

Sweetgospelharmony.com

The Gospel in the Law

PART IV

CHAPTER XIII.

Christian and Jewish Ethics.

Lev. xix. 18 ; Deut. vi. 5 ; Matt. xxii. 37—40.

SOME special imprecatory passages having been considered in preceding sections, it is still to be sought, in what way the varied (though individually less striking) denunciations which are found elsewhere in the Old Testament, and may be said to pervade the Psalter, are to be reconciled with the forgiving spirit of the Gospel and the counsels of CHRIST. Do they indicate, as many affirm, a contrariety of principle between the Gospel and the Law? or do the two agree essentially, and differ only in phase; the one presenting certain principles in their most elementary form; the other exhibiting a later and continuous development of the same?

I. Comparisons of Old and New Testament Language.

I. The imprecations which abound in the Psalms would doubtless seem, for the most part, out of place, if transferred to the pages of a Gospel, or an Apostolic Epistle. This might be said, *e. g.* of such passages as:—‘Lead me, O Lord, in Thy righteousness because of mine enemies; make Thy way straight before my face... Destroy Thou them, O God; let them fall by their own counsels; cast them out in the multitude of their transgressions; for they have rebelled against Thee’ (Ps. v. 8, 10). ‘Give them according to their

deeds, and according to the wickedness of their endeavours: give them after the work of their hands; render to them their desert. Because they regard not the works of the LORD, nor the operation of His hands, He shall destroy them, and not build them up' (xxviii. 4, 5). 'Let me not be ashamed, O LORD: for I have called upon Thee: let the wicked be ashamed, and let them be silent in the grave. Let the lying lips be put to silence; which speak grievous things proudly and contemptuously against the righteous' (xxxi. 17, 18). 'Let them be confounded and put to shame that seek after my soul: let them be turned back and brought to confusion that devise my hurt. Let them be as chaff before the wind: and let the angel of the LORD chase them. Let their way be dark and slippery; and let the angel of the LORD persecute them. For without cause have they hid for me their net in a pit, which without cause they have digged for my soul' (xxxv. 4—7). 'Let them be ashamed and confounded together that seek after my soul to destroy it; let them be driven backward and put to shame that wish me evil. Let them be desolate for a reward of their shame that say unto me, Aha, aha' (xli. 14, 15). 'But Thou, O LORD, be merciful unto me, and raise me up, that I may requite them. By this I know that Thou favourest me, because mine enemy doth not triumph over me' (xli. 10, 11).

2. But, on the other hand, there are passages comparable with these in the New Testament itself. Thus (not to mention our Lord's denunciations of the scribes and Pharisees, in Matt. xxiii.) we may instance St Paul's words: 'Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil: the LORD reward him according to his works' (2 Tim. iv. 14). Here *ἀποδώσει* should perhaps be rendered as a simple future, and not optatively. But the variation thus introduced is less important than such variations are sometimes thought to be; for the optative rendering would represent the Apostle as desiring that such and such a retribution might overtake the gainsayer; while, with the simple future, he would seem to contemplate the like issue as one to be desired. In any case,

St Paul's words may be compared with those denunciatory passages in the Psalms which are to the same extent ambiguous, and may even be set down as, not improbably, a free citation of Ps. xxviii. 4: *δὸς αὐτοῖς κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν*. The denunciatory expressions in the New Testament may be comparatively few; but the occurrence of even one would indicate either the recognition, in Christian theology, of principles in harmony with the severity of the former Dispensation; or a departure, under special circumstances, from the general law of Christ, which would require explanation, and might give rise to the conjecture that, in the Old Testament also, special considerations may be adducible in explanation of imprecatory passages.

3. That the difference in this matter between the Old Testament and the New is not one of principle, is further shewn by direct statements in the former, which are in complete harmony with the forgiving spirit of the latter. Thus, the Book of Proverbs dissuades from unseemly exultation over a fallen enemy, declaring it hateful in the sight of God: 'Rejoice not when thine enemy falleth, and let not thine heart be glad when he stumbleth, lest the LORD see it, and it displease Him, and He turn away His wrath from him' (Prov. xxiv. 17, 18). So in Job xxxi. 29, 30: 'If I rejoiced at the destruction of him that hated me, or lifted up myself when evil found him: Neither have I suffered my mouth to sin by wishing a curse to his soul.' Again: 'Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart: thou shalt in any wise rebuke thy neighbour, and not suffer sin in him. Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people, but thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself: I am the LORD' (Lev. xix. 17, 18). In Deut. xxxii. 35, JEHOVAH speaks: 'To Me belongeth vengeance, and recompense; their foot shall slide in due time: for the day of their calamity is at hand, and the things that shall come upon them make haste.' The first part of this verse is quoted, in Heb. x. 30, as predictive of Divine retribution to such as have 'done despite unto the Spirit of grace,' 'For we know Him that hath said, *Vengeance*

belongeth unto Me, I will recompense, saith the LORD. And again, *The Lord shall judge His people* (Ps. cxxxv. 14). It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.' But in Rom. xii. 19, the same passage from Deuteronomy is cited as a dissuasive from vindictiveness: 'If it be possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men. Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, *Vengeance is mine, I will repay*, saith the Lord.' The Law then contains the Gospel teaching; the Gospel illustrates the practice of the Law. What is the relation of the doctrine to the practice? How is Christian charity to be reconciled with legal severity?

II. *An Interpretation of Rom. xii. 20, 21; Prov. xxv. 21, 22.*

A solution of the difficulty above propounded is contained in the vexed passage: 'Therefore, if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst give him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good' (Rom. xii. 20, 21). Bishop Patrick remarks, not quite conclusively, upon the *coals of fire*, &c.: 'If he have the least spark of goodness in him, it will work a change in his mind, and make him throw off all his enmities; or, if it have the contrary effect, he shall have so much the sorer punishment, and thou shalt not lose thy reward, which the Lord himself shall give thee.' Dean Alford thus states the case: 'The expression *ἀνθρακας πυρός* occurs repeatedly in Ps. xviii., of the *Divine punitive judgments*. Can those be meant here? Clearly not, in their bare literal sense. For however true it may be that ingratitude will add to the enemy's list of crimes, and so subject him more to God's punitive judgment, it is impossible that to *bring this about* should be set as a precept, or a desirable thing among Christians. Again, can the expression be meant of the *glow and burn of shame* which would accompany, even in the case of a profane person, the receiving of benefits from an enemy? This *may* be meant; but it is not probable, as not sufficing

for the majesty of the subject. Merely to *make an enemy ashamed of himself*, can hardly be upheld as a motive for action. I understand the words, *For in this doing, you will be taking the most effectual vengeance; as effectual as if you heaped coals of fire on his head.* Although the above seems on the whole unsatisfactory, yet *to heap coals of fire, &c.*, is most naturally taken as expressive of vengeance and destruction, as *e. g.* in Ps. xi. 6: 'Upon the wicked He shall rain snares, fire and brimstone, and an horrible tempest: this shall be the portion of their cup.' Hence, it is not likely that 'the expression is used in a good sense,' as some think, and as the following remarks of Dr Macknight express: 'The metaphor,' writes this commentator, 'is supposed to be taken from the melting of metals, by covering the ore with burning coals. This being understood, the meaning will be, In so doing, thou wilt mollify thine enemy, and bring him to a good temper. This no doubt is the best method of treating enemies. For it belongs to God to punish the injurious, but to the injured to overcome them, by returning good for evil.' Augustine concludes: 'ut intelligas, carbones ignis esse urentes pœnitentiæ gemitus, quibus superbia sanatur ejus, qui dolet se inimicum fuisse hominis, a quo ejus miserix subvenitur.'

There is, however, another way of explaining the difficult verse in question, which allows its most natural meaning to the phraseology employed. To heap coals of fire upon an enemy, would imply an uncompromising enmity, not to be satisfied by anything less than the extermination of the foe. In some sense, the Christian is supposed to desire such a consummation, and is encouraged in the attempt to compass it: nor does any difficulty arise in reconciling this with such precepts as, 'Love your enemies,' if it be remembered that the latter are plain practical directions for the conduct of life, while the verse under discussion deals more directly with first principles and the nature of things. In it the word 'enemy' stands, in part, as an abstraction, and signifies rather enmity and antagonism, than the individual in whom the enmity resides. The Christian may, or must, desire to root out the

enmity; and when this is done, the enemy, *qua* enemy, will have been destroyed. The individual (never himself the object of hatred) remains, but the enemy has disappeared, and his place knows him no more: he who was an enemy before, has, *qua* enemy, passed out of being; a deadly vengeance has been exacted; coals of fire have been heaped upon his head. Or, to put the case rather differently: The word enemy symbolizes the complex notion of a person in relation with certain qualities not inherent; and when that relationship comes to an end, then, by its dissolution, the complex being, 'enemy,' is *ipso facto* destroyed. Not unlike, from one point of view, is the case of an *idol*, which 'is nothing in the world.' The essence of an *idol* is an imaginary relationship between *e.g.* 'a stock of a tree' and certain qualities; and the idol is *ipso facto* destroyed when the worshipper's regard for that 'stock of a tree' has vanished. Conversely, the idol is not necessarily destroyed by the burning of the 'stock,' seeing that the false idea of it may still remain: and, in like manner, an 'enemy' is not annihilated by the physical destruction of a person hated, unless the *idea* of the enemy then vanishes. But even thus, if the enmity does indeed cease with the death of the enemy, his physical destruction will but have induced a change of mind in the survivor (which might have been effected by some other means), and will not have contributed in any direct way to the destruction of the 'enemy.' In popular language, *to kill an enemy*, is to kill a *person*, whether or no the idea of enmity survives; but, strictly speaking, the destruction of an enemy can be effected only by the eradication of enmity; a process which stands in no direct relation to the physical destruction of an opponent¹. St Paul, following the Paræmiast, is *not* using popular language, when he affirms that, to succour a distressed enemy is to heap coals of fire upon his head.

¹ St Paul contemplates a *destruction* of enemies, which is a reversal of the process of *making* enemies.

III. *On the Christian duty of Forgiveness.*

There are some confused popular notions on the subject of the Christian duty of forgiving enemies, which take their rise from the assumption that there is some inherent virtue in an unprincipled mercy, and that charity should be cognisant of no distinction between light and darkness. But WHY *are we to forgive our enemies?*

1. Charity, taking the form of compromise, is a condition of imperfection: for in an ideal state of existence which shews things as they are, there is no room for charity which 'thinketh no evil,' and for the nice adjustment of essential contrarities. Right must enter upon the contest without misgiving, and engage in a war of extermination with wrong absolute and irreclaimable. And such must be our mode of representation, when the principles and workings of good and evil are to be set forth as abstractions, though in a concrete form. But in actual life we find none absolutely good, and none whom we can declare absolutely and irreclaimably bad; and hence, precepts for guidance in practical affairs may differ conspicuously from such as relate to abstract good and evil, and presuppose an ideal state of things. Christian Charity, hoping all things, allows for the existence of latent good, and has faith in a Divine Power which can reclaim those in whom evil most preponderates: but if the Christian's enemies were absolutely evil, and known of a certainty to be incapable of amendment, his rightful attitude would be one of uncompromising hostility, and there would be no place for the injunction: 'Love your enemies.'

2. Not to desire the discomfiture of an enemy is *contrary to nature*. The Apostle, granting this, and making it the groundwork of his argument, shews what is the most efficacious weapon that can be employed: the benignant treatment of an enemy is the readiest way to overcome him: 'In so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome

of evil, but overcome evil with good ;' *i.e.* perhaps : 'I say not, that you should yield and allow yourselves to be overcome by evil ; but rather that you should resist and overcome it ; and that, by the most potent weapon, *good*.' The Psalmist takes it as evidence of God's favour towards him, that 'mine enemy doth not triumph over me ;' CHRIST himself by His passivity and non-resistance evinces no desire that His enemies may triumph over Him, nor indifference as to the issue of their antagonism : in a word, wherever the mutual relations of persons and things can be symbolized under the form of a contest, the desire to discomfit one's enemy must of necessity enter as one element into the representation.

IV. *Distinction between practical and ideal Ethics.*

It has been remarked above, that our Lord's *practical* precepts are, in some cases, unsuited for an ideal state of things ; and it follows as a natural consequence, that representations which presuppose such an ideal state may be *prima facie* at variance with, while yet not actually opposed to, the doctrine of CHRIST. The Psalmists being for the most part conversant with an ideal condition of affairs, the above remark is applicable to their compositions. The characters which they introduce are, in certain cases, absolutely good, or absolutely evil : they depict sin, truth, purity, ungodliness, &c. in the abstract : the Psalmist, if not an embodiment of righteousness, is at least *on the side of right*, the object of Jehovah's care, calling to Him for aid : his enemies are 'the wicked,' 'the workers of iniquity,' 'the blasphemer ;' and hence, it is only natural that a Psalmist should pray, not *for*, but *against*, his enemies, and that he should desire their destruction ; seeing that they are regarded as embodiments of evil, and are not thought of as capable of amendment.

Again, the figure of a contest being presupposed, it is scarcely necessary to remark, that the success of one implies the discomfiture of another ; and that in the description of a battle it is, so to say, immaterial from which point of view the

issue is regarded. It has been thought however that the directness with which the Psalmists contemplate the destruction of their enemies is out of harmony with the Christian spirit, which would choose rather to dwell upon the victory of faith, and to cast into the back-ground the implied defeat of the opposing powers of evil. It has been thought too, that if the latter is to be dwelt upon at all, it should be with less of detail than the Psalms exhibit. (a) As a practical answer to the former of these two objections, it may be urged that the discomfiture of enemies is prayed for, in no unchristian sense, in our National Anthem:

Scatter her enemies,
And make them fall:

and in *A Prayer for the Queen's Majesty*: 'strengthen her that she may vanquish and overcome all her enemies.' (b) But the objections to certain imprecations in the Psalms may be said to spring almost entirely from their particularity and detail. Is not this at least at variance with the tenour of Christian teaching? The answer to this is obvious. The thing objected to is essential to the completeness of the broad concrete representations of Hebrew poetry, which are very far removed from euphemistic abstractions of modern phraseology; and not only so, but parallel representations are found in the work of a Christian Apostle, which concludes the Canon.

V. *The Curse of Babylon, Ps. cxxxvii. 8; Rev. xviii. 6.*

Of all denunciatory passages in the Psalms not as yet specially considered, the most striking is the curse of Babylon in Ps. cxxxvii. 8, 9: 'O daughter of Babylon, who art to be destroyed; happy shall he be that rewardeth thee as thou hast served us. Happy shall he be that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones.' Whatever the true explanation of the difficulty which the foregoing passage raises, it may be remarked that the Apocalypse contains passages which may well be compared with it. The description of the

fall of Babylon in Rev. xviii. is cast in the Old Testament mould, and borrows one of its expressions from the Psalm in question:—‘*Reward her even as she rewarded you*’ (Ps. cxxxvii. 8), and double unto her double according to her works: in the cup which she hath filled fill to her double. How much she hath glorified herself, and lived deliciously, so much torment and sorrow give her: for she saith in her heart, I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow. Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning [*ἀτεκνία καὶ χηρεία*, Is. xlvii. 9], and famine; and she shall be utterly burned with fire: for strong is the Lord who judgeth her... Rejoice over her, thou heaven, and ye holy apostles and prophets; for God hath avenged you on her.’ As regards sustained severity of tone, the passage of which this forms a part can scarcely be said to fall short of ‘the varied, deliberate, carefully constructed, detailed anathemas of the Psalms.’

VI. *The Psalms, being poetical, are to be interpreted non-naturally.*

I. The opinion that the Psalmists’ denunciations were directed against their spiritual enemies has been maintained by some as the means of accounting for the semblance of vindictiveness which attaches itself to some of them: but on the other hand this explanation has been characterized as *non-natural*, and on that account to be rejected. Advocates of the theory in question (which is at least plausible) have sometimes indeed exaggerated its non-naturalness, by taking the characters introduced in the Psalms for more complete abstractions than they are, and neglecting the natural element altogether. For David, contemplating the destruction of his enemies, is not a mere abstraction; though, on the other hand, to his *natural* feelings he superadds the consciousness that he is the favoured of Jehovah: ‘The Lord is on my side.’ ‘Zion,’

¹ The original, *את גְּמוּלָךְ שְׁגַמְלַת לָנוּ* (Thy reward wherewith thou hast rewarded us), illustrates the use of the genitive in Ps. cix. 20. See p. 250.

again, is not the advanced abstraction of a later age but the Psalmist speaks of it with the feelings of a patriot, yet all this notwithstanding, he feels, at the same time, that it is the Holy City¹. The descriptions in the Psalter are something more than natural, even if not altogether spiritual; and, being moreover poetical and ideal, they are to be compared with the Apocalyptic Vision, rather than contrasted with the Sermon on the Mount. To characterize an interpretation of a poetical passage as non-natural is not always to condemn it, for such interpretations are, in many cases, plainly necessary, and to admit none but such as are natural would lead oftentimes to ludicrous results.

2. It has been urged above that the Psalms are to be treated as poetical and ideal, and their interpretation, especially as regards some imprecatory passages, to be modified accordingly. All this notwithstanding, it may be, that those who used the Psalter, in a manner misapplied it; and that, through faulty and restricted notions of God's purpose, and a wrong estimate *e.g.* of the place of the literal Zion in the Divine economy. This consideration, be it remarked, is an important element in the distinction between the Ethics of Christianity and the Ethics of Judaism.

VII. *Representative Characters described in the Psalms.*

A recent commentator thus sets forth the difficulty presented by the Old Testament imprecations:—

'Now the real source of the difficulty lies in our not observing and bearing in mind the *essential* difference between the Old Testament and the New. The older dispensation was in every sense a sterner one than the new. The spirit of Elias, *though not an evil spirit*, was not the spirit of Christ

¹ It is a part of the Hebrew style to express spiritual ideas by types. Thus in Rev. ii. 20, an evil principle is denounced under the name of Jezebel. So, by Zion and Babylon are under-

stood their suprasensual counterparts. It is hard to assign limits to the *natural* and the *spiritual* in the conceptions which such typifications suggested to a Jew.

(Luke ix. 55). "The Son of Man came not to destroy men's lives, but to save them." And through Him His disciples were made partakers of the same spirit. But this was not the spirit of the older economy¹. The Jewish nation had been trained in a sterner school. It had been steeled and hardened by the discipline which had pledged it to a war of extermination with idolaters, and however necessary such a discipline might be, it would not tend to foster the gentler virtues; it is conceivable how even a righteous man, under it, feeling it to be his bounden duty to root out evil wherever he saw it, and identifying, *as he did*, his own enemies with the enemies of Jehovah, might use language which to us appears unnecessarily vindictive. To men so trained and taught, what we call "religious toleration," was a thing not only wrong, but absolutely inconceivable².

So far, however, as a righteous man identifies 'his own enemies with the enemies of Jehovah,' and has no misgiving about the accuracy of his estimate; it is clearly incumbent upon him to dismiss the thought of compromise and toleration; nor do even extreme measures render him amenable to the charge of *unnecessary vindictiveness*. But a more enlightened view of things, and a clearer insight into the failings and the capacities of man's moral nature, shews the necessity for that toleration (with a view to amendment) which Christianity enjoins. Christianity, no less than Judaism, is 'pledged to a war of extermination with idolaters,' and with every kind of evil: but the former differs as regards its mode of warfare from the latter; inasmuch as it has a clearer insight into the complexities of human character, and the difference between the sinner and his sin. 'Resist, be not overcome by, evil,' is their common teaching; but the former counsels the more excellent way. Charity (it proclaims) is the most effectual disintegrant, whereby the evil may be separated from the good.

¹ Psalms lxi, cix, cxxxvii have been thought plain proofs of 'the essential difference &c.' But, as cited by SS. Peter, Paul, and John, they must

be regarded as capable of a New Testament application.

² Perowne, on Ps. xxxv. 22.

VIII. *The Growth of Charity.*

There are two ways in which knowledge may affect conduct, and contribute to that charitableness which Christianity requires.

1. The Psalter is adapted to an ideal and absolute state of things, and its language is such as we recognize as appropriate, when spiritual things and the final separation of good and evil are contemplated. It has indeed been urged, that their comparative ignorance of all that related to the future state and the workings therein of the Divine judgements, led the Psalmists to desire, and express a longing-for, the temporal destruction of the wicked. Thus, Mr Perowne :—‘Once more, the very fact that a dark cloud hid God’s judgment in the world to come from the view of the Old Testament saints, may be alleged in excuse of this their desire to see Him take vengeance on His enemies here. How deeply the problem of God’s righteousness exercised their minds, is abundantly evident from numerous places in the Psalms. They longed to see that righteousness manifested. It could be manifested, they thought, only in the evident exaltation of the righteous, and the evident destruction of the wicked here.’ They used temporal imagery to express the spiritual idea of the Divine judgements, and exhibited the working of those judgements in time, rather than in eternity. Hence must arise an apparent (but not real) contrariety of principle between the Old Dispensation and the New ; for Christian Charity, as in the parable of the Tares, contemplates a final separation between good and evil, and tolerates the admixture of evil in time, only that it may the more effectually, and without injury to the good, be cast away in eternity. This would seem to contribute somewhat to the understanding of the Psalmists’ frame of mind ; or, if so much be not granted, it at least justifies the *Christian use and application* of certain passages objected to. Many other passages in the Psalter, such as those which portray the peaceful issue of righteousness, are

expressed in terms strictly applicable only to the life in the flesh ; and are yet more broadly interpreted by Christians (and that without hesitation) to the spiritual life. Why should not certain imprecatory passages be treated likewise ? It is usual to apply a 'non-natural' interpretation to the former¹ : why not to the latter ? But, to conclude, this one thing will perhaps be granted : that the prospect of a future retribution tends to induce longsuffering in the present, and thus Christian Charity is naturally *developed* from Legal severity ; and that, by the clearer Revelation of Divine Truth.

2. It has already been remarked, that, so long as a Psalmist *e.g.* viewed himself as on the Lord's side, it was permissible, not to say required, that he should use expressions which may seem 'unnecessarily vindictive,' to those who view him as other than a representative of truth and righteousness, and his enemies as neither worse nor better than ordinary men. It might however be asked, what was the practical effect of such representations upon the Jewish mind, and whether exclusive and exaggerated views of their religious *status* were not thereby encouraged ; for while in ideal representations intolerance is a necessity, in life and practice it is a product of ignorance and prejudice ; seeing that in the one case good and evil are supposed discernible ; while in the other they are confusedly joined together. In earlier times, doubtless, if the Jew did not exterminate the idol-worshippers, their idolatry would have corrupted the Jew ; and hence it was necessary to maintain uncompromisingly certain broad distinctions, and to sanction intolerance, as a concession to acknowledged weakness. This fostered, doubtless, a spirit of exclusiveness, and was directly favourable to that confusion

¹ Cp. Ps. xxxvii. 25 : 'I have been young, and now am old : yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging bread.' Such passages are not taken to mean, that good men escape outward ills and privations. One of two *non-natural* interpretations must be accepted. Either (1) ills are no

ills, but "all things work together for good to them that love Him ;" or (2) the ideally righteous man is described, and the Psalmist intends only to express that the ultimate *tendencies* of virtue are sufficiently indicated by the course of nature. Compare Psa. xxxiv. 10 ; lxxiii. 2 sqq.

between positive precepts and negative, which led to the development of: 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour;' into: 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy.'

3. The ancient precept contained the common principle of the old and the new moralities, which differed as regards the largeness of their interpretations of the one word, 'neighbour.' The word was an expansive one, interpretable, in the first instance, in the most restricted sense; but equally applicable in the broadest sense which increased knowledge and experience could suggest. As, in the individual, there is a continuous growth of the affections, through the several phases, domestic, social, &c.—their sphere widening continually—so the narrowest interpretation of the precept: 'Thou shalt love *thy neighbour*,' was historically the undeveloped form of its Christian acceptation. To interpret it, at any time, as implying that, 'thy neighbour *only*' was to be loved, was to reverse its tendency, by importing into it a negative element from without. The like may be said of other Mosaic precepts which have not passed unchallenged; as, for example, of that to which our Lord thus refers, by way of contrast: 'Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth' (Ex. xxi. 24): 'But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also' (Matt. v. 38, 39). It seems, at the first glance, that the Christian principle, in the matter of retaliation, is here contrasted with that of Mosaic law; but a distinction drawn above should be once more applied. CHRIST is giving practical precepts to the multitude, and teaching them that, whereas by Mosaic law it was permitted to exact an equivalent for an injury—eye for eye, tooth for tooth—in the Christian code the spirit of vindictiveness was not recognized, except as evil. Thus there is the *practical* difference and contrast, that Moses gave 'eye for eye, &c.:' but not so CHRIST. But in *principle* there is no contrast, as St Augustine admirably sets forth. The injunction was not imposed as an incentive to revenge, but as a restriction of it: '*non fomes sed limes furoris est.*' 'Who

would rest content, in a moment of anger, with a mere equivalent for injury received? Do not we see men who have been but slightly injured, thirsting for the blood of the offender, and not to be satisfied by anything short of his death? The *Lex Talionis* was instituted to limit this extravagant vindictiveness: 'lex, justum modum figens, pœnam talionis instituit: hoc est ut qualem quisque intulit injuriam, tale supplicium pendat.' Moses, then, does not here encourage vindictiveness, but propounds in an elementary form that same principle of self-restraint which Christianity develops.

4. The above may suffice to illustrate, how the moral precepts of our Lord are to be reconciled with the system of 'the Law and the Prophets,' of which they are, and indeed professedly, developments. The Mosaic precepts are to be interpreted not statically, so to say, but dynamically: not as fixed and stereotyped results in legislation, but as signs which register the extent of a still continuing progress: or as special manifestations of a vital power, in due time to be embodied in a higher organism. It is easy to gather from examples, the possibility of reconciling directly opposite courses of conduct with one and the same principle of action; the contrariety being brought about solely by difference of knowledge. There is a zeal according to knowledge, and there is a zeal not according to knowledge: and the two may lead to opposite courses of conduct, in persons whose *animus* and intention is the same. It is notorious that in common affairs ignorance is continually prompting men to act in ways in which but for ignorance they would never have acted; and, in particular, that it gives occasion to harsh judgements, and severities of procedure, which would have been abstained from if the results of after experience could have been anticipated. Where knowledge fails, 'Charity,' allowing for the lack of knowledge, 'thinketh no evil;' but 'beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things' (1 Cor. xiii. 5, 7).

IX. *The Originality of Christian Ethics.*

The old problem of the Originality of Christian Ethics has been much discussed from age to age, and various solutions of it have been attempted. A full discussion of the difficulty being here impracticable, it may suffice to call attention to a few particulars.

1. By our Lord, as by His Apostles, the Old Testament is referred to as the ground of Christian Ethics. They make no profession of inventing precepts which are not contained implicitly in the existing code. 'Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil' (Matt. v. 17). And, again, the saying quoted, almost more than any other practical precept, as characteristic of our Lord's teaching, is enforced by the argument that it is a gathering up of what the Law and the Prophets contained. 'Therefore *all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them*¹: for this is the law and the prophets' (Matt. vii. 12). St Paul uses the same argument, that '*it is written*,' when he would enforce the duty of forgiveness, 'Avenge not yourselves... *for it is written*, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord. Therefore if thine enemy hunger, &c.' (Rom. xii. 19, 20).

2. It might seem that our Lord's teaching was novel in respect of its exhibiting the twofold Law of Love as the sum of Old Testament morality. Thus, in Matt. xxii. 40, Christ is represented as answering to the lawyer's question: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. *On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.*' But the addition in St Mark's account (xii. 32): 'Master, Thou hast said the truth;'

¹ See also Luke vi. 21.

might imply that the answer to that oft-mooted question was no new one, but rather that which was *recognized* as true. In another passage—introductory to the Parable of the Good Samaritan—‘a certain Lawyer,’ gives the two commandments, *To love God*, and, *To love one's neighbour*, as a summary of the law. He is asked: ‘What is written in the law? how readest thou?’ And he answers: ‘Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself’ (Luke x. 26, 27). But the fact that St Paul grounds this equivalence on reason solely, goes far to prove that he did not regard the mere statement of it as a characteristic novelty in the Christian scheme. ‘Love,’ writes the Apostle, ‘worketh no ill to his neighbour: *therefore* love is the fulfilling of the law’ (Rom. xiii. 10).

3. A modern advocate of the Talmud has, in the course of an attractive Article², enlarged the popularity of a celebrated anecdote of Hillel and thereby caused perplexity to some, who had been accustomed to set down the supposed invention by our Lord of the precept already quoted from Matt. vii. 12, as evidence of the Divine origin of Christianity. The anecdote referred to runs as follows:—‘One day a heathen went to Shammai... and asked him mockingly to convert him to the law while he stood on one leg. The irate master turned him from his door. He then went to Hillel, who received him kindly and gave him that reply—since so widely propagated—*Do not unto another what thou wouldest not have another do unto thee. This is the whole Law, the rest is mere commentary*’³. But without the aid of Talmudic lore, it may be seen that the substance of Christ's precept had been already expressed; for, shades of difference apart,

¹ In Joh. xiii. 34, the words, ‘A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another,’ might seem to imply, that the law of mutual love was put forward as new. But the words following explain wherein lay the no-

velty: ‘*As I have loved you, &c.*’

² *Quarterly Review*, No. 246.

³ דעלך סני לחברך לא תעביד זו היא כל התורה כולה ואידך פירוש היא. Buxt. *Lex.* 1508. Lightfoot, Matt. vii. 12.

Hillel's saying (the converse of our Lord's precept) agrees with Tobit iv. 15: '*Do that to no man, which thou hatest.*' It should be noticed, however, that, whereas the saying of Hillel, as above rendered, is couched in the familiar phraseology of the Gospels, its more literal rendering: '*That which is hateful to thyself do not to thy neighbour,*' would bring it into a very exact coincidence with the saying in Tobit, *ὁ μισεὶς μηδενὶ ποιήσῃς*. But suffice it to remark, that the English reader may find in our Authorized Version of the Apocrypha (*loc. citat.*), a precept which is the direct converse of our Lord's precept: 'as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise' (Luke vi. 31). Further, is it not patent, that both precepts are readily deducible from the 'second great commandment,' which enjoins that 'thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself'? For *the one does but enjoin a course of conduct agreeable to that commandment; while the other deprecates the plainly inconsistent opposite course.*

4. Our Lord Himself and His Apostles referred persistently to the Old Testament for principles of action, and did not rest the claims of the new Dispensation upon the invention of new Precepts. The Gospel claims to be a life-giving power rather than a formal system of morality, and its claims are therefore undisturbed by possible discoveries of approximations from without to the principles of what we understand by Christian Ethics. On any other hypothesis, it would be difficult to account for the phenomena *e.g.* of St Paul's Epistles, which contain but scanty allusions to those ethical *formulae* whereon some have attempted to raise a superstructure of Christian Evidences. St Paul himself must be supposed familiar with the principles of contemporary Rabbinism, nor did he regard the acceptance of them as precluding the necessity of conversion to CHRIST; and hence, to those whose faith is based in any degree upon the evidence of St Paul, it will be so far a question of comparative unimportance, whether or no such and such approximations to the *formulae* of Christian Ethics were in vogue with the Jews at or before the commencement of the Christian Era. With

St Paul, the Gospel is CHRIST: that name gives the tone and meaning to his writings, as to his life: and their entire power and significance would be confessedly lost, if all direct references to the personal CHRIST could be supposed blotted out. While, on the other hand, the forms of his moral teaching and exhortations might be supposed to vary indefinitely from their acknowledged standard; yet still, so long as the all-pervading *ἐν Χριστῷ* remained, it would be felt that the essential characteristic of his Epistles was preserved, and we should still trace therein the familiar features of the Apostle of the Gentiles. Such a statement seems scarcely to need formal confirmation: the attention, however, may be directed to St Paul's singular faculty of assimilating extraneous conceptions by the solvent power of his devotion to CHRIST. Things external, practices that prevail around, current thoughts and maxims—one and all are transfigured into their spiritual antitypes. The panoply of the Roman sentinel becomes 'the whole armour of God': the athlete's garland, a crown incorruptible: the Stoic's *αὐτάρκεια*, a self-sufficiency in CHRIST¹. 'I have learned, in whatsoever state I am, therewith *to be content*... I can do all things through CHRIST which strengtheneth me' (Phil. iv. 11, 13). And thus, all forms reflect his one indwelling thought; and all aspirations of poets and philosophers converge towards, and find their joint realization through, the one Name CHRIST.

¹ See the Dissertation on *St Paul and Seneca* in Lightfoot's *Philippians*.

CHAPTER XIV.

The Symbolism of Sacrifice.

Gen. xv. 17 ; Matt. xxvi. 28 ; Heb. ix. 16.

THE representative theory of sacrifice having been applied by Mr Wratishaw to the case of covenants, it is proposed to consider the ordeal by which the Promise was confirmed to Abraham (Gen. xv. 8 sqq.) with a reference to its bearing upon the doctrine of Theanthropic Mediation. The analogy of the New Covenant to the Old is dwelt upon by our Lord Himself and His Apostles with considerable minuteness of detail, and it will be assumed in the present investigation that retrospective inferences may be drawn from such comparisons, with regard to the nature of the Old Covenant and its attendant ceremonial. The argument will thus depend, in great measure, upon the New Testament representations of the Mediation and Death of CHRIST.

I. The New Covenant ratified in the Blood of Christ.

1. One writer upon the Atonement and Satisfaction has summed up the results of his Scriptural research in the three propositions following :—

‘Firstly : That our Lord never describes His own work in the language of atonement and sacrifice.

‘Secondly : That this language is a figure of speech borrowed from the Old Testament, yet not to be explained by

the analogy of the Levitical sacrifices ; occasionally found in the writings of St Paul ; more frequently in the Epistle to the Hebrews ; applied to the believer at least equally with his Lord, and indicating by the variety and uncertainty with which it is used that it is not the expression of any objective relation in which the work of Christ stands to the Father, but only a mode of speaking common at a time when the rites and ceremonies of the Jewish law were passing away, and beginning to receive a spiritual meaning.

‘Thirdly : That nothing is signified by this language, or at least nothing essential, beyond what is implied in the teaching of our Lord Himself. For it cannot be supposed that there is any truer account of Christianity than is to be found in the words of Christ.’

But, firstly, not to mention His appropriation to Himself of Is. liii., our Lord very clearly describes the last culminating act of His mission under the figure of an expiatory sacrifice, not without reference to the sacrificial sanctions of the former covenant (Matt. xxvi. 28). Moreover, the ordinance thus instituted upon the basis of sacrificial analogy was to be perpetually conjoined with the commemoration of His death. (1 Cor. xi. 24 sqq.) And secondly, while the legal sacrifices, so far as they were merely external, were inefficacious observances, it must not be assumed hastily that they were devoid of inner meaning—difficult as it might be to elucidate their true significance. One thing at least may be affirmed, *viz.* that if St Paul regarded CHRIST as the End of the Law, there must have seemed to him to be some reality shadowed forth by that Law, and consummated in CHRIST. If again, as well may be surmised, sacrifice was the central ordinance of the legal system, it would follow that it was viewed as having a deep esoteric significance ; and this being granted, it is incredible that sacrificial analogies should have been lightly used. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, the analogy of CHRIST’S sacrifice to the Levitical sacrifices is expressly and particularly dwelt upon, and much of the Epistle is taken up with shewing that their mutual relation was that of type and anti-

type. Thus much is plain, but much still remains obscure: nor does it commend itself as an exhaustive answer to the enquiring mind, that the former sacrifices were simple prophecies of the latter and had no *direct* significance; no meaning except such as might be reflected upon them from their Antitype. 'We seem to be very much in the dark,' writes Bishop Butler¹, 'concerning the manner in which the ancients understood atonement to be made, *i.e.* pardon to be obtained by sacrifices;' but that their sacrifices conveyed some idea to them originally, however soon the full primitive meaning thereof may have lapsed into oblivion, is a point that will perhaps be conceded as axiomatic, or will at any rate be assumed in the present enquiry.

With regard to the Levitical sacrifices in particular, it may be taken for granted, at least provisionally, that they were not solely prophetic, but had a meaning of their own; nor does the fact that the Pentateuch leaves their import unexplained militate in the slightest degree against the assumption that they *had* a meaning; for it is not to a code of practical regulations (such as those parts of the Books of Moses which deal with sacrifice) that we should naturally have recourse, when our aim is to determine the symbolism of the outward acts prescribed. It is assumed therein without explanation, that there is *e.g.* a purifying efficacy in sprinkling with blood, but from the lack of explanation it could not be inferred that no *direct* meaning was attached to it; and the like may be said of sacrifice in general, whereof the form, rather than the meaning, would naturally be sought in the Levitical code. Whence then is the explanation to be gathered? One way, that of theory and hypothesis, is sufficiently obvious: but may not the truth of conjecture be brought to the test of Apostolic teaching? may not retrospective conclusions be drawn, as above assumed, from the New Testament language? might it not be inferred from the later sacrificial analogies—drawn out, be it remarked, *deliberately* by those who had been trained in

¹ *Analogy*, Part II. Chap. 5.

the school of Moses—what was the actual and direct significance of the rites from which those analogies were drawn? This principle of retrospective inference will be seen to confirm the view that it was a function of the covenant-victim or 'mediator' *to represent or symbolize the union in itself of the two covenanting parties.*

2. A disputed passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews will be mainly dwelt upon. The passage is for the most part thought to require that *διαθήκη*¹ should be rendered 'testament'; but not to say that this usage, *qua* Hellenistic, is perhaps altogether post-Biblical, the mention of a 'testament' is allowed to be so far inappropriate, that it reduces the whole passage to a mere play upon the double meaning of a word which signifies in one dialect a *covenant*, and in another a *will*. The rendering 'testament' has indeed been imported herefrom into some few other passages, and especially into the narratives of our Lord's institution of the Eucharist; but it is a strong argument against such a rendering in those places, that the mention of a *new διαθήκη* implies a reference to one that had gone before and was clearly *not* a 'testament.' Moreover the death spoken of, as in Matth. xxvi. 28, is expiatory, and is thus altogether out of harmony with the mention of a will. 'This,' says our Lord, 'is my blood of the new *διαθήκη*, which is shed for many *for the remission* of sins.' The same expression, 'blood of the *διαθήκη*,' occurs in Ex. xxiv. 8 (the passage alluded to), and there means, the blood by which the *covenant* is ratified: in Zech. ix. 11 the same idea is expressed: but in Heb. ix. 20, where the passage from Exodus is distinctly cited, the same formula is incongruously rendered, 'blood of the *testament*;' whereas the Authorized Version of its original has *covenant* for *testament*. But the testamentary sense is now very commonly abandoned, except in the passage from Heb. ix.; nor are there wanting those who regard that one exception as apparent, and who consider that even there 'covenant will probably

¹ See *Test. XII. Patr.* (Sinker, p. 31).

make the more pertinent sense¹. Assuming then that there are but slight independent grounds for the testamentary sense in any other passage, we proceed to shew that there are serious objections to that sense in the one passage where it has been strongly supported.

II. *General view of the Argument in Heb. viii., ix.*

The eighth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews commences with a summation of the arguments which precede, and sets forth as the point whereto all converge, that 'We have such an high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens. A minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man.' The Levitical analogy is further dwelt upon: the priests and their offerings served unto the example and shadow of heavenly things; but CHRIST hath obtained a more excellent ministry, 'by how much also He is the Mediator of a better Covenant, which was established upon better promises. For if that first [Covenant] had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second. For finding fault with them He saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new Covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: Not according to the Covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because they continued not in my Covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord. For this is the Covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: And they shall not teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the

¹ Browne, *On the Articles* (xxviii). See Professor Scholefield's '*Hints for a New Translation*.' The same view is advocated in Stroud's *Physical Cause of the Death of Christ*; and Wratislaw's

Notes and Dissertations, to which I have several times referred in the present Chapter. For other authorities, see Alford *in loc.*

least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more (Jer. xxxi. 31—34). In that He saith, A new [Covenant], He hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away' (Heb. viii. 6—13). The ninth chapter, as a whole, is taken up with detailed comparisons between the work of Christ and the Mosaic types. 'Then verily the first [Covenant] had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary. For there, &c.' 'But CHRIST being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and of calves, but by His own blood He entered in once into the Holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?' (Heb. ix. 11—14).

III. *Objections to the usual rendering of Heb. ix. 15—18.*

I. This vexed passage, as commonly rendered, is hard to reconcile with its context; although in the passage itself (ver. 15—18) a superficial simplification is introduced by the disuse of the word Covenant—thus far consistently adopted as the rendering of *διαθήκη*—and the temporary intrusion of another meaning, whereof many great authorities affirm unhesitatingly that there is no trace elsewhere throughout Holy Scripture.

The meaning alluded to is *Testament* or *Will*; the former word being adopted in the Authorized Version. Since however this word has lost much of its definiteness by its theological usage in the passage before us, and still more by its employment as a designation of the Canonical Books; it may not be amiss to transcribe the vexed passage, using *Will* for *Testament*, and thereby exhibiting perhaps more strikingly the

marked change, not to say incongruity, which is brought about by the departure from the rendering of *διαθήκη* which is used both before and after.

As a conclusion following upon ver. 14, we should thus read :—

‘And for this cause He is the Mediator of the new Will, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first Will, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. For where a Will is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a Will is of force after men are dead : otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth. Whereupon neither the first Will was dedicated without blood. For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book, and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the Will which God hath enjoined unto you. Moreover he sprinkled with blood both the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry. And almost all things are by the law purged with blood : and without shedding of blood there is no remission. It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these ; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these’ (Heb. ix. 15—23).

There are several difficulties in the way of reconciling the passage, if thus rendered, with the context.

a. Three significant words are common to Heb. viii. 6 and ix. 15, viz. *Promise, Covenant*, and the remarkable technical word, *Mediator* ; yet whereas in the former verse JESUS is styled ‘the Mediator of a better *Covenant*,’ in the latter He is said to be the ‘Mediator of the new *Will*,’ although the same Greek word represents in both cases that whereof He is the Mediator.

b. After detailed allusion to sacrificial atonement and purgation we read that, ‘For this cause He is the Mediator of the new Will, that by means of death for the redemption of transgressions, &c.’ But in the case of a Will, there is no

'redemption of transgressions : ' the testator does not offer himself up as a sacrifice for those in whose favour the will is made.

c. With regard to a will being of no strength at all while the testator liveth, we may remark (1) (with Codurcus') that a disposition of property, as in the case of the Prodigal Son (Luke xv. 12), is none the less valid for the Father's being alive ; and (2) that the Prodigal seems to have regarded the portion asked for as one which would have fallen to him of right, and without testamentary disposition (Deut. xxi. 17), on the death of his Father. Moreover the Hebrew word which the LXX. render by *διαθήκη* certainly does not mean a Will ; and many have affirmed that the very idea of a Will (the *classical διαθήκη*) was altogether foreign to ancient Jewish modes of thought. 'The very idea of a Will or Testament,' argues Mr Wratislaw, 'is unknown throughout the Hebrew Scriptures, and was probably unknown in the ordinary life of the Jews, as such, in our Lord's earthly lifetime, although King Herod the Great left both a will and codicils attached to it.'

d. What is meant by the Mediator of a Will ? It would seem that (1) there is no third party concerned in such cases ; and (2) if there were, he (the *μεσίτης*) must be identical with the *διαθέμενος* (ver. 15, 16). Who, then, are the other two ?

e. The second *διαθήκη*, like the first (ver. 18), must be dedicated not without blood. This first is elsewhere alluded to as a *Covenant*, and is here made by some to be a *Will*, by the reverse process of *assimilation* to the second '*Will*,' although it is apparently the aim of the writer to shew that the second has a detailed antitypical correspondence with the first, whereof the ceremonial sanctions are supposed familiar to the reader. But, granted that *διαθήκη* is here a Will, what is meant by 'the *blood* of the Will' ; for how does blood, as a

¹ *Critici Sacri*, Vol. VII. p. 4278.

² The *blood* of a *διαθήκη* is spoken of in Ex. xxiv. 8 ; Zech. ix. 11 ; Heb. x. 29 ; xiii. 20 : also in Matt. xxvi. 28 ; Mark xiv. 24 ; Heb. ix. 20. Cp. Luke

xxii. 20 ; 1 Cor. xi. 25. In the first series of passages *διαθήκη* is rendered *covenant* ; in the second, *testament* ; the *identity* of Ex. xxiv. 8 and Heb. ix. 20 notwithstanding.

symbol of death by *violence*, enter into the conception of a Will?

f. Codurcus, dismissing the supposition that God the Father is the 'Testator,' goes on to remark that '*neque CHRISTUS mortuus est quasi Testator, quasi dominus bonorum: sed quasi vas et sponsor, tanquam debitor, tanquam obnoxius, tanquam reus,...tanquam damnatus, tanquam servus.*' And to this it may be added, that through His humiliation unto death CHRIST obtained to Himself a kingdom, and did not leave by way of testamentary bequest a kingdom of which He had been previously in possession (Phil. ii. 8—11).

g. There is perhaps little to be urged directly in favour of 'Testament' as a rendering of *διαθήκη* in the passage before us, except (1) the implied death of the testator (ver. 16); and (2) the use of the word *κληρονομία* in the preceding verse. The former analogy is a but slight one, seeing that the death in question is *violent* and *expiatory*: the latter—*prima facie* plausibility notwithstanding—is equally inconclusive, as may be shewn by the comparison of passages wherein the like collocation of *διαθήκη* and *κληρονομία* occurs. One such passage is Gal. iii. 15, 18, where, in the opinion of Dr Lightfoot, 'the mere mention of the inheritance is not sufficient to establish the sense *a Testament*, which is ill-suited to the context.' Dean Alford to the same effect: 'not *Testament*...for there is no introduction of that idea: the promise spoken to Abraham was strictly a *covenant*, and designated *διαθήκη* in the passages which were now in the Apostle's mind.' Thus we are brought round once more to the same Covenant of Promise with Abraham which is alluded to in Heb. vi. 13—18, and into which the idea of *κληρονομία* enters, but not so (it will be granted) that of testamentary bequest. In Gen. xv. 7, 8, we read with respect to it:—'I am the LORD that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees, to give thee this land to *inherit* it. And he said, LORD God, whereby shall I know that I shall *inherit* it?' And thereupon follows the sacrificial ratification of the *Covenant*. If then in this, the original account, 'inheritance' does not import a testamentary sense into *διαθήκη*,

it cannot be inferred from the same collocation in *citations of the passage* that *διαθήκη* must mean not *covenant* but *will*.

2. The foregoing objections shew the meagreness of the analogy between the old Covenant and the new so-called 'Testament,' which is further granted, not only by those who make this their non-correspondence an argument against the rendering 'Testament,' but by others who here adopt the meaning Testament, while yet regarding it as unique and unprecedented in Holy Scripture. Thus Dr Lightfoot *loc. cit.*:—

διαθήκη] *a covenant*. This word in classical writers almost always signifies, 'a will,' 'a testament'...On the other hand in the LXX. it is as universally used of a covenant, whether as a stipulation between two parties (*συνθήκη*, 'a covenant' in the strict sense) or as an engagement on the part of one. Nor in the New Testament is it ever found in any other sense, with one exception. Even in this exceptional case, Heb. ix. 15—17, the sacred writer starts from the sense of 'a covenant,' and glides into that of 'a testament,' to which he is led by two points of analogy, (1) the *inheritance* conferred by the covenant, and (2) the *death* of the person making it. 'The disposition in this case,' he says in effect, 'was a testamentary disposition or will.'

Le Clerc too regards the passage as a rhetorical play upon the word *διαθήκη*, 'ex qua nihil philosophice colligas.' But it seems incredible that the sacred writer should here turn from his course to pursue a slight lateral analogy, and should dwell with strong emphasis upon the *natural* death which concurs with a testamentary bequest, when the central argument of the context is made to depend upon Christ's *expiatory* and *sacrificial* death. With this remark we pass on to a passage which is sometimes adduced in favour of the testamentary rendering in Heb. ix. 15 sqq.

IV. On the meanings of *διαθήκη* and *διαθέσθαι*.

1. A particular passage, wherein CHRIST on the eve of departure claims to be in some sense a *διαθέμενος*, has been

adduced, on the hypothesis that the implied *διαθήκη* is testamentary, as corroborative of the usually-received interpretation of Heb. ix. 16, 17. But whatever be the precise nature of the *διαθήκη* in Luke xxii. 29, it is obvious from its immediate context that it is not such as implies the death of the testator, and therefore not such as is contemplated in the Epistle to the Hebrews, *loc. citat.* According to the Authorized Version, the Lord says to His disciples: 'Ye are they which have continued with me in my temptations. And I *appoint* unto you a kingdom, as my Father *hath appointed* unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel' (Luke xxii. 28—30); where CHRIST does not represent Himself as about to suffer death in the capacity of 'testator,' but rather as on the point of entering upon a kingdom purchased by His sufferings and death, and as granting to His faithful followers a share in the glorious issue which is all but consummated. Thus much is sufficiently clear from the Authorized Version, which is here, however, scarcely equal in perspicuity to the rendering of Theophylact. It seems at first sight that a kingdom is transmitted from Christ to His disciples, in the same sense as that in which a kingdom had been appointed for CHRIST by God the Father; but this is scarcely coincident with the promise to the disciples, to eat and drink 'at my table in *my* kingdom.' A closer consistency is gained by reverting to the order of the Greek original and thus arranging the clauses: 'And I appoint unto you (as my Father hath appointed unto me a kingdom) that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom.' To the same effect, St Paul: 'As ye are partakers of the sufferings, so shall ye be also of the consolation' (2 Cor. i. 7): and again: 'If we suffer, we shall also reign *with* Him' (2 Tim. ii. 12).

2. Of the meanings of *διαθήκη* one, viz. *Testament*, has been above considered in relation with Heb. ix. 15—18, and seems there inappropriate, as being not only extra-Biblical, but out of harmony with the context. Setting this meaning aside, we have two others, viz. (a) *Covenant* proper, where two

covenanting parties and a Mediator are involved ; and (b) the general and abstract meaning *dispositio*, derived from the preceding through the assignation of special prominence to one of the covenanting parties, who dictates the terms. In this way the Divine covenant with man is commonly conceived of, and is described as a *διαθήκη*, rather than as a *συνθήκη*¹ or compact of equality. In this second class of usages there are several degrees of abstractness and departure from the full primal significance of the covenantal sanction, whereas, in Heb. ix. 15—18 much depends upon the symbolism of the ordinance ; and indeed by the argumentative particularity of the allusion in that passage, we are apparently restricted to the primary acceptance of *διαθήκη*², and are thus led back successively to the covenant of Ex. xxiv. 6—8, and, further, to that still more primitive form of covenant whereby the promise was confirmed of God to Abraham. What was the significance of its attendant ceremonial ?

V. *The Confirmation of the Promise to Abraham.*

In answer to the patriarch's doubt, 'Whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it?' the LORD said to him, 'Take me an heifer of three years old, and a she-goat of three years old, and a ram of three years old, and a turtle-dove, and a young pigeon.' 'And he took unto him all these, and divided them in the midst, and laid each piece, one against another : but the birds divided he not. And when the fowls came down upon the carcases, Abram drove them away. And when the sun was going down a deep sleep fell upon Abram : and, lo, an horror of great darkness fell upon him....And it came to pass, that, when the sun went down, and it was dark, behold a smoking furnace, and a burning lamp that passed between those pieces. In the same day the LORD made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land'

¹ Compare the composite formula *συνθώμεθα διαθήκην* (1 Macc. xi. 9).

² The LXX rendering of *ברית*.

(Gen. xv. 8—18). The burning lamp is here taken to be the symbol of the Divine presence; but although the LORD alone thus symbolically passed between the pieces we may assume doubtless with Menochius that, *transiit et Abraham*¹, as the subjoined parallel from Jeremiah suggests. 'And I will give the men that have transgressed my covenant, which have not performed the words of the covenant which they made before me, *when they cut the calf in twain, and passed between the parts thereof*, The princes of Judah, and the princes of Jerusalem, the eunuchs, and the priests, and all the people of the land, *which passed between the parts of the calf*; I will even give them into the hand of their enemies, and into the hand of them that seek their life: and their dead bodies shall be for meat unto the fowls of the heaven, and to the beasts of the earth' (Jer. xxxiv. 18—20). We may assume then, from these passages jointly—and the assumption is further justified by classical analogies—that the two covenanting parties were required to pass between the pieces into which the victim had been divided, and that so the covenant was ratified. Thus far all is plain; but what was the meaning of the symbol?

VI. *The Symbolism of the Covenant.*

It is commonly said, that the death of the victim symbolized the consequences which would ensue upon the breaking of the covenant. But this can scarcely be said to exhaust the esoteric symbolism of Abraham's sacrifice; for (1) whereas it was natural to contemplate, in ordinary cases, the breaking of the treaty by either party, and his actual death consequent thereupon, yet in Gen. xv. 17 chief stress is laid upon the passing of the 'burning lamp,' the symbol of the Divine Presence, between the pieces, and it is not mentioned (though doubtless implied¹) that Abraham likewise passed between; (2) it would not be surprising if something of the primal symbolism of sacrifice had come in later times to be forgotten, and if, by consequence, so ancient a sacrifice as that

¹ But see note A, p. 3.

of Abraham had a significance which could not be fully brought out by the reflex process of a *posteriori* illustration ; and (3) bearing this in mind, we must not overlook the particularity of detail in that sacrifice, wherein, not only is it essential to pass between the pieces, but the parts of the several beasts are *adjusted carefully*, and laid each over against its fellow (ver. 10). It might be assumed that this had its meaning, and that meaning was perhaps *the introition of the covenanting parties* into the being of the mediator or victim, which was intended to be the actual representative of the parties concerned ; and this identification with the victim would imply not a potential death in the future, but an instant participation in the fate and conditions of the victim. Hence the ceremony may be said to signify, that :—

[i] The covenanting parties then and there died *in* the victim, which implied the irrevocability of mutual engagement, and did not merely represent a potential and future death, consequent upon non-fulfilment of their covenanted duties.

[ii] By identification with one and the same victim, the two parties (previously, it might be, at variance) became *εἷς ἓν* and so at peace with one another¹.

[iii] In the case of a covenant between God and man the ideas of expiation and purgation would enter necessarily into the preceding, for man *qua* sinner, must have died before becoming *εἷς ἓν* with God.

The second of these three symbols contains the idea of the Incarnation in its bearing upon the Sacrifice of Christ, for it imports the unification of the two covenanting parties, God and Man, in the person of one Covenant-Victim ; while light is reflected upon the third symbol by the sacrificial language of the New Testament, elsewhere remarked upon.

VII. *The symbolical Resurrection of Isaac.* Heb. xi. 19.

This principle of Representation is easily discernible, as Mr Wratislaw remarks, in the case of the Passover, where

¹ 'Transibant per medias partes, ut sanctius in unum corpus coalescerent, sacrificio simul juncti' (Vatablus).

'a lamb was taken for every family, representing the firstborn of that family. The firstborn of the Egyptians suffered a real death in their own proper persons; those of the Israelites a symbolical death in the substituted lambs.' And again, on the great Day of Atonement it is provided, that 'Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, *putting them upon the head of the goat*, and shall send him away by the hand of a fit person into the wilderness: And the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities into a land not inhabited' (Lev. xvi. 21). Here too the principle of Representation is exemplified; the individuality of the people, *qua* sinners, being transferred to the goat; and the whole symbolizing a renunciation of the sinful Self. But a still more striking example is afforded by Heb. xi. 19 (taken as a comment upon the narrative of Gen. xxii. 1—14), where Abraham is described as having received back Isaac from the dead 'in a figure' or symbolically. This difficult passage yields at once to the alternative rendering of Chrysostom, taken in connexion with the foregoing theory, which it incidentally corroborates; and when thus explained, it throws much light upon the expression which has been thought to militate most effectually against the non-testamental rendering of *διαθήκη* in the great *crux* of Heb. ix. 15—18. The ram, as Chrysostom suggests, was a 'figure' of Isaac, and represented him in its death; and by consequence, when Abraham received back Isaac, whose death had been symbolically represented, he received him symbolically from the dead¹. In the light of this remarkable Scripture so strikingly elucidated, we proceed to attempt a direct exposition of the passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews, not without a reservation of some points for a fuller subsequent discussion.

¹ 'Chrysostom himself afterwards, in recapitulating, gives this very interpretation as an alternative: ὡς περ γὰρ παραβολὴ ἦν ὁ κριὸς τοῦ Ἰσαάκ.' Alford *in loc.*

VIII. CHRIST *the Mediator of the New Covenant.* Heb. ix.

It has already been remarked, and is sufficiently obvious, that in the immediate context the most sacred sacrificial rites of the Old Covenant are dwelt upon as introductory to the Mediatorial work of CHRIST, and that the central point of the argument is to evince the strict analogy of New to Old. The Old is regarded as a 'figure' of the New (ver. 9), where, be it noted, the same word is used to express the analogy as in Heb. xi. 19 (*supra*): 'Accounting that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead; from whence also he received him *in a figure*.' In accordance with this analogy, it is proposed to interpret the argument: 'For where a covenant is, there must also of necessity be implied¹ the death of the covenanter. For a covenant is in force over corpses²: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the covenanter liveth. Whereupon neither the first covenant was dedicated without blood' (Heb. ix. 16—18).

On the foregoing it has to be remarked, that:

Whereas in the authorized version we read, that 'there also must of necessity *be* the death of the testator,' yet the expression is not γενέσθαι (ver. 15), but φέρεσθαι, which has been well explained as meaning, that 'there must be necessarily something done that *implies* the Death of the Covenanting Party³.' Now, as in ch. xi. 19, ὅθεν, referring to ἐκ νεκρῶν,

¹ θάνατον ἀνάγκη φέρεσθαι τοῦ διαθεμένου.

² διαθήκη γὰρ ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία. A covenant can only be ratified over the bodies of slaughtered victims. Dr Stroud quotes Ps. l. 5: 'those that have made a covenant with me ἐπὶ θυσίαις.' This clause, taken in connexion with the following, 'otherwise it is of no force, &c.', is a good instance of a particular affirmative implying a general negative. Cp. 'So then faith cometh

[not except] by hearing...For how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard?' (Rom. x. 17, 14.)

³ Thus we need not with Dr Stroud make the διαθέμενος to be the covenant-victim. See Wratislaw. Or perhaps we may say that Abraham's covenant was an imperfect type, and that in the ideal covenant the victim would be a person, and at once the μεσίτης, ἑγγυος, and διαθέμενος.

includes the double meaning of (1) an actual death, viz. of the animal victim, and (2) the implied death *in* that victim of the person represented by it; so in ch. ix. 16, 17, it is affirmed that a covenant is not of force otherwise than over the body of a representative victim actually slaughtered, and thus with the implied death of the Covenanting Party. 'Whereupon neither the first covenant was dedicated without blood. For when Moses &c.' Then follow further allusions to expiation and purgation by the blood of the first covenant; and the 'holy places made with hands' are again set forth, as in the opening of the chapter, as 'figures of the true.'

IX. *What is the fundamental idea in Mediation?*

1. A mediator is said to be a 'go-between,' who interposes between two contending parties, and negotiates a reconciliation; but although this is doubtless the later form of the idea of mediation, it may be questioned whether something more may not have been once included therein: whether in fact the later meaning is not degenerate¹, and ultimately referable to a fuller and more expressive original. The word *μεσίτης* is used by Suidas to explain *μεσέγγυος* (a depositary of mutual pledges), and by implication attributes a quasi-representative function to the *μεσίτης*, which may be a relic of a more complete *personation* formerly involved in the conception of a mediator. A passage wherein the covenantal sanctions are dwelt upon argumentatively may well be chosen as a point of departure in an attempt to trace the archetypal significance of mediation. Starting, accordingly, from Heb. ix. 15, we remark (1) that the *death* of the mediator was an element in the covenantal sanction: 'For this cause He is the *Mediator* of the new covenant, that by means of *death*, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first

¹ An attempt is here made to investigate the primary idea of *mediation*; not that of the words *μεσίτης*, &c., which may have come into use when

the primary idea had degenerated. Thus a secondary idea might with reference to the words themselves be primary.

covenant, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.' And (2) that the mediator represented the covenanters, inasmuch as the real death of the former implied (ver. 16) the death of the latter. Moses, indeed, who was in some sense a mediator, and is called a *μεσίτης* by Philo, does not fulfil this condition literally in his own person; but his mediation, too, which will be further considered in the sequel, was not unattended by sacrifice. (Ex. xxiv. 8; Heb. ix. 18.)

2. Meanwhile we may revert to the covenant with Abraham, in quest of a fuller explanation of the term *μεσίτης*: a course of proceeding suggested by the use of the rare word *ἐμεσίτευσεν*, in reference to God's twofold confirmation of the promise to Abraham. The Authorized Version, which does not make it clear what were the two elements of confirmation, runs as follows: 'Wherein God, willing more abundantly to shew unto the heirs of promise the immutability of His counsel, *confirmed it by an oath*: That by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us' (Heb. vi. 17, 18). The words italicized correspond to *ἐμεσίτευσεν ὅρκῳ*, where the verb perhaps refers, as Mr Wratishaw suggests, to the sacrificial confirmation of Gen. xv. For, not to mention that the English rendering, and that of the Vulgate, 'interposuit jusjurandum,' are philologically, so to say, unsatisfying, it may be urged, further, that the oath is probably to be regarded as a contemporaneous expression of the promise (ver. 13, 14), rather than as a second confirmation of that whereof the *promise itself* was the first. And again it would be remarkable indeed if there were no implied allusion to so prominent a feature of the narrative as the incident of Gen. xv. 9, sqq., which is an *express confirmation* of the promise, following closely upon the misgiving of the Patriarch: 'LORD God, whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it?' We may assume, then, that in *ἐμεσίτευσεν ὅρκῳ* there is the double allusion (1) to the sacrificial confirmation, and (2) to the subsequent oath of Gen.

xxii. 16, 17. The meaning of the verse in question would thus be that the *oath* was the second confirmation of the promise, whereof the *sacrifice* was the first. The promise that, as the stars of heaven 'So shall thy seed be,' is recorded in Gen. xv. 5, and in immediate sequence follows its covenantal sanction: the like promise, 'I will multiply thy seed as the stars of heaven,' is recorded in Gen. xxii. 17, in connexion with the oath for confirmation, 'By myself have I sworn.' And with reference to this twofold sanction, it is said in the Epistle to the Hebrews, that God, willing more abundantly to shew the immutability of His counsel, ἐμεσίτευσεν ὄρκῳ, covenanted *with* an oath, or superadded the assurance of an oath to the covenantal sanction.

3. If then it be allowed to assume that ἐμεσίτευσεν refers to the covenant made with Abraham by sacrifice, we may glean from the sacred narrative a suggestion with regard to the meaning of the word. The covenant was ratified when the Divine symbol 'passed between those pieces;' and in Jer. xxxiv. 18, 19, not dissimilarly, the ratification seems to consist in passing between the parts of the severed calf. It may be, then, that μεσιτεύειν signifies to submit oneself to an ordeal whereof the distinctive feature is a passing ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν διχοτομημάτων, and the word, being applicable to the two covenanting parties, would thus have a simple and intelligible application to God Himself as sharing in the covenant.

4. A meaning above suggested for the symbol is, that the two covenanting parties *coalesced* in the person of the mediator: in other words, that the mediator (or covenant-victim) *included* rather than *came between* the parties engaging in the covenant. And this interpretation will appear to be confirmed by the language of St Paul, if the thoughts expressed thereby be regarded as a light thrown back upon the past, rather than as novelties intruded upon, and superadded to, the true and primæval idea of the mediatorial function. Thus, in Eph. ii. 14—16 the reconciliation of those at variance is thought of as effected by joining the two together *in one body*, whether the reconciliation be that of Jew to Gentile,

or of man to God. 'For He is our peace, who hath made both *one*, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; Having abolished in His flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; *for to make in Himself of twain one new man*, so making peace; And that he might reconcile both unto God *in one body* by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby.' Nor is it improbable that the same idea of *inclusion*¹ lies at the root of the argument in a difficult passage of the first Epistle to Timothy: 'For there is one God, and one *Mediator* between God and man, the man Christ Jesus; Who gave Himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time' (1 Tim. ii. 5, 6). Supposing however that the primary idea of a mediator was one of *inclusion* rather than of *intervention*, it would naturally degenerate into the latter, when the form of the covenantal sanction was changed from that of Gen. xv. 17 to that of Ex. xxiv. 8.

X. *The Blood of Sprinkling.*

1. Moses did not fully discharge the function of mediator in his own person, but stood between God and the people *with* the blood of the victim. 'And Moses took half of the blood, and put it in basons: and half of the blood he sprinkled on the altar...And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant, which the LORD hath made with you concerning these words' (Ex. xxiv. 6, 8). In Lev. xvi. 15 we read further of a sprinkling of blood within the vail, on or towards the mercy-seat: 'Then shall he kill the goat of the sin-offering, that is for the people, and bring his blood within the vail, and do with that blood as he did with the blood of the bullock, and sprinkle it upon the mercy-seat and before the mercy-seat.' Nor must the sprinkling of the Paschal blood upon the door-posts (Ex. xii. 7) be left unnoticed.

It is difficult to see how the idea of purification could have

¹ CHRIST is said to 'mediate' or *stand between* God and man in virtue of His *being* both God and Man. But

this is to make the idea of *standing between* secondary, and that of *inclusion* primary.

attached *primarily* to the sprinkling with blood, nor indeed is the same language used with reference to this Paschal sprinkling, as was used subsequently of the like ceremony, *e.g.* in Lev. xvi. and Heb. ix. But if we attempt to collate the ceremonies of the covenant in Ex. xxiv. with the earlier forms of Gen. xv., and assume that the one is a modification of the other, an explanation of the sprinkling at once suggests itself; one which is strikingly confirmed by our Lord's mode of inauguration of the New Covenant, not to say by the remarkable passage in the Epistle to the Ephesians which has already been in part alluded to.

2. In the covenants of Gen. xv. and Jer. xxxiv. the two covenanting parties *coalesce* in the *one body* of the 'mediator' or victim, and this is symbolized by their passing between its parts, and so *into the body of the victim*. If then with this introition, which was the main feature of the ceremony, be identified the *sprinkling* of altar and people in the covenant of Ex. xxiv., it would follow that by that sprinkling the parties to the covenant—heaven and earth—were joined together in the body of the covenant-victim. The people sprinkled with the blood, 'which is the life,' of the victim, become thereby partakers of the individuality of the victim, and are joined *in one body* with him. So in the ratification of the Christian Covenant, man becomes one with the mediating *θεάνθρωπος* by assimilating the Body and the Blood of CHRIST, the Covenant-Victim¹. (Matt. xxvi. 26, 27.) And once more, if the sprinklings in the Law symbolized an incorporation into the *one body* of the 'mediator,' we have a simple explanation of the difficult expression *ἐν τῷ αἵματι*, which in the two subjoined passages stands in connexion with the being joined *in*

¹ In Luke xxii. 20 and 1 Cor. xi. 25 the expression 'testament *in my blood*' is used. Purification is not the primary notion in the making of a covenant, but rather the conjoining of the covenanters. It may be remarked, that it is not here intended to affirm anything with regard

to the *essence* of the Sacraments, which would be to enter upon a subject not directly associated with the present inquiry. The *form of representation* is all that I have ventured to consider. This remark is applicable, more or less, to the whole Chapter.

one body to the Theanthropic Mediator, and thereby having access to and being one with God.

(a) 'But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh *in* the blood of Christ...who hath made both one...that He might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross' (Eph. ii. 13—16).

(b) 'Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest *in* the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which He hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, His flesh...Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water' (Heb. x. 19—22).

3. We may conclude then the idea of purgation by sprinkling was not improbably a secondary and derived idea, to be referred back to the archetypal sacrifice of Abraham, wherein the coalescence of the covenanters was symbolized by their introition into the body of the victim or mediator; and that, in aftertime, the blood of the victim being sprinkled upon the covenanters symbolized the same coalescence of those 'who sometimes were far off,' in the 'one body' to which the blood of sprinkling appertained. In like manner, a share in the New Covenant is appropriated by an assimilation of the Body and Blood of CHRIST the Mediator. It is not difficult to see that the idea of purgation by sprinkling is involved in, and derived from, that which is conjectured above to be primary and inherent.

XI. *St Paul's conception of Membership in Christ.*

1. To pass from the case of covenants to the case of sin-offerings, we remark that the same theory of Representation explains a marked characteristic of St Paul's phraseology, which in turn bears out the assumption that the victim was regarded as an impersonation of him by whom it was offered. 'The soul that sinneth, it shall die' (Ezek. xviii. 4) was the unalterable decree, in accordance wherewith the death of the offender was symbolized by that of the offering. Death was

the penalty of sin, and when that penalty had been paid, the man was thereby justified, from sin (Rom. vi. 7); but without death to sin he could not be freed from sin¹. The thought of being *in* CHRIST is the corner-stone of the Apostle's theology. The context of the last mentioned passage is built up upon it. 'How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into His death? Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death²: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of His death, we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection. Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin' (Rom. vi. 2—7). So in Gal. ii. 20, he speaks again of being crucified with Christ; and in Col. ii. 20, of being dead with Christ to the rudiments of the world; not to mention numerous other passages wherein the inclusion in Christ and the being part of Christ are spoken of. All such expressions are simply explained upon the hypothesis of a symbolical introition by the sacrificers into the sacrificial victims of the law; and this being presupposed, the ideas of being *in* CHRIST, and *one with* CHRIST, and of sharing the death and resurrection of Christ, would naturally suggest themselves to one with whom CHRIST was the End and Antitype of the law and its ceremonial. The Sacrifice of CHRIST is thus viewed as *representative*; and—whatever may be the precise meaning of the expression—He is set forth as the Saviour of those who are '*in* HIM,' rather than of those whose life and being are independent of His own.

2. There are indeed other modes of statement wherein Christ is represented broadly as suffering in the place of others—the Just for the unjust; and it is to such representations

¹ Wratishaw *in loc.*

² Cp. 2 Cor. v. 15: If One died (*ἀπέθανεν*) for all, then all died (*ἀπέθανον*).

as these that exception has sometimes been taken by opponents of Christianity, on the ground that an injustice is involved in punishing the innocent for the guilty ; a view of the case which is distinctly recognised by Holy Scripture itself in such passages as : 'The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son : the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him. But if the wicked will turn from all his sins that he hath committed, and keep all my statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live, he shall not die. All his transgressions that he hath committed, they shall not be mentioned unto him : in his righteousness that he hath done he shall live. Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die ? saith the LORD God : and not that he should return from his ways, and live ?' (Ezek. xviii. 20—23.)

3. With this principle, that each must bear his own sin and not another's is to be compared the complementary sentence of the Decalogue : 'I the LORD thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children.' The former is at once accepted as obviously just ; while the latter is seen to involve no contradiction thereunto, but to follow as a consequence of the organic oneness of the race, whereby the sins of one portion are entailed upon another. The one principle is abstract ; the other practical : and to argue from analogy, so far as the individuals of a race are separate and independent one of another—which they are not *absolutely*—so far and no farther, does natural justice seem to require that one should not be made to suffer for another : but on the other hand, if the human race can be regarded as a continuous unit, so far is it in accordance with the moral sense that one part thereof should suffer, as one member of a body suffers, for the act of another.

St Paul is careful to set forth the work of CHRIST in a way accordant with this analogy. CHRIST suffers for and saves man, inasmuch as He includes humanity. 'As in Adam all die (all as members of one body sharing a common fate), even

so *in* CHRIST shall all be made alive' (1 Cor. xv. 22). And again, in the preceding verse: 'Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead;' where it is implied, that the race which had sinned must pay the penalty of its own sin, and was not to be freed therefrom by the sufferings of an altogether separate and *unrelated* substitute.

XII. *Summary of Results.*

(a) If the representative theory of sacrifice be applied to covenants, it follows that the covenant-victim (or mediator), by representing each covenanting party separately, represents the union of the two in its one body¹: and this may have been symbolised by the ceremony of passing between the parts of the victim, pp. 293, 298.

(β) Mediation may have referred originally to this passing between the parts of the victim², and only secondarily to the standing between³ the covenanters, p. 298.

(γ) In the form of ratification used in Gen. xv. the covenanters passed between the parts of the victim; but in the covenant of Ex. xxiv. it was necessary to find a substitute for this form, seeing that the symbols of the Divine Presence were *fixed* and localized. It thus became necessary for an administrator (in this case Moses) to intervene: and one main feature of the ceremony was then the sprinkling of the blood

¹ A remarkable confirmation of the theory that covenants were ratified by symbolical assimilation and conjunction in one body, is afforded by Herod. i. 74. There the form mentioned is *the licking up of one another's blood*. τὸ αἷμα ἀναλείχουσι ἀλλήλων. This unification is even more completely symbolized by the ceremony described in Tacit *Annal.* xii. 47. 'Mos est regibus, quotiens in societatem coëant, implicare dextras, pollicesque inter se vincire nodoque præstringere: mox ubi sanguis in artus extremos suffuderit, levi ictu cruorem

eliciunt, atque invicem lambunt.' May not compounds of ἀλλάσσειν, used of reconciliation, refer back to the symbolical *change of individuality* which took place in the ancient covenantal sanction? Cp. such usages as that in 2 Cor. v. 18, where the reconciliation takes place through a Mediator. [τοῦ καταλλάξαντος ἡμᾶς ἐαυτῷ διὰ Χριστοῦ.]

² ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν διχοτομημάτων. Gen. xv. 17; Jer. xxxiv. 18 (Aquila).

³ καὶ ἐστήκειν ἀνὰ μέσον Κυρίου καὶ ὑμῶν. Deut. v. 5.

i. e. the application thereof to the covenanting parties. By this was symbolised, as in the more ancient form, their being joined together in the one body to which the blood appertained, p. 301.

(8) Priest and victim in the later form of covenant answered to the victim alone in the primitive form; and hence when CHRIST is represented as discharging a twofold function as Mediator, the idea is not novel but archetypal—the two lines of thought, which had a common origin, once more converging, p. 299.

(e) The idea of being *in* CHRIST, which in one form or other pervades the New Testament, is an expression of the inner symbolism of the ancient sacrifices, wherein the victim *represented* the covenanter or the person for whom atonement was made, pp. 298, 301.

NOTE ON CHAPTER XIV.

A. The statement that *transiit et Abraham* requires further consideration; but it may suffice to remark that the main argument of the chapter depends upon a *general view* of the covenantal sanction, and not specially upon the covenant of Gen. xv. The sanction in this case is assumed however to be of the same class as in Jer. xxxiv., even though abnormally developed in one direction. The chapter was indeed written on the assumption that *transiit et Abraham*; and thus undue prominence may seem to have been given to some points in the account of the covenant in Gen. xv. But this will not impair the argument, if it be granted that the ordeal was implicitly the same there as in the general case.

CHAPTER XV.

The LXX. as a Medium of Citation.

THE intrinsic value of the original Septuagint Version, the state of preservation of its text, and the estimation in which it was held by our Lord and His Apostles, are questions which have entered largely as controversial elements into the momentous and widely-ranging subject of Citation in the New Testament from the Old.

1. Some have inferred from the frequent use made of the LXX. in the New Testament, that the Version is authorized and declared immaculate, not only in passages cited, but throughout. Discrepancies between portions of the Hebrew text and the corresponding Greek citations have been thought to prove a corruption, by wilfulness or by negligence, of the former; and again, from the palpable inadequacy of the existing LXX. renderings in numberless instances, it has been argued that the text of the LXX. has likewise suffered, and that, from the same cause or causes as the Hebrew. Thus Dr Henry Owen, after attributing a high degree of excellence to the original Septuagint, proceeds as follows :—

‘Whilst the Jews therefore employed such diligence about it, the genuine purity of the *Septuagint* Version must needs have remained in a great degree at least, if not entirely, unblemished. For few, if any, errors could creep into their

Copies in that early age, when they were carefully transcribed, critically examined, and publickly read in their Synagogues. And since no occurrence appears to have happened for a length of time, that could induce them either to remit their care, or to make alterations in this version; we may reasonably conclude, that it continued in a pure, uncorrupted state, and in general agreement with the Hebrew Original from which it was derived, quite down to the days of our Saviour.'

The same writer supposes the LXX. to have been since corrupted, partly by Christians¹, who, 'to serve a turn, have daringly interpolated, altered, or expunged, as best suited their purposes;' and partly by Jews, when pressed by arguments from the Greek Version, to which they allowed a certain authority, by their adoption of it in their Synagogue worship.

'Can we suppose, that the Jews...could strictly adhere to the Septuagint Version, when they saw it produced so frequently against them?...must we not rather on the contrary imagine, that such a circumstance would have provoked their resentment, and set them entirely against this version? This is certainly the most natural conclusion. And IRENÆUS assures us, that they were so enraged on this very account, that, "if they had known the Christians would have arisen, and brought such Testimonies from the Scriptures against them, they would have made no scruple themselves to have burned their own Scriptures"—meaning thereby the *Septuagint copies*: for the Testimonies alleged, or the Quotations produced by the ancient Christians, were drawn from *them* only.'

2. Others have contended for the *Hebraica veritas*, or practical perfection of the Masoretic text, and have thought more or less slightly of the LXX. The Hutchinsonian

¹ This statement is exemplified by the reading of the *Alexandrine*: ἐν ὕδατι οὐκ ἐλούσθη τοῦ Χριστοῦ μου (Ezek. xvi. 4). The latter words may

have arisen as a Christian *midrash* from יְעֻזָּר. *An Enquiry into the Present State of the LXX.* (p. vi).

school of Hebraists held high mystical views of the Hebrew, and depreciated the Greek Version. 'They conceived that Greek terms were totally inadequate to represent the mysteries contained under the corresponding words in the Hebrew; and that it was out of mere condescension to the Gentiles, the New Testament was written in Greek. Viewing, therefore, the Greek Version, *as a Targum rather than a literal translation*, they would not admit, strictly speaking, there were any quotations from the LXX. *Neither doth the use the writers of the New Testament make of the LXX.* (writes Spearman) *stamp any authority on that version, or entitle it to impose the sense of the Greek words and phrases on the Hebrew*'.¹ Surenhusius, again, argues learnedly for a Hebrew original of the New Testament citations, while fully recognizing the divergences which have to be accounted for. In his treatise on the subject he undertakes (as the title-page announces) to harmonize the quotations and their originals in accordance with Rabbinic usages in citation and modes of interpretation.

3. A third class of harmonists assert the co-ordinate canonicity of the Hebrew and the Septuagint. '*Spiritus qui in Prophetis erat,*' writes St Augustine, '*quando illa dixerunt; idem ipse erat in LXX. viris quando illa interpretati sunt.*' This side is espoused by Mr Grinfield, who, in his *Apology for the Septuagint*, lays chief stress upon the use made of that version by our Lord; remarking, that 'nearly all the quotations made by JESUS Himself from the Old Testament are taken *verbatim* from the LXX., and occasionally, where they differ from the Hebrew; whilst several quotations made by the Evangelists, differ from the LXX. and agree with the Hebrew.'

I. *Results of Investigation with Inferences therefrom.*

The persevering advocacy with which mutually exclusive theories on the immediate sources of the citations have been

¹ See Grinfield's *Apology for the Septuagint*, where frequent references to the literature of the subject may be found.

defended, has been instrumental in shewing clearly the difficulties which have to be surmounted, and has suggested simultaneously, as the only safe course to be pursued, that the phenomena of the various cases should be noted carefully, while *a priori* theories of reconciliation are abstained from. Space forbids the attempt to treat this broad question exhaustively: it may suffice therefore to state generally some of the results which seem to have been established by the labours of successive harmonists; and to consider one or two cases of citation, which have a marked and special bearing on the point at issue.

- (a) *A large proportion of the Citations are taken from the LXX.*
- (β) *The LXX. is sometimes followed where it differs considerably from the Hebrew.*
- (γ) *In some few cases the Greek, being clearly inadequate, is replaced by another rendering of the original Hebrew.*

Bishop Horne, in his Preface to the Psalms, expresses the reasonable conclusion to which many have been led by the above results:—‘It may be considered, that the Apostles generally cited from the Greek of the LXX. Version, and took it as they found it, making no alteration, when the passage as it then stood was sufficient to prove the main point which it was adduced to prove;’ and closely connected with this is the important canon of interpretation, not unrecognized by Jerome, that the general purport, rather than the mere words, should be considered, and that the Apostles may be thought, in their citations, ‘*sensum scripturæ posuisse, non verba.*’

Dr Owen, in his *Modes of Quotation*, gives reasons why the Septuagint should have been adopted, for the most part, as the source of citation:—

‘It is allowed on all hands, that, as the Old Testament Prophecies were delivered in *Hebrew*, and the Gospels were penned in *Greek*, the Evangelists must either have translated for themselves, or else have adopted the *Septuagint* Version,

which was the only one extant at that time. *Both* these methods lay equally before them, and they might make choice of either as they thought proper. Now, if we suppose that they chose the first and always translated the Hebrew for themselves, we shall find them exposed to many difficulties which otherwise they might have easily avoided; and which prudence indeed would have directed them to avoid. (1) In the first place it would have been an useless, unnecessary undertaking; for the translation was already made to their hands with great care and acknowledged fidelity. And therefore they seem, generally speaking, to have had nothing more to do but to adopt and apply it as occasion required. (2) In this way, no objections could be formed against them; whereas, had they gone in the other, and translated for themselves, the Jews would have disputed the authority of their version, would have perpetually charged it with errors and corruptions, and brought the other that was highly esteemed, and in common use, to support the charge against it. (3) Besides, had the Evangelists rejected the Septuagint Version,...they would have first discouraged their converts from reading it, and then have precluded themselves from the advantage of appealing to it in their frequent conferences with the *Hellenistick* Jews, &c.—To obviate, therefore, these cavils and inconveniencies, the Evangelists, we may presume, chose rather to follow, *in general*, that common version, against which the Jews had *then* nothing to object, and for which the *first converts* had a high veneration.'

But, granted, further—as some would have it—that to the Apostles and Evangelists themselves, the Septuagint was what the Authorized English Version is to us; granted, that they were acquainted with the Hebrew Scriptures only as we may be acquainted with the Scriptures in any language which is not vernacular; it still would not follow—nay, it is implicitly denied by these very assumptions—that their ultimate appeal was to the Septuagint. For from our Authorized Version it is customary, and no less natural within certain limits, to draw illustrations and arguments without critical

reference to the Hebrew of the passage from which the argument or illustration may be drawn: but beyond those limits—*i.e.* if an inference from the version should seem *unscriptural*—none would insist upon the argumentative value of the English except so far as it is, or is assumed to be, a faithful rendering of the original Hebrew. To apply this principle to the New Testament citations from the Septuagint—

(i.) *If the Greek sufficiently proves the main point at issue, and thus far agrees with the Hebrew, the accuracy of the Greek rendering is not thereby vouched for in particulars which have no well-defined bearing on the general argument.*

A striking illustration hereof is afforded by St Stephen's citation from Amos, in Acts vii. 42, 43, where the point to be proved is, that the service required of the Israelites in the Wilderness was not ritual but spiritual. This the citation proves by its opening clauses; and seeing that their counter-bias towards a sensuous worship was sufficiently evinced by the history of the Golden Calf, it becomes a question of merely critical and archæological importance, whether at any time—and if so, when—they betook themselves to the worship of a god called Remphan. This citation would seem then not to guarantee the accuracy of the LXX. rendering in respect of '*Remphan*' or '*Raiphān*,' whereof there is no mention in the Hebrew.

(ii.) *A citation of a Septuagint rendering does not guarantee its accuracy, even when it contains important accessions to the argument, whereof no trace is found in the existing Hebrew text.*

An illustration is supplied by Heb. x. 5, where the word 'body' is quoted from the LXX. and incorporated into the argument, but is not found in the Hebrew text, as it has come down to us. This addition to the Hebrew is made subservient to the general argument of the Psalm, which is preserved *entire*; and the fact that there is nothing in the familiar Greek version which does not harmonise with the original may be described as a sufficient reason why the Greek should be retained, rather than replaced by a *strange* rendering more literally exact. There are cases, however, in which the

Septuagint would fail to convey the meaning of the Apostle or Evangelist, and in such cases the original Hebrew is resorted to.

II. *Non-Septuagintal Citations.* *Joh. xix. 37; Rev. i. 7.*

To pass by the striking deviations from the LXX. which have been already commented upon in Chapters IV. and VII.¹, we proceed to notice the citation from (or allusion to) Zech. xii. 10, which occurs in St John's account of the Crucifixion: 'And again another Scripture saith, *They shall look on Him whom they pierced*' (Joh. xix. 37); and which is incorporated in Rev. i. 7: 'Behold, He cometh with clouds; and *every eye shall see Him, and they also which pierced Him*: and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of Him.' The original passage is thus rendered in the Authorized Version: 'And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the Spirit of grace and of supplications: and *they shall look upon Me whom they have pierced*, and they shall mourn for Him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for Him, as one that is in bitterness for his first-born.'

This passage was anciently interpreted of *the MESSIAH the son of Joseph*; and it is quoted by the Evangelist, argues Calvin, as an assertion of the Divinity of the Crucified: '*ut ostendat Christum esse Deum illum, qui olim conquestus fuit per Zachariam, sibi pectus a Judæis transfodi.*' But the allusion to the Crucifixion could not have been expressed by the rendering of the LXX.², which is accordingly rejected, and replaced by a more exact rendering of the original Hebrew.

The error of the LXX. is very naturally attributed by St Jerome to their accidental transposition of two letters which very closely resemble one another³; and seeing that like errors have arisen in numberless passages of little or no con-

¹ Compare 1 Cor. xv. 54. In Rom. xii. 19, where the argument depends upon the *emphasis*, the Hebrew is resorted to. See Deut. xxxii. 35.

² ἀπὸ ὧν κατῴχετό αὐτό.

³ Reading רָקַרְו for רָקַרְו.

troversial interest, it must be confessed that there is a strong presumption in the favour of the explanation which he has propounded. Some, however, with Dr Henry Owen, have charged the Jews with a wilful corruption of the LXX., in this as in other places:—‘When the Jews began to censure and condemn the Septuagint Version, and, in consequence thereof, to correct and model it to their Hebrew Copies; there is reason to suspect, that in some remarkable places where a word, by similarity of letters, was capable of being read differently, they changed the Greek to the worse Reading, in order both to pervert the sense, and to bring contempt on the old Translators and the Version they had made. Thus, I conceive, the Septuagint Version was altered by them in that noted passage of ZECHARIAH, chap. xii. 10, where the Greek is at present ἀνθ’ ὧν κατωρχήσαντο...whereas it appears from undoubted testimonies, that the original Greek was εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν... For the Syriac Version has *quem transfixerunt*; and the Vulgate, *quem crucifixerunt*. IGNATIUS and JUSTIN MARTYR read ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν. IRENÆUS, *videbunt in quem compunxerunt*. And TERTULLIAN, *cognoscent eum, quem pupugerunt*.’ The charge however must be regarded in this case as ill-supported; for while, on the one hand, the reading κατωρχήσαντο may have arisen from one of those slight misreadings of the Hebrew, of which so many instances are afforded by the Septuagint Version; on the other, the testimonies cited by Dr Owen for the reading ἐξεκέντησαν are altogether neutralized by the consideration, that this reading would have been adopted on the authority of St John’s citations, even though no trace of it were discoverable in the Septuagint.

Again, it has been urged that in Hos. xi. 1 the LXX. was wilfully corrupted by the Jews, into ἐξ Αἰγύπτου μετεκάλεσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ, and that they did this, either to exclude St Matthew’s application of the passage to the infant Saviour, or to bring discredit on the LXX. Version. But against the first supposition it is to be noted, that in their own later Greek versions the form of the citation is approximated to; and

against the second, that their Targum has points of contact with the Septuagint rendering of the passage in question. In these cases, then, the hypothesis of wilful corruption may be regarded as inadequately sustained. Other causes, however, have contributed to the palpable deterioration of the LXX. text (whatever may have been its original value as a rendering of the Hebrew), and to some of these it may be well to advert.

III. *Assimilations of the Septuagint to the New Testament.*

In the Prayer-Book Version of the Psalter, which agrees in general with that of the LXX., the following passage occurs as a rendering of Ps. xiv. 1—7 :

1. The fool hath said in his heart : There is no God.
2. They are corrupt, and become abominable in their doings : there is none that doeth good, *no not one.*
3. The Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men : to see if there were any that would understand, and seek after God.
4. But they are all gone out of the way, they are altogether become abominable : there is none that doeth good, no not one.
5. *Their throat is an open sepulchre, with their tongues have they deceived : the poison of asps is under their lips.*
6. *Their mouth is full of cursing and bitterness : their feet are swift to shed blood.*
7. *Destruction and unhappiness is in their ways, and the way of peace have they not known : there is no fear of God before their eyes.*

The Bible rendering, which is taken directly from the Hebrew, contains no trace of the part italicized. How then (it may be asked) is this great difference in the two versions to be accounted for ?

An answer is easily found. In Rom. iii. 10—18, a succession of verses are cited from the Old Testament : 'As it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one. There is none

that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable ; there is none that doeth good, no, not one. &c.' To the end of ver. 12, the citation is from Ps. xiv. ; and it has been assumed incautiously, that the remaining verses must have been drawn from the same source, and that the LXX. therefore had need to be corrected by the insertion of the words cited in Rom. iii. 13—18, in immediate sequence upon those cited from the Psalms. Hence has arisen the interpolation, or supposed correction, whereby the Vatican text of Ps. xiv. is distinguished from the Masoretic. Nor is this a full statement of the argument for the hypothesis of interpolation ; for, in one clause of the citation, which *is* drawn from the Psalm, there is a marked departure from the form of Hebrew and LXX. alike. In the original, 'the LORD looked down...*to see if there were any that would understand ;*' in the citation the categorical form of statement, '*There is none that understandeth &c.*' is anticipated from the following verse.

Thus far, then, St Paul's words *do not agree exactly with the LXX.*, although expressing faithfully its general purport. But with the following verses the case is different ; the LXX. agreeing word for word with the citation in the New Testament, and thereby favouring the hypothesis, that the verses in question, viz. those not occurring in the Hebrew, have been interpolated from Rom. iii. 13—18.

The true account of St Paul's citation is, that it is composed of detached passages from various parts of Holy Scripture, which were freely rendered (being perhaps cited from memory), and brought into combination, as illustrative of like particulars. The citation and the corresponding passages as rendered in the Authorized Version are subjoined : references being given in the notes to some of the Greek renderings.

Rom. iii. 10	There is none	Eccl. vii. 20.	For there is
righteous ¹ ,	no, not one :		not a just ¹ man upon earth,

¹ δίκαιος.

11 There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God.

12 They are all gone out of the way, they are altogether become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good¹, no, not one.

13 Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit²; the poison of asps is under their lips:

14 Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness³:

15 Their feet are swift to shed blood:

16 Destruction and misery are in their ways:

17 And the way of peace they have not known:

18 There is no fear of God before their eyes.

that doeth good¹, and sinneth not.

Ps. xiv. 2, 3² The LORD looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand, and seek God.

They are all gone aside, they are altogether become filthy: there is none that doeth good, no, not one.

Ps. v. 10 Their throat is an open sepulchre; they flatter⁴ with their tongue.

Ps. cxl. 3 Adders' poison is under their lips.

Ps. x. 7 His mouth is full of cursing and deceit⁵ and fraud.

Prov. i. 16 For their feet run to evil, and make haste to shed blood.

Is. lix. 7, 8 Their feet run to evil, and they make haste to shed innocent blood: their thoughts are thoughts of iniquity; wasting and destruction are in their paths. The way of peace they know not.

Ps. xxxvi. 1—4 The transgression of the wicked saith within my heart, that there is no fear of God before his eyes &c.

¹ ἀγαθόν.

² The same as Ps. lii. 3, 4 (LXX.), except in having *χρηστέγητα* for ἀγαθόν.

³ χρηστέγητα.

⁴ ἐδολιούσαν.

⁵ πικρίας.

It would seem, then, that the text of the LXX. has here been very greatly disturbed by forced assimilation to the New Testament; and this being granted, it might be supposed that numberless minor corruptions have arisen from the same cause.

IV. *Further Remarks on the Corruption of the LXX.*

Amongst causes of deterioration, other than mere inaccuracy of transcription may be further mentioned :—

(1) A desire to bring the Greek text into conformity with the Hebrew by alterations and interpolations, which may be evinced by a comparison of the Vatican and Alexandrine MSS. (2) A tendency to simplify Hebraisms or difficult constructions; as, perhaps in 1 Sam. xvii. 53, where *ἐκκαίνοντες ὀπίσω* may be a corruption of *ἐκκαίωντες ὀπίσω*, which would agree more literally with the corresponding Hebrew phrase. This phrase signifies in another passage (Gen. xxxi. 36), *to pursue hotly after*; the verb meaning literally, *to burn*, and its participle being rendered by *καιομένοις*, in Ps. vii. 14. (3) Another fruitful source of error has been the existence of *double renderings*, an alternative rendering (or explanation) being first written in the margin and then introduced into the text, while the former rendering was still retained. This was probably the origin of the confusion in Gen. ix. 20, where a literal rendering would be *ἄνθρωπος γῆς*, in the sense, *a man of the ground*, or *husbandman*; but, an explanatory word or second rendering being absorbed into the text, there results the existent reading *ἄνθρωπος γεωργὸς γῆς*. So in Deut. xxxii. 40, where the Hebraism '*to lift up the hand*' is used in the sense, *to swear*, we have first the literal rendering, *ἄρῳ εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν τὴν χεῖρά μου*, and in immediate sequence, a fragment of a like expression (with *δεξιάν* for *χεῖρα*) confusedly joined with an explanatory *ὁμῶμαι*, thus, *καὶ ὁμῶμαι τὴν δεξιάν μου*. These causes alone would account for a very great deterioration of the Septuagint original, which may or may not have been as nearly perfect as some have presumed; and, this being the case, it would seldom

be necessary to resort to the hypothesis of wilful corruption by controversialists, although some changes may have owed their origin to a predisposition and bias in favour of such and such views and interpretations.

V. *On the Hellenistic Dialect as Vernacular.*

The question of the Apostles' comparative familiarity with the Hebrew and the Greek might be variously answered; but the inference from their frequent citation of the LXX. is rendered to a great extent precarious by a consideration already dwelt upon, viz. that the desire to speak and write *so as to be understood* would induce a preference for the Greek version, as being very generally adopted. Professor Jowett, after a general survey of St Paul's citations, draws the following conclusion:—'None of these passages offer any certain proof that the Apostle was acquainted with the Hebrew text. That he must have been so can hardly be doubted; yet it seems improbable that he could have had a familiar knowledge of the original without straying into parallelisms with the Hebrew, in those passages in which it varies from the LXX. . . . The inference is that the Greek and not the Hebrew text must have been to the Apostle what the English version is to ourselves.' But this conclusion—to whatever extent plausible—has only an indirect bearing on the value of the LXX. as an ultimate appeal; for, to revert to the analogy suggested by Professor Jowett, a person acquainted with the English version alone may hold the original of the Old Testament in no less esteem than would the most accomplished Hebraist, and may be equally ready to appeal thereto in cases of difficulty, or of supposed *inadequacies* of rendering which are of sufficient importance to vitiate an argument. The Septuagint might be so used freely for illustration, and even for verbal argumentation, as to seem, at first sight, the one medium of evangelistic citation; yet a single case of departure therefrom, where in some important particular it fails to express the

meaning of the Hebrew, would suffice to degrade that version from its ideal supremacy: while, on the other hand, no amount of deviation from the Hebrew in the direction of the Septuagint (provided only that the results be *true* and *scriptural*) could do more than evince the esteem in which the Septuagint was held *as a generally recognized and familiar rendering*.

While however some (with Mr Grinfield) have laid perhaps undue stress on the quasi-vernacular knowledge of the LXX. which the New Testament citations evince, it must be admitted that the thought and expression of the New Testament have been very largely contributed to by that first Greek version of the Old. To pass by professed citations (whereof some, as perhaps those in Rom. iii. 10—18, are made from memory), we find cases in which citations and adaptations occur without acknowledgement; nor is it always obvious, whether we are dealing with conscious citations or unconscious adaptations, especially when fragments of two or more distant unconnected verses of the Old Testament are blended into a single sentence or phrase. But, to pass on from more or less unconscious assimilations of whole clauses or passages, there is yet another way in which the Septuagint translation has entered largely into the composition of the New Testament Scriptures.

The doctrinal terminology of the New Dispensation owes much to the Hellenistic version of the Hebrew Scriptures; nor is it easy to over-estimate the importance of this consideration. The terms Repentance, Faith, Justification, &c. drew their theological significance from Hellenistic usage, and the composite language of the Dispersion became an *instrument of thought* to Apostles and Evangelists, as it had been for ages to no mean portion of the civilized world. One unflinching advocate of the Sacred Tongue¹ thus concedes the indebtedness of the New Testament to the existing Greek rendering of the Old:—‘Had there not been a translation of the Old

¹ Spearman, quoted by Grinfield (*Apology*, p. 27).

Testament into Greek before this time, I do not see how they could have wrote the New Testament in Greek ; for as they must have used Greek words in a different sense from what they were used in the Greek authors, there could have been no standard by which to have tried them, had not the LXX. Version been made. I think I am justified in saying, that, if there had not been a translation in Greek of the Old Testament, made and received by sufficient authority, a proper time before the advent of our Saviour, I do not see how the penmen of the New could have written Greek.'

Conversely, an acquaintance with the LXX. is rightly commended by Bishop Pearson, as a key to the New Testament style and diction :—'for the sacred penmen, not only frequently produce testimonies out of the Old Testament, but also accommodate Moses and the Prophets to the doctrines of Christianity : and hence it will needs happen, that the mode and manner of expression, or the phraseology of the Hebrew, which was unknown or at least unusual amongst the Grecians, must, to such as only understand Greek, render the Apostolic writings more obscure than they would otherwise have been. Neither can this obscurity be taken away or cured by any other means than by the knowledge of the Hebrew idiom, in which the Old Testament is written ; upon which the Apostles everywhere keep an eye, and which, a little varied from its original purity, the Jews spake in the time of our Saviour, to whose customs and manner of speaking they accommodated their discourses. For which reason, the Greek Version of the Old Testament will of necessity be of very great use in understanding the apostolic writings ; since in that Version all the idioms of the language were transplanted, as well as the soil would bear them ; in that, the sense of the prophetic writings was explained, as well as the Greek tongue and the skill of the translators would permit ; and to that the Grecians, with whom the Apostles had most concern, had long been accustomed. And it is reasonable to believe, that this translation, by Divine Providence, was at first made to be the instrument and means of preparing the minds of the nations, who every-

where had it among them, for the better and more kindly reception of the doctrines of CHRIST and His Apostles.'

VI. *General Conclusion on the Authority of the LXX.*

The Hellenistic dialect was to a large proportion of converts the sole medium whereby the truths of Christianity and its relation to Mosaism could have been communicated; and it must be admitted to have served as *an instrument of thought, and a groundwork of theological conceptions*, if not so much to the preachers, at least to no mean array of hearers of the Gospel. It followed as a natural consequence that theological *ideas* were developed through the instrumentality of the Septuagint; words and expressions occurring in the Greek to which nothing can be found precisely equivalent in the Hebrew. Thus Dr Lightfoot concludes¹, after an investigation into the origin and growth of the Hellenistic conception *πίστις*, that *the word 'Faith' can scarcely be said to occur at all in the Hebrew Scriptures of the Old Testament*. As the Gospel to the Law, so is the plastic dialect of the Dispersion to its Hebrew archetype. The New may pass the limits of the Old, but the Old must contain the rudimentary principles of the New. Though the Hellenistic dialect may have been to the preachers of the Gospel a quasi-vernacular language; though they may have thought *in* and *by* it, and adopted therefrom words and phrases which could not have been simply and adequately retranslated into Hebrew; the ultimate appeal might (and would) still be from the Greek, as from any other vernacular rendering, to the original. The product of Greek thought must be a legitimate development from the Hebrew; the Hebrew must enfold the germ of the Hellenistic development. *Granted that Hellenistic Greek was the vernacular language of Citation, analogy requires that we should presuppose a reservation—however seldom to be exemplified—in favour of the Hebrew.*

¹ *Galatians*, ed. 2, p. 1, 6.

VII. *Styles of Citation.*

1. Seeing that the LXX. rendering is sometimes rejected in citation, and sometimes retained, the enquiry suggests itself whether the New Testament writers may not have differed as in their styles of composition, so in their Styles of Citation from the Old Testament Scriptures; and if so whether arguments may not be deduced therefrom, evincing *identity* or *diversity* of authorship in cases where external (and other) evidences are conflicting. In illustration, it may suffice to call attention to a remark of Dr Wordsworth on the passage from Zechariah above considered. In the Apocalypse the Septuagintal ἀνθ' ᾧ κατωρχήσαντο is replaced by εἰς ᾧ ἐξεκέντησαν, and by the same form of words in the fourth Gospel. Hence arises an argument for identifying the author of the fourth Gospel with the author of the Apocalypse—an argument the strength whereof is proportionate to the infrequency of such departures from the familiar phraseology of the LXX.

2. It may be remarked in further confirmation of this identification, that a prominent feature in the Apocalypse is the representation of CHRIST as the ἀρνίον ὡς ἐσφαγμένον, while the author of the fourth Gospel is careful to point out the fulfilment of the Paschal Type, ὅστον οὐ συντριβήσεται αὐτοῦ¹, and to record the saying of the Baptist: 'Behold the *Lamb* of God.' In this case indeed ἀμνός not ἀρνίον is used, but the change of word is perhaps sufficiently accounted for by the difference of subject and accessories in the two compositions and more than this, in the one case the description is the Evangelist's, and in the other the words are cited from the Baptist². But, be this as it may, CHRIST stands out prominently as the Sacrificial *Lamb*, in the fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse alike; and hence a corroboration of the argument whereby it is sought to prove that the fourth Gospel was written by the author of the Apocalypse, ST JOHN.

¹ See Note A, p. 323.

² ἀρνός, &c. are commonly used for the oblique cases of ἀμνός.

3. The Hellenistic idiom and that singular admixture of the Old and the New which characterize the New Testament Scriptures, fix (within certain limits) the date, and may aid in determining the authorship of compositions in which they occur. This is well expressed by the subjoined remarks of Professor Jowett, with which we conclude :—

‘Vestiges of Old Testament language are so numerous as to admit of an argument from their occurrence to the genuineness of the Epistles. If the same interpretation of new and old phraseology occurs in the Epistle to the Ephesians that we find in the Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, and the Galatians, here is considerable reason for supposing that they are writings of the same author, or at any rate of the same date. A new argument from coincidence arises, for no one would imagine that it could have occurred to a forger of a later age to imitate the manner in which St Paul used the language of the LXX.’

NOTE ON CHAPTER XV.

A. The notice of the efflux of ‘blood and water’ (Joh. xix. 34) is a strong testimony to the writer’s having been an eye-witness of the Crucifixion. The phenomenon is at any rate a very rare one, and one therefore which was unlikely to have been thought of by any but an eye-witness, and more unlikely to have been mentioned, seeing that it must necessarily give rise to great perplexities. Some have assumed it to be wholly miraculous and of mystical import. For a striking investigation see Stroud’s *Physical Cause of the Death of Christ*. Death ensued preternaturally soon (ver. 33), and that, some conjecture, from previous exhaustion. Against this is the fact, that JESUS *cried with a loud voice* when on the point of yielding up the ghost (Matt. xxvii. 50; Mark xv. 37; Luke xxiii. 46). Dr Stroud’s theory accounts for this fact, which St John does not mention, and at the same time for the very singular phenomenon which he alone records.

CHAPTER XVI.

Miscellanea.

I. Ps. cxvi. 11; Ps. li. 4; Rom. iii. 4

'Yea, let God be true, *but every man a liar*; as it is written, *That Thou mightest be justified in Thy sayings, and mightest overcome when Thou art judged*

1. THE words $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \delta\grave{\epsilon} \alpha\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma \psi\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma$ (Ps. cxvi. 11) which precede the formula of citation, are perhaps no more than an instinctive adaptation of a familiar phrase. The reference in the original is to man's weakness and frailty; and commentators have illustrated the Psalmist's meaning by such passages as: 'Vain is the help of man' (Ps. lx. 3) 'Surely men of low degree are vanity, and men of high degree are a *lie*; to be laid in the balance, they are altogether lighter than vanity' (lxii. 9); 'Put not your *trust* in princes nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help' (cxlvi. 3) The meaning of the words 'All men are liars' would thus be that men, owing to their frailty and inability to help, are deceivers of those who put trust in them. A further illustration might be drawn from a passage in which Job describes the failure of his friends' attempts to comfort him:—'My brethren have *dealt deceitfully* as a brook, and as the stream of brooks they pass away . . . What time they wax warm, they vanish; when it is hot, they are consumed out of their place . . . The troops of Tema looked, the companies of Sheba waited for them. They were confounded because they had hoped; they came thither, and were ashamed. For now y

are *nothing*; ye see my casting down, and are afraid' (Job vi. 15—21).

Perhaps, however, the Psalmist is describing not the inability of others to help him, but his own frailty:—'I said in my extreme affliction, Man's life is a shadow, a phantom, an *unreality*.'

2. To pass by the *Syriasm* 'overcome,' we have to reconcile the following ἐν τῷ κρῖνεσθαι σε (usually rendered passively) with the original Hebrew, where the corresponding verb is active, and the justice of God's sentence is acknowledged:—'that thou mightest be justified when Thou speakest, and be clear when Thou *judgest*' (Ps. li. 4). An explanation frequently adopted is, *That Thou mightest be acknowledged righteous, when the justice of Thy dealings is called in question*. But some think a *middle* rendering of κρῖνεσθαι more suitable. Thus Bengel:—'Simul Deus et κρῖνει et κρῖνεται. Κρῖνεται, media significatione, qualem habere soleat verba *certandi*. Κρῖνονται, qui in jure disceptant. LXX., Es. xliii. 26. Jud. iv. 5; Jer. xxv. 31. Exemplum Mich. vi. 2 s. necnon 1 Sam. xii. 7. Ineffabilis benignitas, qua Deus ad hominem disceptandi causa descendit.'

II. Gen. xviii. 10; Rom. ix. 9.

The citation differs from the LXX. in a detail involving merely critical considerations. In the former we read: 'At *this time* will I come, and Sarah shall have a son;' while the LXX. uses the fuller expression, κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον εἰς ὥρας. The Hebrew is literally, *at the living season*¹, i.e. according to the analogy of χρόνῳ τῷ ζῶντι καὶ παρόντι (Soph. Trach. 1169)—*at the present season*, sc. of next year. Nor does there seem to be any necessity for assigning to the adjective *living* the unusual sense *reviving*. The latter meaning is not established by such passages as: 'and . . . the spirit of Jacob their father *revived*' (Gen. xlv. 27); 'If a man die *shall he live again*'? (Job xiv. 14); 'They are dead, *they shall not*

¹ היחיה :

ותחי :

¹ כעת חיה :

*live*¹ (Is. xxvi. 14); for the fact that a *tense* of a verb may mean, *to become alive* (sc. *again*), does not prove that reviviscence is expressed radically by the verb 'to live.' It would seem, then, that the Hebrew phrase in question means *at the living* (i.e. present) *season*, and that it is fully and sufficiently rendered by *κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον*. On the other hand, the citation may be a direct *abbreviation from the LXX*.

III. Hos. i. 10; ii. 23; Rom. ix. 25, 26; 1 Pet. ii. 10.

One expression in the citation calls for critical remark. 'As he saith also in Osee, I will call them my people, which were not my people; and her beloved, which was not beloved. And it shall come to pass, that *in the place where it was said unto them*, Ye are not my people; *there* shall they be called the children of the living God.'

The phrase italicized is taken from the LXX.: *καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ οὗ ἐρρέθη κ.τ.λ.*, and it is also a literal rendering of the Hebrew: but a difficulty arises in explaining the local reference, which is further marked by the subsequent *ἐκεῖ*. Dean Alford's comment illustrates the difficulty:—'By *ἐν τῷ τόπῳ*... *ἐκεῖ* must not, I think, be understood, in any particular place, as Judæa; nor among any peculiar people, as the Christian Church: but as a general assertion, that in every place where they were called, *not His people*, there they shall be called, *His people*.' The original² might, however, be rendered literally: 'in place of that they should be called;' i.e. 'instead of their being called;' which appears to satisfy the requirements of the context better than the *local* rendering, and to agree better with the *general* statements of a subsequent verse: 'And I will have mercy upon her that had not obtained mercy; and I will say to them which were not my people, Thou art my people; and they shall say, Thou art my God' (Hos. ii. 23).

It remains to ask whether the citation is susceptible of a like general rendering; and it may be suggested in answer,

¹ בל יחיו.

² במקום אשר יאמר להם, Hos. ii. 1, *Heb.*

that the Greek ἐν τῷ τόπῳ κ.τ.λ. may have been intended originally as a simply *literal* (and therefore unidiomatic and *non-natural*) rendering. Thus much being premised, we remark that, τόπος (like *locus*) may mean *a passage*, or place *in a book*, as in Luke iv. 17: 'when he had found the PLACE where it was written¹.' With a very similar non-local sense of τόπος, St Paul's citation may be explained to mean, that 'where, or whereas, they used to be called οὐ λαός μου, they should be called υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζῶντος.'

IV. Deut. xxxii. 43; Rom. xv. 10.

This is one of the places in which the Jews have been suspected of corrupting the text of the original; and, whatever may be the grounds of the accusation, there is certainly a wide divergence between the Hebrew and the Greek. The citation occurs in connection with some others of which the characteristic word is ἔθνη—'Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers: And that the Gentiles might glorify God for His mercy; as it is written, For this cause I will confess to Thee among the GENTILES, and sing unto Thy name (Ps. xviii. 49). And again He saith, *Rejoice ye GENTILES, with His people* (Deut. xxxii. 43). And again, Praise the Lord, all ye GENTILES; and laud Him, all ye people (Ps. cxvii. 1). And again, Esaias saith, There shall be a root of Jesse, and He shall rise to reign over the GENTILES; in Him shall the GENTILES trust (Is. xi. 10).—In the Hebrew of the passage in Deuteronomy, it is said: 'Rejoice, ye nations, His people;' which will bear the same application as St Paul's '*with His people*;' for in the original the nations are addressed *as* His people, while in the citation, they are numbered *with* His people. And moreover the hypothesis of a very simple case of double-rendering would go far to account for the Septuagintal reading, regarded as a development out of a briefer original.

¹ τὸν τόπον οὗ ἦν γεγραμμένον.

The Authorized Version, following the Hebrew, reads:—

‘Rejoice, O ye nations, His people: for He will avenge the blood of His servants, and will render vengeance to His adversaries, and will be merciful unto His land and to His people’

and the Greek:—

εὐφράνθητε οὐρανοὶ ἅμα αὐτῷ, καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ· εὐφράνθητε ἔθνη μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐνισχυσάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες υἱοὶ θεοῦ· ὅτι τὸ αἷμα τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ ἐκδικᾶται, καὶ ἐκδικήσει καὶ ἀνταποδώσει δίκην τοῖς ἐχθροῖς, καὶ τοῖς μισοῦσιν ἀνταποδώσει· καὶ ἐκκαθαριεῖ κύριος τὴν γῆν τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ.

Against the view that the Greek here represents the genuine Hebrew text, it may be urged that the whole passage in the Greek is apparently an expansion, and is not sufficiently concise to represent the original; so far at least as may be judged from the remaining portions, wherein no such wilful corruption is suspected. It is not only to the former part of the passage cited from the LXX. that there is nothing correspondent in the Masoretic text, but the like may be said of the latter part, where a tampering with the text would have been aimless and superfluous. If there is an accidental double-rendering of the clause, *will render vengeance*, the like may be the case with the preceding clauses; nor is evidence in confirmation of this hypothesis altogether lacking. Thus, whereas the literal rendering of the third word in the Hebrew¹ is ὁ λαὸς αὐτοῦ, its literal rendering if pointed differently would be, ἅμα αὐτῷ, or μετ’ αὐτοῦ, the former whereof occurs in the first clause of the Septuagint rendering, while a confusion of the latter with ὁ λαὸς αὐτοῦ might have led to the μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ.

Further, it is well known that the LXX. in many cases vacillate between υἱοὶ θεοῦ and ἄγγελοι θεοῦ, as renderings of one and the same expression; and hence (not to mention that in another reading of *this* passage the two expressions

are transposed) it seems more than probable that we have here too a case of double-rendering. The apostrophe to the heavens, *εὐφράνθητε οὐρανοί*, may have been suggested by the opening words, ver. 1: 'Give ear, O ye heavens, and I will speak;' and, in connection with this, the language of Ps. xcvi. 6—8 (LXX.) may have contributed to the interpolation. In particular, the words *προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ* have been compared with the seventh verse of the Psalm, *προσκυνήσατε αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι*, and if, as some think, the citation in Heb. i. 6 is referable directly to the Psalm, the interpolation in the LXX. may have come to pass through the medium of the citation, as in the case of Ps. xiv., which has been already discussed¹. Lastly, it may be noted that if *ἅμα αὐτῷ* and *μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ* have indeed arisen from a single Hebrew word, the fact that *καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν κ.τ.λ.* intervenes goes far to prove it an interpolation, and with it the corresponding clause *καὶ ἐνισχυσάτωσαν κ.τ.λ.* must stand or fall. We may conclude then that the LXX. cannot safely be adduced as evidence that the Masoretic text of Deut. xxxii. 43 has been, wilfully or otherwise, corrupted.

V. Is. xxv. 8; Hos. xiii. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 54, 55.

Two more or less direct citations are joined together in the last-named passage:—'Then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?'—but it might be questioned, whether the formula of citation applies in the outset to both passages, or to the former only; the latter being supposed to follow as an adaptation of Hos. xiii. 14, suggested by the foregoing. It may be well to notice the passages separately.

1. In the Authorized Version Is. xxv. 7, 8 is rendered as follows: 'And He will destroy in this mountain the face of the covering cast over all people, and the vail that is spread over all nations. *He will swallow up death in victory*; and the LORD God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and

¹ See pp. 314—317.

the rebuke of His people shall He take away from off all the earth: for the Lord hath spoken it.' The LXX. rendering being altogether inadequate, is rejected, and (a) the verb signifying *to swallow up* is rendered, as it should be, in the past: (b) the *passive* form, instead of the active, is adopted: (c) a Hebrew expression, meaning *for ever*, and for which Symmachus *e.g.* has εἰς τέλος, is by St Paul rendered εἰς νῦν.

To obtain the passive κατεπόθη the Apostle may have rendered the active (which seems well suited to the original context) indefinitely, and thus have obtained idiomatically (1) *one hath swallowed up death*; (2) κατεπόθη ὁ θάνατος. But supposing God to be the subject, the general sense is the same with the active as with the passive. As regards the expression εἰς νῦν, its *natural* meaning is fairly expressed in the Authorized Version; it is, however, a translation of a phrase signifying *for ever*, in which sense εἰς νῦν is not unfrequently used elsewhere, and especially by Aquila*. The two renderings being ultimately coincident, it has only to be observed that St Paul adopts the *literal* rendering εἰς νῦν (which is an Aramaizing periphrasis for *in perpetuum*), and then, as is his wont, goes off at a word, viz. νῦν, which leaps up, not unnaturally, to the citation from Hos. xiii. 14.

2. The following is the Authorized Version of Hos. xi. 9—14: God thus addresses Israel:—'O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself; but in me is thine help. *I will be thy king: where* is any other that may save thee in all thy cities and thy judges of whom thou saidst, Give me a king as princes? I gave thee a king in mine anger, and took him away in my wrath. The iniquity of Ephraim is bound up; his sin is hid. The sorrows of a travailing woman shall come upon him: he is an unwise son; for he should not stay long in the place of the breaking forth of children. I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from

* κατέπιεν ὁ θάνατος λχύσας.

† Aquila reads καταποτρίσει τὸν θάνατον εἰς νῦν. Theodotion, the same as St Paul. 'Pro כָּנַן et כָּנַן Aquilæ proprium est εἰς νῦν' (Field, *Orig.*

Hexapl. Ps. xii. 1). Cp. 2 Sam. ii. (LXX.): μὴ εἰς νῦν καταφάγεται ἡ φάλα; num in perpetuum devorabitur? (Schleusner, *Lex. Va. Test.*)

death: *O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction*: repentance shall be hid from mine eyes.'

This rendering is perhaps not quite accurate in some particulars. (1) To pass by the difficult ninth verse (which seems to be a reproach for forgetting that the LORD is the sole helper), it may be remarked that the word for 'I will be' signifies, in all probability, *where*, and is best taken in connection with the interrogative particle which follows the word 'thy king,' and is rendered 'where' in our English Version. The sense then would be that Israel had forgotten wherein lay their true help; '*Where* now is thy king to save thee?' where thy judges, whom thou askedst for?' (2) The word italicized recurs in the verse from which St Paul's citation is drawn; and many (following the Septuagint) assign to it the same meaning, '*where*,' both in that verse and in the tenth. To say: '*O death, I will be thy plagues*,' appears somewhat strange and unnatural; and it may be well to ask whether the substitution of '*where*' for '*I will be*,' might not lead to a more satisfactory adjustment of the passage.

3. The word *deber* or 'plague' probably means an *arrow*; and hence, secondarily, the *arrow of pestilence*, as may be illustrated, not only from Hebrew, but from Greek², Arabic, &c. A discussion of the root will be found in the second number of the *Journal of Philology*³: it may suffice therefore to adduce a single passage, which illustrates, not only the meaning of *deber*, but the very collocation of the words, '*plague*,' or pestilence, and '*destruction*,' as in Hos. xiii. 14. The passage is as follows: 'Thou shalt not be afraid for the terror by night; nor for the *arrow* that flieth by day; nor for the *pestilence* that walketh in darkness; nor for the *destruction* that wasteth at noonday' (Ps. xci. 5, 6). Here the two words in question occur in parallelism with one another, and with *arrow*, which favours the hypothesis that their primitive meanings are, *dart* and *goad*, or the like. These meanings will be recognized as appropriate in Hos. xiii.

¹ אֱהִי מַלְכְּךָ אִפּוֹא וְיוֹשִׁיעַךְ. In some copies there are two slightly different pointings for אֱהִי in ver. 10, 14. Some suppose that this word has arisen,

by accidental transposition, from אֵיךְ, *where*. But compare the Chaldee אֵיךְ.

² *Iliad*, 1. 47.

³ November, 1868, p. 56.

14; for Death is oftentimes represented as armed with missiles or other implements of destruction. 'I will ransom them,' is the Divine promise, 'from the power of the Grave; I will redeem them from Death.' And, as in ver. 10, Israel had been asked, —' *Where* now is thy king, that he may save thee?'—so the promise of deliverance in ver. 14 is followed up by the quick parenthetic interrogations—' *Where*, Death, thy darts? *Where*, Grave, thy goad? Wherewithal wilt thou oppose Me?'—and lastly by the asseveration, that '*repentance* shall be hid from mine eyes;' the LORD hath sworn, and will not *repent*¹.

The foregoing seems better suited to the context than does the rendering '*I will be &c.*;' and it agrees, further, with the LXX. and the citation, except as regards the use of the one word *νίκος*. Different methods of reconciliation have been applied to this particular; but it may suffice to suggest, that we are perhaps not dealing with a *formal* citation, and if so, we are under no obligation to harmonize the several clauses of 1 Cor. xv. 55 with the original Hebrew, but need only shew that there is a general agreement between them. In the citation, be it remarked, there is a doubt about the order of the words *νίκος* and *κέντρον*. Placing *νίκος* first (although the variation is unimportant), we may thus explain the allusions in 1 Cor. xv. 54, 55.

[i.] St Paul adduces Is. xxv. 8, *rejecting the LXX. rendering as inadequate.*

[ii.] He goes off at the word *νίκος*, which occurs in a phrase meaning *in perpetuum*.

[iii.] He passes on to Hos. xiii. 14 (wherein a *victory* over death is described), taking up the preceding *νίκος*, and thus incorporating it into the passage: 'O grave, where is thy victory?'

[iv.] He concludes, in the Prophet's words: 'O Death, where is thy sting?'

VI. Ex. xxxiv. 33; 2 Cor. iii. 13.

By the insertion of the word 'till' in the Authorized Version, the meaning of the passage cited seems to be misrepre-

¹ 1 Sam. xv. 29; Ps. cx. 4.

sented. According to the literal rendering of Ex. xxxiv. 33, it appears that, when Moses had done speaking with them, he put a veil on his face; this being done, that they might not see the quenching of its transitory radiance. 'The use of this veil,' writes Delgado¹, 'was to cover from the people the Shechinah, or glory, that was on Moses' face: but *that* he did not dare to do while he was rehearsing the Lord's words to them; for that glory was his credentials, as if the Lord was speaking to them through his mouth.' But with regard to the putting on of the veil, the true explanation seems to be the former, viz. that they might not scrutinize the ending of his intermittent glory².

St Paul's application of this text has occasioned much difficulty. In the Authorized Version, the word 'vail' being inserted, ver. 14 is thus rendered:—'But their minds were blinded: for until this day remaineth the same vail untaken away in the reading of the old testament³: which [vail] is done away in Christ⁴.' But it is *a priori* more natural to refer the last clause (as does Bengel) to the abolition of the Old Testament, and thus to interpret the *καταργεῖται* of ver. 14 analogously to the *καταργούμενον* of ver. 13. With one other alteration we may render the clause in Bengel's words, though not altogether with his meaning, *Quia in Christo aboletur*, 'because it is abolished in Christ.' The connection between ver. 13, 14, may now be exhibited as follows: 'Moses put a veil upon his face that the fading of its transitory radiance might not be looked into: The Jews veil their hearts, and will not gaze upon the fading glories of the Old Covenant; they will not look closely into it, because of their instinctive feeling that it is being done away in Christ.' And this is indeed the application which we should *anticipate* from the way in which the allusion is introduced. 'Much more *that which remaineth* is glorious. Seeing then that we have *such hope* (viz. in the durability of the new dispensation), we use

¹ See Barrett's *Synopsis*.

² On the doing away of the *old* covenant, see Heb. viii. 13.

³ πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἀτενίσαι τοὺς υλοὺς Ἰσρα-
ήλ εἰς τὸ τέλος τοῦ καταργουμένου.

⁴ ὅτι ἐν Χριστῷ καταργεῖται.

great plainness of speech : And not as Moses, &c.' (2 Cor. 11—13). We use πολλῇ παρρησίᾳ, trusting that our 'glory will endure : they veil their hearts, for the lack of that so confident assurance'.

VII. Ps. cxvi. 10; 2 Cor. iv. 13.

The Apostle quotes from the LXX. : 'I believed, : therefore have I spoken;' where articulate expression viewed as indicative of strong conviction. Do the Hebrew words yield any such meaning as this? Various renderings have been given; but suffice it here to suggest that the connection in the Psalm *may* be as follows. The Psalmist scribes the extremity to which he had been reduced. 'I am greatly afflicted : I said in my haste, All men are liars.' The vexed clause immediately precedes, and might be rendered *I believed, for I must needs speak*¹; and thereupon follow words spoken, which express the greatness of his affliction. With this interpretation, the speaking is an evidence of belief; the fact that he must needs speak testifies to the strength of his conviction : and thus the sense is the same as in the inverted rendering of the LXX. which the Apostle cites.

VIII. Ps. iv. 4; Eph. iv. 26.

The meaning in the Psalm is, apparently, 'stand in anger and sin not;' but the citation (from the LXX.) seems to me 'Be ye angry, and sin not.' Mr Sinker suggests, however, that ὀργίζεσθε, which has naturally *one* meaning of the Hebrew *ragaz*, may be intended by the LXX. to represent it general and thus to include a variety of emotions; for *ragaz*, meaning primarily *to tremble*, may imply the tremulousness of *fear*, &c., equally with the tremulousness of *anger*. In Gen. xlv. 24, the LXX. have ὀργίζεσθε, where the meaning, 'Fear

¹ In this explanation, καταργούμενον, καταργούμενον, καταργείται (ver. 11, 13, 14) are referred to one and the same thing, viz. the glory of the old διαθήκη. Also the κάλυμμα μὴ ἀνακαλυπτόμενον

of ver. 15 is contrasted, as seems philosophically simplest, with the ἀνακεκαμμένον προσώπῳ of ver. 18.
האמנתי כי אדבר¹

not by the way,' seems more appropriate than, '*Fall not out by the way:*' and a stronger argument may be based upon Ex. xv. 14: 'The people shall hear, and *be afraid*;' unless the Alexandrine reading ἐφοβήθησαν is to replace ὀργίσθησαν¹.

IX. Gen. xlvii. 31; Heb. xi. 21.

The LXX. by change of pointing, read 'staff' for 'bed,' and their rendering is adopted in the citation. The Authorized Version has, doubtless, the true rendering of the original: 'And Israel bowed himself *upon the bed's head*²;' where, moreover, there is an ambiguity in the word *bowed*, which may import, that he *worshipped*, or only that, 'se rursus ad caput lectuli requiem captaturus *inclinet*³.' The bed's *head*, it may be remarked, is a Hebraism for the *top* or *surface* of the bed⁴; and thus the meaning is, that he prostrated himself upon the bed, after having strengthened himself, and sat up, as in Gen. xlviii. 2. In the similar passage, 1 Kings i. 47, the word *head* is omitted, and it is recorded simply, that the King bowed himself *upon* the bed; where, however, the word for 'bed' is different. In Gen. xlviii. 2 the same Hebrew word occurs, and is rightly rendered κλίνην by the LXX. These two passages combined almost suggest the suspicion that the text of the LXX. in Gen. xlvii. 31, may have been corrupted; but, in any case, the Greek of 1 Kings i. 47, should be taken as a guide to the true construction in the passage cited, and it is evidently unfavourable to the rendering of the Vulgate: 'et adoravit fastigium virgæ ejus.'

It remains however to be asked, whether Jacob's bowing down of himself signified worship, in accordance with the *prima facie* meaning of the citation: and the parallel case of David (*loc. citat.*) suggests that worship is at any rate implied, even if not expressed by the word 'bow down;' for in immediate sequence, comes the prayer of the King: '*Blessed*

¹ Schleusner, *Lex. Vet. Test. s. v.*
ὀργίζομαι.

² The word is על ראש המטה.

³ Poli *Synops. in loc.*

⁴ The rendering, 'upon the bed's head,' though literal, is misleading. It means no more than *on the top of*, or simply *on*, the bed.

be the LORD God of Israel, which hath given one to sit on throne this day.'

X. *Latent Citations.*

Of unacknowledged citations, or such as occur without any introductory formula, there are many which occasion difficulty, but are at once recognized as containing more or less direct allusions to doctrines of the ancient Scripture to the circumstances, it may be, of the Old Testament history. But an allusion may at times presuppose a very exact acquaintance with the documents referred to, and be set forth accordingly with an indirectness and obscurity which would render it a matter of no slight difficulty to find traces of reference or citation at all. And it is obvious moreover that the traces of any such reference might be disguised not only by its obliquity and intrinsic indefiniteness, but, in cases of special difficulty, by our imperfect comprehension of (1) the passage in which the allusion occurs, or (2) that to which the allusion is made. This remark may be illustrated by the help of R. Shalom ben Abraham's rendering of an obscure verse, Prov. xxi. 8, which we proceed to consider; premising that, even if the rendering proposed should be incorrect, it may still serve to illustrate the nature of a difficulty which has sometimes to be encountered.

1. The Authorized Version reads in the place referred to 'The way of man is froward and strange: but as for the pure, his work is right' (Prov. xxi. 8). But it is very doubtful whether the word rendered 'man,' and equivalent to Latin *vir*, can rightly be contrasted with 'the pure.' So we therefore have had recourse to the Arabic, and have rendered the first clause: *tortuosa est via viri criminibus onusti*¹—a rendering at which the Rabbinic instinct revolts, 'since Hebrew *usus loquendi* and the absence of all reason for applying such an unhebrew word are repugnant².' The explanation about to be proposed is based upon a peculiar idiom of the Hebrew

¹ Gesen. *Thesaur.* 399 b.

² Fürst. *Lex.* s. v. נח.

language, exemplified below. 'Thou shalt not have in thy bag *divers weights* [lit. *weight and weight*], a great and a small. Thou shalt not have in thine house *divers measures* [lit. *measure and measure*], a great and a small' (Deut. xxv. 13, 14). 'They were not of *double heart* [lit. *heart and heart*]... All these men of war, that could keep rank, came with a perfect heart to Hebron, to make David king over Israel' (1 Chron. xii. 33, 38). 'With flattering lips and with a *double heart* [lit. *heart and heart*] do they speak' (Ps. xii. 3). Double-dealing is thus expressed in the Hebrew idiom by a simple repetition; and according to this usage *homo duplex* would assume the form '*man and man*.' This formula indeed occurs in another sense in Esther i. 8; but may not the idiom in question be capable of a modified expression, by means of two words of opposite meaning, instead of one and the same word repeated, with an *implied* contradiction and antagonism? If so, then an insincere and self-contradictory character might be expressed as well by the formula *one and another*, as by the more usual collocation *one and one*; and it is on this assumption that Prov. xxi. 8, is explained in the *Qab u' Naql*.

2. The first word in the Hebrew of Prov. xxi. 8¹, is reduplicated from one which means *to turn*, and it may be represented by our vernacular *zigzag*, if taken as an epithet of the following 'way.' But in the Rabbinic commentary referred to it is taken somewhat differently, as descriptive of a person or character; and the verse is said to define such a person, as *one whose way is sometimes that of one man and sometimes that of another*². The general meaning is thus the same as with the former construction, but it is perhaps better to make 'zigzag' a predicate and render the verse as follows:

The way of a double-minded man is zigzag:
But as for the pure, his work is right.

¹ הפכפך דרך איש וזר וזך ישר פעלו:

² נתן גדר לאיש הפכפך והוא שיש לו לפעמים דרך איש ולפעמים דרך זר:

Thus the proverb is strikingly similar to that in James
A double-minded man is unstable in all his ways.

The Hebrew words here rendered *double-minded* are rally 'man and stranger,' or 'one and *another*¹, and the phrase is taken to imply duplicity, *i.e.* the coexistence, so to say, of two distinct individualities in the same person. This expression is the natural antithesis of 'the *pure*, or *sincere*,' which conveys the idea of ἀπλότης or freedom from admixture. The LXX. have ἀγνά in the second hemistich, and St James where contrasts this double-mindedness with purity, using a derivative of ἀγνός in the second clause of the antithesis thus: 'Cleanse your hands, ye sinners; and *purify* your hearts, ye *double-minded*' (James iv. 8).

3. The LXX. rendering of the proverb occasions some difficulty, but it is not quite clear that they do not intend to imply a *duplicity* of way by σκολιὰς ὁδοῦς², the epithet likewise in Prov. xxviii. 18, where the literal rendering is, 'versus *duarum viarum &c.*' This is made to appear still more unlikely by their freedom in rendering the similar expression in Prov. xxviii. 6, where they make no attempt to preserve the Hebrew idiom, but replace by πλουσίου ψεύδους the well-known clause: 'than he that is perverse in *his ways* [lit. *two ways* though he be rich.' The figure of *going two ways* is produced in Eccus. ii. 12: 'Woe be to fearful hearts, to faint hands, and the sinner that goeth two ways.' And it is worthy of remark that Junius³, commenting upon the passage, uses instinctively the language of St James, and describes the character in question, *viz.* the man of *two ways*, as, 'The man

¹ This is the first meaning of נֶאֱמָר. See Job xix. 27, where the LXX. have οὐκ ἄλλος for נֶאֱמָר.

² See Ex. xxvii. 20.

³ Schleusner, *Lex. Vet. Test. s.v.* σκολιὰς σκολιός, seems to consider that the LXX. repeated σκολιός to express the reduplication in נֶאֱמָר. But they may have intended to express freely that the

way of the double-minded man is crooked. Their words are: πρὸς τοὺς σκολιὰς ὁδοὺς ἀποστέλλει ὁ Θεός, γὰρ καὶ ὁρθὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ. Here is explanatory, the literal rendering being taken to be: 'The way of the perverse is [by God's ordering] crooked, so that pure and right is His doing.'

⁴ Quoted by D'Oyly and Mant.

who is *unstable in his ways*, impelled here and there by doubt and distrust.'

4. The contrast between *purity* and *duplicity* (Prov. xxi. 8; James iv. 8) is illustrated by language used in the *Testaments of the xii Patriarchs*¹, where the ἀγαθὴ διάνοια is described as having, not *two tongues*, of cursing and blessing, &c. but μίαν περὶ πάντας εὐλικρινῇ καθαρὰν διάθεσιν. And a further illustration—none the less trustworthy for its indirectness—is afforded by Mic. vi. 11: 'Shall I count them *pure with the wicked balances*², and with the bag of *deceitful weights*?' i.e. containing *two* kinds of weights, great and small, as the Targum well expresses it.

We may reiterate in conclusion that, if the first clause of Prov. xxi. 8 be rendered as proposed, viz.:

The way of a double-minded man is zigzag;

or, with slight variation:

A double-minded man is changeful in his way;

there results a perfect parallelism between the first hemistich and the second, wherein *pure* or *sincere* contrasts with *double-minded*, and *right* or *straight* with *zigzag*. St James (i. 8), introduces a proverb so strikingly similar to the foregoing that he would seem almost to be citing it; and this conjecture is confirmed by the circumstance, that elsewhere (iv. 8) he uses the same word *double-minded* in direct contrast with the idea of *purity*. This gives much plausibility to the hypothesis of citation: but whether we are dealing with a citation or no, it is more than probable that citations still lie concealed by our imperfect understanding of the passages cited, or, on the other hand, of those into which they are incorporated.

With this remark we leave the great subject of Citation from the Old Testament in the New; not as one which has been dealt with fully and exhaustively, but with a sense of its

¹ *Test.* Benj. 6. On the word εὐλικρινής, see Isocrat. *ad Demon.* § 47, ed. Sandys. With the δψυχος of St James, compare δγλωσσος (Prov. xxiv.

22), διλογος (1 Tim. iii. 8), διπρόσωπος (*Test.* Dan 4, Asher 2—4). Cp. μονόπρόσωπος.

האזכרה במאזני רשע:

vastness and complexity which has grown keener and yet keener with the progress of research. It was patent at the outset, that a plan would be indeed pretentious, which should propose to treat of all the main principles—to say naught of details not unimportant—which invite examination ; but the end has seemed even to recede and grow yet more distant, as each upward step has widened the horizon of enquiry. And when now at length we pause, it is not as upon a summit gained, or with an ocean fathomed ; but rather, as with a quickened appreciation of heights yet unscaled, and of depths which rest yet unexplored.

APPENDIX.

On the words עלמה and בתולה.

The renderings of העלמה, Is. vii. 14, may be classed under three heads.

1. The word being regarded as a derivative of עלם *to hide*, it is taken to mean 'a virgin,' on etymological grounds. The case is thus stated by Rosenmüller, who adopts the rendering παρθένος, though *not* for etymological reasons:—'Nolumus cum pluribus superioris ætatis interpretibus *virginis* notionem voci עלמה vindicare ex ejus etymo, etsi speciosum sit. Observant עלמה esse ab עלם, cujus forma niphāl *absconditum, occultum esse, ignorari*, designat... Eam vero etymologiam soli convenire *virgini*, quæ sic appellata sit, vel, quod nescia consuetudinis viriliis *occulta* hactenus et *tecta* habeat, quæ honestas, alii quam marito, revelari vetat; vel quod, pro more veterum, *domi lateat* et occultetur, non versata in publico, sed sub oculis matris aut custodis clam aliis servetur, cujusmodi virgines appellarunt κατακλειστός, *conclusas* (2 Macc. iii. 19; 3 Macc. i. 18), ut contra *meretricem* Chaldæi נפקת ברא, *prodeuntem foras*, in publico versatam, vocant.'

2. The Jewish interpreters deny that עלמה means *a virgin*. In Is. vii. 14, Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion render it by νεάνις. Gesenius, referring to the Arabic, makes the root mean 'pubes et coeundi cupidus fuit,' and remarks that, 'Etymon a עלם i. q. علم indubitatum est, neque audiendi qui *puellam* pr. *absconditam* dictam volunt...vel *signatam, obsignatam* (ab Arab. علم) i. e. intactam (Schult.).' But a later lexicographer, Fürst, no less strongly opposed to the rendering παρθένος, directly contradicts Gesenius as regards the first meaning of the root, and affirms the *coeundi cupidus fuit* to be only secondary.

3. A third class of interpreters agree that **עלמה** does not mean etymologically *a virgin*, but think this meaning required by usage, and in Is. vii. 14 by the context. In this class may be numbered Hengstenberg, who thus writes in his *Christology*: 'All parties now rightly agree that the word **עלמה** is to be derived from **עלם** in the signification *to grow up*. To offer here any arguments in proof would be a work of supererogation, as they are offered by all dictionaries... Being derived from **עלם**, *to grow up, to become marriageable*, **עלמה** can only mean *puella nubilis*.'

We proceed to consider the meanings of I. **בתולה**; II. **עלמה**; III. **עלומים** and **בתולים**.

I. 'Für die *virgo illibata* hatten aber die Hebräer und übrige Semiten einen ganz andern Ausdruck, nämlich **בתולה**, und die dem entsprechenden Wörter (1 Mos. xxiv. 16).' So Gesenius, who adds, not without plausibility: 'Höchst unwahrscheinlich ist es nur, dass die Hebräer für dieselbe Sache zwey ganz synonyme Ausdrücke gehabt.' But it may be questioned whether **בתולה** means *παρθένος* strictly and etymologically, as is frequently supposed. On the contrary, the derivation from **בשל**, *maturescere*, would seem to satisfy the requirements of the case more completely than those which make **בתולה** etymologically *παρθένος*. On the affinity of **ש** and **ל** see Fürst *Lex. s. l.* **ש**. [חַרַּשׁ, Ex. xxxii. 16, = חֶרֶשׁ.] Fürst, in his *Concordance*, but not in his *Lexicon*, gives the derivation proposed which makes **בתולה** primarily equivalent to 'matura viro,' and secondarily to 'nondum corrupta aut viro nupta,' nor that, without qualifying additions, and 'wo es ohne Nachdruck steht.' We proceed to notice some of the usages of the word.

a. The corresponding masculine word is **בחור**, lit. *choice*, i. e. one in the prime of life. The two occur together in such passages as: 'With thee also will I break in pieces man and woman; and with thee will I break in pieces old and young; and with thee will I break in pieces the *young man* and the *maid*' (Jer. li. 22). Here the contrasts are those of age and sex. Comp. Deut. xxxii. 25; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 17; Is. lxii. 5; Ezek. ix. 6.

b. 'I made a covenant with mine eyes, why then should I thin upon a *maid*?' Here (Job xxxi. 1) it seems unnecessary, as Berners remarks, to superadd the notion of virginity to that of maturity.

Comp. 2 Sam. xiii. 2 (where בתולה is again used): 'Amnon was so vexed that he fell sick for his sister Tamar; for she was a *virgin*.' In ver. 18, the meaning *matura* seems more appropriate. It is there said that 'the king's daughters that were בתולות' wore a certain kind of robe, which was perhaps 'longior et amplior' (Gesen. s. v. מעיל). But all the daughters in question would probably be virgins; those that were married and living elsewhere being excluded. If so, then בתולות must have some other meaning than *virgin*, for this would imply no distinction, but be applicable to all alike. It would be however quite natural that the *grown-up* daughters should wear a dress implying a certain dignity; and accordingly it is not improbable that *grown-up* is the true meaning of בתולה in this place. Nor does Joel i. 8 (*infra*) favour the opinion that בתולה means strictly παρθένος. 'Lament like a בתולה girded with sackcloth for the husband (בעל) of her youth.'

c. In Gen. xxiv. 16 it is said of Rebecca, that she was 'a *virgin*, neither had any man known her;' where the last words seem to supplement the foregoing, and to express what they alone could at the most have implied. The full phrase rendered 'virgin' is, נערה בתולה, i. e. a girl of *full age*, not a *child*, as is shewn by the epithet בתולה, but which would have been left doubtful if נערה had stood alone. A like form of expression is used in Jud. xxi. 12; and even in Lev. xxi. 14 it is not certain that בתולה of itself means strictly παρθένος. The high-priest is to take a wife in her virginity (ver. 13): not a widow, or a divorced woman, or profane, or an harlot: 'but he shall take a בתולה of his own people to wife.' The force of the words italicized must not be overlooked. The harlot is 'the *strange* woman:' אחרת (Jud. xi. 2) corresponds to זונה; and in Deut. xxiii. 17 it is expressly laid down, that 'there shall be no whore of the daughters of ISRAEL, nor a sodomite of the sons of ISRAEL.' The first meaning of בתולה might well be *matura*, one in the prime of early womanhood; and the meaning παρθένος might naturally arise therefrom as secondary.

d. Some have assumed, and that, as it would seem, arbitrarily, that the word בתולה when applied to cities implies (1) the state of not being conquered; or (2) religious purity, and faithfulness to the

God of Israel. But Rosenmüller, following the Chaldee, remarks on Amos v. 2, that '*virgo* pro coetu hominum, quacunque se ratione habet, per prosopopœiam accipienda erit.' Jerome indeed defends the hypothesis (2), remarking: '*Virgo* autem appellatur populus Israel, non quia in virginitatis permanserit puritate, sed quia quondam instar virginis Deo sit copulata.' But the name *virgo* is not applicable to the heathen cities Egypt, Babylon, &c. as to the Holy City. Moreover, it is not required by the Hebrew idiom that a city should be represented as a *virgin* proper; but, as in other languages a city may be a *metropolis*, so in Hebrew the suburbs of a city are called its *daughters* (Josh. xv. 45). Again, בתולה is applied to Isaiah not only to a *heathen* city, but to one in the prophet's view already *conquered*, which seems opposed to the theory (1). Thus 'Come down, and sit in the dust, O *virgin*, daughter of Babylon, upon the ground: there is no throne, O daughter of the Chaldeans' (Is. xlvii. 1).

In ver. 9 we read: 'These two things shall come to thee in one moment in one day, *the loss of children, and widowhood*.' while John styles Babylon the 'mother of harlots' (Rev. xvii. 5), and thus writes, with plain reference to Is. xlvii: 'For all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her... How much she has glorified herself, and lived deliciously, so much torment and sorrow will I give her: for she saith in her heart, I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow. Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine' (Rev. xviii. 3, 7, 8).

We shall now proceed to consider the meaning of עלמה.

II. The verb עלם is common in Hebrew, and has one well-defined sense, viz. *to conceal* [opp. to ידע]: it is natural therefore to attempt an explanation of עלמה as a derivative of this root, before having recourse to comparatively modern dialects. If the primary meaning *to seal* (for which Albert Schultens refers to the Arabic) be assumed, we may explain all the usages of עלם in a way which is at least plausible.

(i.) The meanings *seal* and *conceal* are intimately connected, the latter being immediately deducible from the former. Hence the prevalent usages of the verb in question may be accounted for.

(ii.) עֶלְם signifies *eternity* (past or future), which is like a *scaled* book (Rev. v. 1).

(iii.) In deriving עֶלְמָה we must take into account its masculine correlative עֶלְם; and this may be done by a physiological application of the root-meaning *seal*. The words would thus carry with them primarily the negation of development, and would be applicable from the time of infancy to the age of the בָּחוּר and בְּתוּלָה, as their upper limits. For this application of the meaning *seal*, we may compare, הַחַתִּים (Lev. xv. 3); and Cant. iv. 12, where the beloved is described as מַעֲיֵן חַתּוּם, 'fons *obsignata*, de puella casta et intemerata' (Gesen. *Thesaur.* 587 *b*).

(iv.) The *usages* of עֶלְם and עֶלְמָה have yet to be considered. The former occurs in 1 Sam. xvii. 56: 'Enquire thou whose son the *stripling* is.' And in 1 Sam. xx. 22, where it is applied to the נַעַר קָטָן of ch. xx. 35.

The word עֶלְמָה is allowed, if not to mean etymologically *παρθένος*, at least to be used of *παρθέναι*, in all cases except two, viz. Cant. vi. 8 and Prov. xxx. 18—20. But in the former passage עֶלְמוֹת is contrasted with *queens* and *concubines*, and would thus seem to designate such as are in fact *παρθέναι*. The latter passage, which is much disputed, runs as follows: 'There be three things which are too wonderful for me; yea, four which I know not: The way of an eagle in the air; the way of a serpent upon a rock; the way of a ship in the midst of the sea; and the way of a man with a *maid* (רֶדֶךְ גִּבּוֹר בַּעֲלָמָה). Such is the way of an adulterous woman; she eateth, and wipeth her mouth, and saith, I have done no wickedness.' Like phraseology is used in Sap. Sol. v. 10, 11, for the purpose of illustration, but the mention of the *serpent* is omitted, as though unsuited for the application which is made of the passage: nor again are the things in question there described as wonderful and mysterious. But, to return to the passage, the marvel is said to consist in the *invisibility* of the eagle's track, &c. Why then should the eagle be chosen, rather than any other bird? The question is answered by Rosenmüller, who in his answer confounds the want of any mark upon the air with the invisibility of the bird itself. But a ship cannot be said to leave no track; and that especially בְּלִב הַיָּם.

All trace no doubt soon vanishes, but less soon in salt-water than in fresh; and thus בלל הים¹ instead of being emphatic is made meaningless, not to say inaccurate. Nor, supposing these preliminary difficulties surmounted, is it easy to apply them to the final clause, *via viri in virgine*. The result would be at least disappointing, if the great marvel to which all converges were that the עלמה² 'quid vitii sibi hæreat ita dissimulat, ut ab aliis id frustra pervestigatur.' But it is altogether unnatural that the invisibility of a bird's track in the air should be described as an impenetrable mystery; and so with the serpent, and the ship.

The word דרך does not mean ἵχνη or *vestigium*, but *modus agendi*. The flight of the eagle challenges especial admiration (Job ix. 26); the ship³ at sea, and the strange convolutions of the footless serpent are likewise chosen as fit types of the marvellous. One and all lead up to that crowning mystery, the infatuation of youthful love, which has arrested the attention of paroemiasts, poets and philosophers in all time. After the mention of the 'four things' comes, in ver. 20, an allusion, suggested by the contrast, to the infatuation of an adulterous woman, who 'saith (*sc.* in her heart), I have done no wickedness.'

To recapitulate—we have concluded that עלמה (from the root *obsignavit*) implies a negation of development, and is applicable up to the age at which the term בתולה or *matura* becomes applicable. The former word is not used in the Bible of any but παρθένοι, while the latter may imply, but does not expressly predicate, παρθεμία. We proceed to notice

(i.) עלומים; (ii.) בתולים.

III. These last forms, after the analogy of וקנים, בעורים, denote (a) the age or time of life of the עלם or the עלמה and the בתולה; and (b) the conditions and natural concomitants of those ages. In Jud. xi. 37, the daughter of Jephthah is spared for awhile to bewail the devoted capacities of her early womanhood: אבנה על בתולי, 'deplorabo ætatem meam virgineam' (Gesen. *Thesaur.*

¹ ים seems here to mean strictly *sea*, though it does not necessarily in all contexts. For the whole phrase, cp.

Prov. xxiii. 34.

² French and Skinner understand *nautilus*, by 'ship,' in Ps. civ. 26.

205, *b*). In Ezek. xxiii. 3, בתוליהן, standing in parallelism with געוריהן, denotes the time of incepting maturity. Again, עלומים denotes the condition of the עלם in Job xx. 11, where it stands for the freshness as of extreme youth, in contrast with decay and death; while the בתולים are the natural concomitants of the age of the בתולה, and their absence therefore implies some defect. Hence בתולים means primarily *signa pubertatis*, and then by implication *signa virginitatis* (Deut. xxii. 14). We may compare further Is. liv. 4, where, in a description of the barren that did not bear, בשת עלומך, 'the shame of thy youth,' stands in parallelism with חרפת אלמנותך, 'the reproach of thy widowhood.'

It has been noticed above that there is *one* Biblical meaning of עלם undisputed, viz. *occultavit, abscondit*. Gesenius adds, that 'in reliquis linguis cognatis hæc radix non reperitur' (*Thesaur.* 1035, *a*). It is noteworthy that the Arabic غلم, to which Gesenius refers עלמה, nearly coincides with a meaning of ידע, *to know*, while the Hebrew root עלם has a directly opposite meaning. In Job xx. 11 עלומים is said by some to mean radically *strength*; and hence it may be seen how easily that meaning might have come to be thought inherent though not really so. Thus, supposing עלם to have meant originally *obsignavit*, the meanings *youth, youthfulness* and *strength* might have been successively derived, and the last may then have been taken as primary in the cognate dialects. But inferences from those dialects are precarious unless corroborated by internal evidence from the more ancient Hebrew.

INDEX OF TEXTS AND PASSAGES.

<i>Genesis.</i>				<i>Ruth.</i>	
	Page		Page		
ii. 4.....	xxiii	xxxiii. 19.....	195	ii. 14	—
iii. 5.....	102	xxxiv. 33.....	332		
iv. 25	219			<i>1 Samuel.</i>	
ix. 20	317			x. 2	—
x. 23	67	<i>Leviticus.</i>		xv. 22	—
xi. 1	xxv	xi. 42	xxii	xvii. 53	—
xiv. 17—20.....	25	xvi. 15.....	299	xviii. 21	—
xv. 5.....	210, 298	xix. 17, 18	260, 262	xxv. 1	—
xv. 7, 8	288, 292	xxi. 13, 14	343		
xv. 9—18.....	292, 297, 299			<i>2 Samuel.</i>	
xviii. 10	195, 325	<i>Numbers.</i>		vii. 12—16	14
xxi. 12	195, 219	ix. 12	107, 322	vii. 29.....	—
xxii. 1—14	294	x. 35	172	xiii. 2, 18	—
xxii. 16, 17.....	298	xxi. 5—9.....	119	xxiii. 1—7	—
xxiv. 16	343	xxii. 3	30		
xxv. 21	xxv	xxiv. 8	73		
xxv. 23	195			<i>1 Kings.</i>	
xxx. 36	317	<i>Deuteronomy.</i>		i. 47	—
xxxv. 19.....	55	vi. 5	260		
xxxvii. 10	55	vi. 13	xxx	<i>2 Kings.</i>	
xl. 27	325	vi. 16	xxx	i. 7	—
xlvi. 31	335	viii. 3	xxx	xv. 37	—
xlvi. 7	55	xviii. 15—19	157	xvi.....	—
xlvi. 6	146	xxi. 17.....	287	xxii. 13	—
xlvi. 9.....	52	xxii. 14	347		
xlvi. 10	xxv, 51, 72	xxiii. 17	343	<i>1 Chronicles.</i>	
		xxv. 4	xxx, xxxii	v. 2	—
<i>Exodus.</i>		xxv. 13, 14.....	337	xii. 33, 38	—
i. 12	30	xxxii. 18.....	xxxii	xiv. 17	—
ii. 14	215	xxxii. 35	262, 312	xvii. 1, 2.....	—
iv. 19, 20	61	xxxii. 40.....	317	xvii. 11—14	—
iv. 22	63, 64	xxxii. 43	164, 327	xxviii. 4	—
vi. 3.....	xxvi				
xii. 7	299	<i>Joshua.</i>		<i>2 Chronicles.</i>	
xii. 46	107, 322	xv. 45	344	v. 5	—
xv. 14	335				
xv. 17	171	<i>Judges.</i>			
xx. 1	61	xi. 2	343		
xxi. 24.....	274	xi. 37	347		
xxiv. 6, 8.....	283, 297, 299				
xxv. 8	171				

Index of Texts and Passages.

349

	Page		Page		Page
vi. 41, 42	144	xliv. 6—8.....	162, 166	vi. 6	xxxiii
xxiv. 18—22	11, 15	l. 5	295	x. 24	xiv
xxviii	28	li.	184	xii. 10	xxxii
xxxv. 25	140	li. 4	324	xx. 17, 18	267
<i>Esther.</i>		lii. 3, 4	316	xxi. 8	336, 337, 339
i. 8	337	lv. 20	236	xxv. 21, 22	263
<i>Job.</i>		lvi.	141	xxviii. 6, 18	338
ix. 26	346	lvii.	141	xxx. 18—20	245
xv. 16	252	lviii.	141	<i>Ecclesiastes.</i>	
xix. 27	338	lix.	141	vii. 20	315
xx. 11	347	lix. 11	142	<i>Song of Solomon.</i>	
xxxi. 1	342	lx.	141	iv. 12	345
xxxii. 29, 30	262	lxii. 9	324	v. 10	137
xxxiv. 7	252	lxviii.	171	vi. 8	345
<i>Psalms.</i>		lxviii. 18	167, 170	<i>Isaiah.</i>	
ii.	154	lxviii. 27	52	iv. 2	70
ii. 2, 3	228	lxix.	111, 230	vi. 10	92
ii. 7	27, 157, 229	lxix. 4, 9	241	vii. 4—12	32, 46, 47
ii. 8	77	lxix. 19	232	vii. 6	xxv
iv. 4	334	lxix. 21	114, 116, 241	vii. 13—16	30, 33, 41
v. 10	316	lxix. 22—24	236, 239	vii. 17—25	31, 34, 35
vii. 14	317	lxix. 26	229	viii. 1—4	31
viii. 6	24	lxix. 27, 28	237, 243	viii. 8	41
x. 4	228	lxxi. 16	185	viii. 14—19	42, 44
x. 7	316	lxxiii. 2	273	ix. 1	36, 48, 56
xii. 3	337	lxxviii. 67—69	170	ix. 2—7	36, 41, 48
xiv. 1—7*	314	lxxx. 14	xxii	ix. 13	29
xvi.	141, 147	lxxxix. 3—35	144	x. 15	48, 103
xvi. 3	142	xc. 5, 6	331	x. 20	29
xvi. 8—11	128, 144	xc. 11, 12	xxx	x. 21	37, 45
xviii. 49	327	xcv. 7, 8	135	xi. 1	68, 71, 75
xix. 4	92	xcvi. 6—8	329	xi. 10	122, 327
xxii.	110, 114	xcvii. 7	164	xiv. 19	67
xxii. 1	115	cii.	111	xvii. 9	46
xxii. 7, 8	115, 248	cii. 26—28	164	xxi. 10	91
xxii. 15	242	civ. 4	164	xxii. 13	227
xxii. 18	115	civ. 26	346	xxv. 7, 8	329
xxii. 31	237, 242	cix.	226, 245, 258	xxvi. 2	xxvi
xxviii. 4	262	cix. 20	250, 259, 269	xxvi. 14	326
xxx. 5	115	cx.	18	xxviii. 16	42
xxxiv. 10	273	cx. 1	16, 164	xxix. 9, 10	240
xxxiv. 20	107, 322	cx. 3	17	xxxviii. 9—22	31, 140
xxxv. 4—8	243, 261	cxvi. 10	334	xl. 10	250, 258
xxxv. 19	241	cxvi. 11	324	xlvi. 1—7	211
xxxvi. 1—4	316	cxvii. 1	327	xlvi. 1, 9	269, 344
xxxvii. 25	273	cxvii. 3	250	li. 17, 18	85
xxxvii. 37, 38	236	cxviii. 10—14	143	lii. 2—12	82
xl.	178	cxviii. 8, 9	268	lii. 13—15	74†, 88, 102
xl. 6—8 ...	176, 181, 185	cxviii. 14	263	liii.	75†, 88
xli. 9	255, 257	cxl. 3	316		
xliv.	154	cxlvi. 3	324		
<i>Proverbs.</i>		<i>Proverbs.</i>			
		i. 16	316		

* Prayer-Book Version.

† New Translation.

	Page		Page		Page
liii. 1, 2	69, 70	v. 14, 15	8	<i>Wisdom of Solomon.</i>	
liii. 3	79	vi. 1-6	1, 9	v. 10, 11	345
liii. 8	85, 126	xi. 1	59, 73, 313	xvi. 5-7	119
liii. 9	122	xiii. 9-14	329, 330		
liii. 11, 12	79, 102, 104			<i>Ecclesiasticus.</i>	
liv. 1	197	<i>Joel.</i>		ii. 12	338
liv. 2-5	82, 347	i. 8	343		
lv. 3, 4	128, 142, 144			<i>2 Maccabees.</i>	
lvi. 10	75, 126	<i>Amos.</i>		iii. 19	341
lix. 7, 8	316	v. 2	344		
lxi. 10	124	v. 18-27	207, 211, 222	<i>3 Maccabees.</i>	
lxii. 11	250	vii. 2, 5	75	i. 18	341
lxiv. 3	75				
		<i>Obadiah.</i>		<i>St Matthew.</i>	
<i>Jeremiah.</i>		ver. 18	xxv	i. 21	84
ii. 21	136			i. 22, 23	xiii, 28, 41
vii. 22, 23	214	<i>Jonah.</i>		ii. 1-6	49, 52
xx. 17	33	ii. 2, 6	166	ii. 14	64, 72
xxiii. 5, 6	237	ii. 9	10	ii. 15	59, 64, 73
xxv. 26	xxv			ii. 16	56
xxx. 9	143	<i>Micah.</i>		ii. 17, 18	xiii, 49, 54
xxxi. 15	xiii, 53	iii. 11	50	ii. 23	49, 66
xxxii. 31-34	285	v. 2	49	iii. 7	123
xxxiv. 18-20	292, 298	v. 5	50	iii. 16	118
l. 28	231, 241	vi. 11	339	iv. 3-11	xxx
li. 11	231, 241	vii. 18	10	iv. 12-16	49, 56, 72
li. 41	xxv			v. 17	276
		<i>Nahum.</i>		v. 18	xxvii
<i>Lamentations.</i>		i. 14	126	v. 38, 39	274
i. 12	86			vi. 13	124
ii. 15, 16	86	<i>Habakkuk.</i>		vii. 12	276, 277
iii. 12	86	i. 5	75	viii. 17	88, 92
iii. 42-48	85			ix. 10-13	1
iv. 12	75	<i>Zechariah.</i>		ix. 14	3
		i. 1	15	x. 31	xxxii
<i>Ezekiel.</i>		iii. 1	246	xi. 21-24	58
xvi. 4	307	iii. 8	80	xii. 5-8	1, 4, 6
xviii. 4	301	ix. 11	283, 287	xiii. 17	41
xviii. 20-23	303	xii. 10	313, 322	xiii. 52	ix
xix. 10-14	17			xx. 28	105
xx. 6	34	<i>Malachi.</i>		xxi. 24-27	22
xxiii. 3	347	i. 2, 3	195	xxi. 44	42
xxiii. 8	73			xxii. 37-40	260, 276
xxiv. 11	93	<i>Tobit.</i>		xxii. 42-45	16, 21
xxxiv. 22-24	142	iv. 15	278	xxiv. 3	40
xxxvii. 24-26	143			xxiv. 34-37	
					12, 40, 123
<i>Hosea.</i>				xxvi. 26-28	
i. 10	326				281, 283, 300
ii. 15	62, 213			xxvi. 54	257
ii. 19, 20	12			xxvii. 27-30	241
ii. 23	326			xxvii. 33-49	115, 242
iii. 4, 5	143			xxvii. 50	323

Index of Texts and Passages.

351

<i>St Mark.</i>	Page		Page		Page
i. 10	118	x. 33—36	162	xii. 19—21	263, 276
ii. 10, 11	47	xi. 49—52	110, 149	xiii. 10	277
ii. 17	4	xii. 38	88, 90, 92	xv. 1—3	93, 241
ii. 25	5	xii. 41	92	xv. 10	327
ii. 27	6	xiii. 34	277	xv. 21	88
ix. 12	79	xiii. 37, 38	108		
x. 45	105	xv. 25	241		
x. 46—48	72	xvii. 3	12	<i>1 Corinthians.</i>	
xii. 32	276	xviii. 20, 21	99	i. 21	91
xii. 36, 37	16, 21	xix. 19	69	ii. 9	75
xv. 28	89	xix. 28	242	v. 7	106
xv. 34	193	xix. 30	116	x. 1—4	221
xv. 37	323	xix. 33—36	107, 323	x. 4—9	60
		xix. 37	312	x. 7—11	xxx1, xxxii
				xi. 24	281
<i>St Luke.</i>		<i>Acts.</i>		xi. 25	287, 300
i. 32, 33	41	i. 7	40	xiii. 5, 7	275
i. 46, 47	124	i. 16—20	134, 242, 254	xv. 21, 22	304
i. 79	41	ii. 23	108	xv. 25	24
iii. 21	118	ii. 24	147	xv. 32	227
iv. 3—13	xxx	ii. 25—28	128, 136	xv. 50	147
iv. 17	327	ii. 29—31	136, 147	xv. 54, 55	329
v. 31, 32	4	ii. 34, 35	24		
v. 33	3	iii. 22, 23	157	<i>2 Corinthians.</i>	
vi. 9	8	iv. 27, 28	108	iii. 11—13	332, 334
vi. 31	278	vii.	207	iv. 13	334
ix. 55	271	vii. 37	157	iv. 17	36
x. 26, 27	277	vii. 38—41	223	v. 15, 18	302, 304
xi. 49—51	15	vii. 41—43	208, 311	v. 21	121
xii. 7	xxxii	viii. 32, 33	89, 96, 123		
xv. 12	287	xiii. 15—28	159	<i>Galatians.</i>	
xvi. 8	123	xiii. 32	158	ii. 20	302
xvi. 17	xxvii	xiii. 33	157	iii. 8	220
xviii. 35—39	72	xiii. 34	128, 147, 158	iii. 13	121
xx. 18	42	xiii. 35	128	iii. 15—18	218
xx. 41—44	16, 21	xiii. 36, 37	136, 147	iii. 27—29	219
xxii. 20	300	xiii. 41	75	iv. 21—23	189
xxii. 28—30	290	xv. 18	xv	iv. 24—31	190, 193, 206
xxii. 37	79, 89, 100	xxiv. 5	67, 69		
xxiii. 35, 46	115, 323	xxvi. 4, 5	99	<i>Ephesians.</i>	
xxiv. 5	42			ii. 13—16	50, 298, 301
xxiv. 44	133	<i>Romans.</i>		iv. 4—12	168, 173, 175
		iii. 4	324	iv. 26	334
<i>St John.</i>		iii. 10—18	314		
i. 29, 36	89, 105	iii. 26	77	<i>Philippians.</i>	
i. 47	66, 69	iv. 25	89	ii. 5—11	88, 101, 184
ii. 17	241	v. 18, 19	77	iv. 11, 13	279
iii. 14, 15	119, 121	vi. 2—7	302		
iv. 21, 23	217	vi. 23	250	<i>Colossians.</i>	
v. 7	8	ix. 6—16	147, 195, 325	ii. 20	302
vii. 24	97	ix. 25, 26	196, 326	ii. 23—25	204
vii. 27	23, 97	ix. 32, 33	42	iv. 16	45
vii. 42	53	x. 14—17	88, 90, 295		
ix. 4	8	xi. 2—11	135, 239, 240		
x. 11—19	107, 184	xi. 30, 31	11		

<i>2 Thessalonians.</i>		Page		<i>2 Peter.</i>	
ii. 6	45	x. 1-7.....	176, 181, 311	i. 19.....	
<i>1 Timothy.</i>		x. 10	182	i. 20, 21	
ii. 5, 6.....	299	x. 12, 13.....	24	ii. 22.....	x
v. 17, 18.....	xxx1	x. 19-22	301	<i>1 John.</i>	
<i>2 Timothy.</i>		x. 30	262	iii. 5.....	
iv. 14	261	xi. 19	293, 295	iii. 16	
<i>Hebrews.</i>		xi. 21	335	<i>Revelation.</i>	
i. 5-14.....	24, 164, 319	xii. 10-14	124	i. 7	312
ii. 11, 12.....	124	xii. 18, 22	202	ii. 20	
iv. 7.....	134	xiii. 8	124	v. 1	
iv. 8, 9	135	<i>James.</i>		v. 5	5
v. 5, 6	25, 27, 159	i. 8	338, 339	v. 6	106
vi. 13-18	297	i. 17	xxx1	v. 8, 9.....	
vii. 1-3	25, 98	iv. 8	338, 339	xi. 8.....	
vii. 21-28	25, 77	<i>1 Peter.</i>		xiii. 18	
viii. 6-13	285	i. 10-12.....	45	xiv. 5	
ix. 11-14	285	ii. 3.....	124	xvii. 5.....	
ix. 15-23	286, 295	ii. 8.....	42	xviii. 3-8	268
ix. 28	100	ii. 10	326	xxi. 3	
		ii. 18, 19.....	105	xxii. 12	
		ii. 22	89		
		ii. 24, 25.....	88, 89		
		iii. 10-12	124		

INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

- Abraham, his meeting with Melchizedek, 25; his two wives, 193, 203; catholicity of the promise to, 220; its twofold confirmation, 291, 297; Christ the SEED of, 218.
- Agast, usages of the word, 75, 125.
- Albam, xxv.
- Allegory, xv, xvii. See *Hagar, Philo.*
- Annunciation, the, 41.
- Ark of the Covenant, its procession from the house of Obed-Edom to Mount Zion, 20, 171, 172.
- Ascension, the, 174.
- Assyrian invasion, predicted by Isaiah, 33, 35; by Micah, 50.
- Athbash, xxv.
- Atonement, and Satisfaction (Jowett), 280; day of, 294.
- Babylon, called *Sheshach*, xxv; substituted for Damascus by St Stephen, 223; the curse of, 268; called *virgin*, 344; the fall of, 344.
- Baptism, of John, 22; varying acc^t of the, 118; symbolism of, 302.
- Bethlehem Ephratah, 49; Rachel ried near, 50.
- Blood, of a Testament, meaning 283; of sprinkling, 299, 304; purifying effect not primary, the efflux of 'blood and water,'
- Cabbalistic speculations, xxiv, their origin, 202.
- Captivity, Psalms of the, 113, 234; the spirituality of religion taught by, 177; predicted by Amos, 209; its typology, 239.
- Charity, a condition of imperfect 266; its power, 271; the growth 272; its relation to knowledge, 275.
- Chiun, a noun substantive, 210; changed to Remphan?, 222.
- Christ, the Physician, 2; greater the Temple, 6; His lament

- Jerusalem, 11; His origin mysterious, 23, 26, 97; His sacrifice final, 24, 182; His priesthood, 25, 305; His settlement in Capernaum, 56; called from Egypt, 59; a Nazarene, 66; His Divinity, 100, 165; the second Adam, 102, 303; the Redeemer, 104, 109; the Lamb of God, 105; the good Shepherd, 107; His throne for ever, 165; like Moses, 215; the Mediator, 295.
- Citations, inexactness of, xxi; their contexts disregarded, xxviii; authorship of, 129, 135; abruptly introduced in Hebrew, 75, 227; latent, 88, 336; arguments from styles of citation, 322. See *Formula*.
- Covenant, of God with Abraham, 291; symbolism of, 292; various forms of, harmonized, 300, 304; the old, done away in Christ, 333.
- Crucifixion, narrative of the, 114, 323.
- David, last words of, 20; his relation to the Messiah, 21; a name of the Messiah, 52, 153; the sure mercies of, 128; the Prophet, 142; Psalms of, 18, 133, 184.
- Egypt, the flight into, 59; the idols fall before Christ, 65; Israel's election in, 64.
- Enemies, destroyed by charity, 265; why to be forgiven? 266.
- Ethics, Christian and Jewish, 260; practical and ideal, 267; originality of Christian, 276.
- Formulae of citation, xi; indefinite?, xiii; Rabbinic, xiv; classical, 72; remarks on special, 134. See 57, 70, 116.
- Future state, its relation to ethics, 272.
- Good Shepherd, the, 107.
- Gospel, before the Law, 218; one in principle therewith, 262; genuineness of St John's, 323; Apocryphal Gospels quoted, 64.
- Hagar, St Paul's allegory of, 193; Philo's, 203; interpretations of the word, 199; to be omitted in Gal. iv. 25?, 198, 205.
- Hebrew text, preservation of, xxii; its letters counted, xxii; wilfully corrupted?, xxiv, 327; Masoretic, xxiii; ante-Masoretic, xxvii.
- Hellenistic dialect as vernacular, 318.
- Hezekiah, not Immanuel, 37; thought to be the Messiah, 39; not the subject of Ps. xxii., 110; his hymn, 140.
- Hillel, on the Messiah, 39; anecdote of, 277.
- Immanuel, prophecy of, 28, 50; land of, 34; titles of, 36.
- Imprecations, in the Psalms, 224; in the New Testament, 261, 271.
- Incarnation, indistinctly foreseen, 45; symbolized by the covenantal sacrifice, 293.
- Infancy, formulæ describing, 33; Gospel of the, 64.
- Innocents, murder of the, 56.
- Isaac, the child of promise, 193. See *Resurrection*.
- Jonah. See *Resurrection*.
- Josiah, public lamentations for, 140.
- Judas, the guide to them that took Jesus, 242; the Scripture how applicable to?, 256.
- Knowledge, of God, 12. See *Charity*.
- Lamb, of God, 105; the Paschal, 107, 294; different words for, 322.
- Maher-shalal-hash-baz, not Immanuel, 30.
- Matthias, ordination of St, 257.
- Mediation, its primary meaning, 296; implies *inclusion* not *intervention*, 299; of Moses, 299, 304; of Christ, 280, 301.
- Melchizedek, a type of Christ, 26.
- Messiah, birthplace of, 52; his relation to David, 21; the Branch, 35, 70; the suffering, 74; the servant of the Lord, 82, 102; popular conception of, 71, 86; expected prematurely, 39. See *Shiloh*.
- Messianic, interpretations of the Old Testament, xvii; ideal, xxxiv; hope of David, 19; interpretation of Is. vii., 35; of Is. liii., 78; Psalms, 22, 113, 154. See *Rashi*.
- Michtam, the meaning of, 136; compared with Michtab, 140; Psalms designated, 141.
- Moloch, an incorrect rendering, 210; worshipped in the wilderness?, 212.
- Nazarene, derived from Netser, 67; meaning of, 69.
- Old Testament, nomenclature of its

- books, 133; imprecatory language of, 260.
- Parable, definition of a, xxxiv; of the Tares, 272; of the Prodigal Son, 287.
- Philo, as an allegorist (Jowett), 187; on the brazen serpent, 121; his allegory of Hagar, 203.
- Predestination, 243.
- Prophecy, its relation to history, xxxi; of Immanuel, 28, 50; its Messianic interpretation, 35; of Shiloh, 40, 51; lost, 45; unwritten, 70; unconscious, 23, 149; double sense of, xxxiv, 149.
- Proverbs, teaching by, xxxii.
- Psalms, titles of, 177; non-natural interpretation of, 113, 269, 273; written for congregational use, 116; coextensive with Hagiographa, 133; the monumental, 136. See *Captivity, David, Imprecations, Messianic, Type*.
- Qab w'Naql quoted, 129, 337.
- Rachel, weeping for her children, 53; her sepulchre, 55.
- Ramah, 55.
- Rashi, on the Messianic interpretation of the second Psalm, xvii.
- Remphan, not mentioned in the Hebrew, 311. See *Chiun*.
- Resurrection, Christ's, predicted by David, 147; Ps. ii. 7 applied to?, 157; typified by Jonah, 165; (symbolical) of Isaac, 293; the general, 329.
- Righteousness, manifestation of God's, 237.
- Sabbath, 4, 6.
- Sacraments, symbolism of, 300, 301.
- Sacrifice, contrasted with mercy, 1; with obedience, 181; teaching of captivity with respect to, 177; spiritual meaning of, 106; the symbolism of, 280; its representative nature, 122, 294, 302. See *Wilderness*.
- Sanctuary, a type of heaven, 170, 284; saying of Rashi upon, 170; God dwells in, figuratively, 171, 217; Ark removed to, 20, 172.
- Scripture and Science, 131.
- Septuagint, as a medium of citation, xix, 306; wilful corruption of, 307, 313; inspiration of, 308; why generally adopted in citation, 309; non-Septuagintal citations, 312, 331; assimilated to the New Testament, 314; to the Hebrew, 317; its double renderings, 317, 328; its theological importance, 319.
- Serpent of brass, 119.
- Shiloh, prophecy of, 37, 40; Messianic, xxv.
- Signs, four kinds of, 44.
- Spiritual language at first typical and pleonastic, 154; spiritual interpretations, xxxii, 98, 150.
- Stephen, apology of St, 215; its effect on St Paul, 222.
- Temple, not built till Solomon's time, 217; cleansing of the, 241.
- Testament. See *Will*.
- Traditional exegesis, value of, xv, xvii.
- Type, the word, xxix; spiritual ideas expressed by types, xxxiv; typical characters in the Psalms, 113, 170.
- Vail, of Christ's flesh, 301; on Moses' face, 333.
- Virgin, the, 45; meanings of the two words translated, 341.
- Wilderness, the forty years in, 214; sacrifice not offered in, 212; but in what sense?, 213.
- Will, the idea classical and non-Biblical, 287, 289; inappropriate in Heb. ix, 285; and subversive of the argument, 289.

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS AND PHRASES.

	Page		Page
ἀκοή.....	91	κατάνυξις.....	240
ἀλληγορούμενα.....	191, 206	κεφαλαί.....	xxvii
ἀμνός.....	322	κληρονομήσει πολλοὺς.....	77, 104
ἀνθρακας πυρός.....	263	κληρονομία.....	288
ἀνθ' ὧν κατώρχησαντο.....	313, 322	κρίσις ἤρθη.....	96
ἀνίστημι.....	158	μεσίτης.....	296
ἀρπαγμός.....	101	Ναζωραῖος.....	66
αὐτάρκεια.....	279	ὁδὸν θαλάσσης.....	57, 72
γενεά.....	98, 123	ἄξις.....	117, 234
γεννώσα.....	206	ὀργίξεσθε.....	334
διαθήκη.....	283, 289	ὅτι ἐν Χριστῷ καταργεῖται.....	333
διὰ στόματος.....	134	ὅτι κατηριθμημένος ἦν.....	148, 255
διαφθορά.....	145	ὅθ'.....	67
δίψυχος.....	339	περιθεὶς ὑσώπῳ.....	118
ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν.....	103	πίστις.....	321
ἐγκαταλείψει εἰς.....	146	Ῥαυφάν.....	222
ἐδει πληρωθῆναι.....	256	σκολίδς.....	338
ἐδωκεν δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.....	167	σπέρμα.....	218
εἶδε διαφθοράν.....	147	στηλογραφία.....	136, 140
ελικρινὴς.....	339	σῶμα.....	176, 311
εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον.....	186	τὰ δσια Δαβίδ.....	129
εἰς νίκας.....	330	τὸ γὰρ Ἄγαρ.....	175, 198, 205
ἐκκλίνοντες ὀπίσω.....	317	τὸ δὲ ἀνέβη.....	175
ἐμεσίτευσεν ὁρκῷ.....	297	τὸν δσίων σου.....	129
ἐν τῷ αἵματι.....	300	τόπος.....	327
ἐν τῷ τόπῳ οὗ ἐβρέθη.....	326	τὸ ρηθὲν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν.....	70
ἐν Χριστῷ.....	279, 301	τότε ἐπληρώθη.....	xii, xiii, 72
ἐξ Αἰγύπτου.....	64, 73, 313	χολή.....	117
ἐξουθενώθη.....	79	χρόνῳ τῷ ζῶντι.....	325
ἐπὶ νεκροῖς.....	295	ψεύστης.....	324
ἐστὶν ἔχοντα.....	204	ψυχὴν τίθημι.....	109
Ζωφασημὶν.....	67	ὠργίσθησαν.....	335
ἡγεμόσιν.....	53	ὥσεί περιστεράν.....	118
ἡ παρθένος.....	45, 341	ὦτια.....	176
ἵνα πληρωθῇ.....	xiii, 58, 73		
κἀλαμος.....	118		

INDEX OF HEBREW WORDS AND PHRASES

Page		Page	
331	אהי	163	זדים
179, 183	אונים כרית לי	325	
77, 104	אחלק לו ברבים	48	ח
337	איש ואיש	48, 103	
337	איש וזר	47	
162	אלהים	134	
166	אלהים אלהיך	169	נות באדם
32, 47	אם לא תאמנו	236	
129, 170	אמת	232	
232	אנושה	72	
346	אניה	17	
141	בני אדם	252	
53	באלפי יהודה	136	
117	בברותי	145	
342	בתולה	67, 75	
331	דבר	345	
346	דרך	134	
334	האמנתי כי אדבר	17, 335	המטה
180, 185	הנה באתי	247	
211	ונשאתם	51	זיות
218	זרעים	17, 117, 235	
144	חסידך	xxvi	
10	הפץ חסד	145	
13	חצבתי בנביאים	252	
75, 125	יוה	129	
229, 242	יספרו אל	146	
146	כבודי	30, 46	ופני
210	כוכב אלהיכם		