriptions of the Old Testament are not exhausted by one application. But while these are the principles in the line of which we are to seek for the solution, the solution itself is yet to find. Spurgeon (*Treasury of David, in loc.*), Perowne and others draw nearer a solution when they make the ark prominent in their interpretation. Briggs (*loc. cit.*), whose broad study of Messianic prophecy has given him a grasp of its principles which is always firm, says, "The victorious march of Jahveh finds its appropriate fulfilment in that greatest of all victories, and that greatest of all triumphal processions,"—speaking of the triumphant ascension of Christ. Unfortunately, however, he makes the "train of rescued captives" the prominent idea, rather than the "gifts," which is the leading idea with the apostle. Delitzsch takes substantially the same view, and explains the change of language with reference to the gifts, essentially as do Perowne and Alexander (Psalms, *in loc.*), that a conquering king receives only to give. But while all these thoughts are true and helpful as far as they go, cannot they, like the interpretations of the psalm, be unified by applying the key-thought of this paper? Let us consider the ideas involved in vs. 18 of the psalm in connection with what precedes.

The ark, the seat of Jehovah's manifested glory, after a long period of humiliation, had ascended to Mt. Zion its chosen resting-place; this ascent is the mark of its enemies' defeat, and the earnest of its final victory over all foes; of this victory the spoils of the enemies are the

¹ This does not correctly represent Calvin's view (Psalms, *in loc.*), inasmuch as he can hardly be said to regard a change as *arbitrary* for which he assigns a reason, and which he proceeds to justify.

trophies, and these trophies are to be used in building it a permanent habitation.

Of the typical meaning of this there can be no doubt. The ark of the covenant is the recognized type of Christ. As all are not agreed about the meaning of the cherubim, we will not press the point that in God dwelling between the cherubim we have the symbol of God dwelling in the midst of a glorified humanity, an idea first realized when God was manifested in the perfect, and afterwards glorified, man Christ Jesus, and only in him and through him, capable of a further realization when he dwells in the midst of his ransomed and glorified saints. But as the centre and sun of Old Testament worship; as the material symbol through which God manifested his glory; as the spot where mercy and truth met together, and righteousness and peace kissed each other; where all the lines of atonement converged, that God might be just and yet the justifier of those that sought him in his appointed way—the ark was the most perfect symbol of the word, full of grace and truth, which became flesh and dwelt among us, that we might behold his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father.

If such be the typical meaning of the ark, its ascent to Zion can only find its prophetic fulfilment in the ascension of Christ. It needs no inspired apostle to tell us that Psalm xxiv., descriptive of this same event, is prophetic of Christ's ascension. But the ascension of him who inhabiteth eternity, dwelling in the height (Isa. lvii. 15), implies a previous descent, and the previous humiliation of the ark must have been typical of the humiliation of the eternal Son.¹ Nor need we have any hesitation in recognizing, as others have done, that the victories ascribed to Jehovah (as identified with the ark) were typical of, and found their highest fulfilment in, the victory of Christ when he spoiled principalities and powers, triumphing over them in his cross (Col. ii. 15); the spoils of the enemies must needs be typical of the fruits of that victory—the salvation which he plucked from the jaws of death, together with every gift that was necessary for the full execution of his purposes of grace (cf. Acts ii. 33); and as the spoils of victory re-

¹ We need not begin this humiliation with the capture of the ark (1 Sam. iv. 11) and its subsequent fortunes up to the time of its ascent. Rather would I take it that the whole period from the time that Jehovah descended from Sinai to lead his people through the wilderness to their promised inheritance, dwelling with them in tents, sharing their defeats and captivity as well as leading them to victory, until the time when he ascended to his resting-place on Zion, was typical of the humiliation of Christ and his sojourn in the flesh.

ceived on Zion by him that dwelt between the cherubim were to build him a habitation for glory and defence and beauty, so the fruits of Christ's victory were for the fulfilment of his eternal purpose of founding for himself a church in the world, of endowing it with every gift and grace necessary for its defence and perfection, and of building it up for his eternal habitation. That the temple was typical of the church is one of the elementary ideas of Scripture; and although it also typified Christ's body, as the habitation and seat of his divinity, that very idea expanded gives us the church, which is his body. (Eph. i. 23.)

When we turn to the passage under consideration we find that it is this last idea which is the prominent one, and which occasioned the quotation. Having showed to his Gentile readers their high privilege, as builded together with God's people for a habitation of God through the Spirit (ii. 22), and having besought for them graces corresponding to their privileges (iii. 14-21), the apostle now exhorts them to walk worthy of their calling, giving as reason for their mutual forbearance, the unity and perfection of the "body," and the fact that every one receives his gift from Christ in his own measure (iv. 1-7). It is upon this mention of gifts that he quotes Psalm lxviii. 18, and expounds its reference to Christ, once descended in humiliation, but now ascended that he may fill (or better *fulfil*, *i. e.*, *complete*, a frequent usage of the word in the New Testament,) all things (vs. 8-10). And the gifts in question he bestows in varying measure (the idea of vs. 7), qualifying men for different offices in the church (vs. 11). And to what end? Let the apostle answer: "For the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering, *unto the building up of the body of Christ*, till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ; that we . . . may grow up in all things into him which is the head, even Christ; from whom all the body, fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth, according to the working in due measure of each several part, maketh the increase of the body unto the building up of itself in love" (vs. 12-16, Revised Version). The expressions *grow* (also *increase* in Greek), *building*, *fitly framed*, occurring in this passage and in chapter ii. 20-23, show that the apostle still has in mind the idea of the temple, and merely substitutes another of his favorite figures for the church that better carries out the idea of life and growth. The identity of these two figures has been pointed out above.

In the face of a correspondence like this the verbal difference sinks into insignificance. The apostle does not give a translation,¹ but speaks of the gifts alluded to in the psalm with reference to their use, rather than their source. Conquerors, as has been remarked, receive only to give; but above this idea is the more important truth, that between Christ and his people there is no *meum* and *tuum*—all his is ours, and all ours is his. The gifts that David dedicated are recognized by him as having come from God, not only as the source of all riches, but as the immediate author of the victories which had secured them (1 Chron. xxix. 11-16); yet they are given back to him as free-will offerings for his temple; and while the temple was built for his habitation, its blessings and privileges return to his people. So the gifts of grace are all from Christ, purchased by his blood and wrested from his enemies; yet his people are free-will offerings in the day of his power (Psa. cx.), and give themselves willingly to be living stones built up into a spiritual house (1 Pet. ii. 5), or to be pillars in the temple of their God (Rev. iii. 12). And while the glory of this temple is Christ's, its blessings, privileges, and immortal joys are given to his people for evermore, for the highest glory of Christ is the glory of his grace. The apostle speaks of these gifts in that aspect in which a grateful church ever loves to remember them.

PEYTON H. HOGE.

ON LANGUAGE TEACHING.

It is not always given to one whose work has been the teaching of languages, to know what is being done in other fields of learning; but it would be interesting to compare the various degrees of mental activity in different fields. The language-men certainly cannot be accused of letting themselves stagnate, or of counting themselves to have apprehended. They are continually pressing on, if so be that they may attain unto some more excellent way. Every now and then a revolution is promised; but after awhile, it appears that only a very few, comparatively, have "revolved," and that the large majority are not yet ready to abandon the lines on which they have worked so long.

Some years ago, "The Natural Method" was widely and loudly proclaimed as being the way of ways for teaching language. Its

¹ How it would delight a certain class of commentators if they could show that Paul had followed an erroneous translation of the LXX! But the LXX. merely give an unintelligible word-for-word transfer of the Hebrew idiom.