

and roughen and dehumanise our race. The other object has been to direct attention to the truth which points out what the standard of education is which we should adopt for our daughters. If their minds are as valuable as those of our sons, if they are designed to be helps meet for men, if they are the mothers of the mental and moral man, then they should have the advantage of a discipline no less thorough, a culture no less deep, and acquisitions no less extensive and substantial, than we seek for the ruder sex. To move good men to provide to the utmost for the accomplishment of woman, needs only that the way be pointed out. For they agree in declaring to them—

“Ye are stars of the night, ye are gems of the morn,  
 Ye are dew-drops whose lustre illumines the thorn;  
 And rayless that night is, that morning unblest,  
 When no beam in your eye lights up peace in the breast.  
 And the sharp thorn of sorrow sinks deep in the heart,  
 Till the sweet lip of woman assuages the smart.  
 'Tis hers o'er the couch of misfortune to bend  
 In fondness a lover, in firmness a friend ;  
 And prosperity's hour, be it ever confessed,  
 From woman receives both refinement and zest,  
 And adorned by the bay or enwreathed with the willow,  
 Her smile is our meed, and her bosom our pillow.”

#### ARTICLE V. WHAT WERE THE CHERUBIM ?

In answering this question with perhaps a novel theory, we shall say but little of other theories, and present our own as briefly as possible, consistently with clearness and force, making free use of Fairbairn's Typology (sixth edition.)

The Cherubim were a symbol and type of the person and work of Christ. Let us substantiate this view by the following considerations :

I. The first is only presumptive ; still, if we mistake not, is strong of its kind, and is this : the design and the nature of the

system of symbols and types, as used in the development of revelation, would lead us to expect to find some comprehensive symbol and type of the person and work of the promised Messiah. If this comprehensive type be not found in the Cherubim, it is no where found.

It was evidently God's method, in revealing to man the plan of redemption, at first to propound to our first parents a grand central truth (Gen. iii. 15); and then, by a progressive development, to evolve therefrom the whole system of revelation. Why he chose this method and gave to the world the Book of his revealed will as the result of four thousand years' growth, rather than to present it finished and complete to our first parents we do not here inquire; suffice it at present to observe that he did choose this method.

A striking characteristic of this chosen method was that the truth first revealed, if clearly understood and practically received by the hearer, prepared the way for the truth to be next revealed. This, in its turn, prepared the way for the next, and so on until the whole was revealed. This characteristic evinces at once the divine wisdom displayed in the appointment of symbols and types to be daily used during all the first periods of revelation. For the symbol being a visible representation of a truth already revealed, its use enabled the believer more clearly to apprehend such truth ; but the clear apprehension of the truth revealed, prepared the mind for the reception of some coming truth. Thus the symbol indirectly aided in the development of revelation. The type aided directly; for it was the visible representation of the truth to be revealed in future. Therefore, concerning the use of symbols and types as aids to revelation, we may safely conclude—

(1) That if any specially important truth was in future to be revealed, such truth would, if possible, be typified;

(2) The more nearly related any truth already revealed stood to any important one yet to come, the more certain was it to be symbolised; and hence,

(3) If, at the beginning, the germ of a great central truth were revealed, which was by future revelation to be developed in differ-

ent lines of doctrine, and these were to converge again to the corresponding grand fundamental truth, we should surely expect to find the first (i. e., the germ to be unfolded) set forth in a symbol; and the second (i. e., the corresponding central doctrine to be evolved from the germ) set forth in a type, and the symbol and type to be identical. That Gen. iii. 15 was such a germ, all agree. That it was designed to develop in the manner above stated, into the great central doctrine of the cross, facts have proved. But where is the comprehensive symbol and type setting forth each ? According to received views, the only symbol and type for ages possessed was the bloody sacrifice, which set forth in symbol and type “the shedding of blood for the remission of sins.” It is granted that this was one fundamental truth ; yet it was evidently not the only one, for it was simply one of several other equally important ones. It will be readily seen to have been only a part of one of those deductive lines of doctrine through which the germ was to be developed. Therefore it was not the only, nor even the most important, truth at that time revealed. Why, then, should that alone be honored with a symbol and type ? The predicted fact of the incarnation stood antecedent and paramount to it. How ill does this accord with the chosen method for revealing truth ! The whole gospel (Gen. iii. 15) was greater in every sense than any of its parts ; and yet here is one of its parts (the heel-bruising) exalted not only above all the other parts, but also above the whole, by being the only one kept before the mind of the worshipper in symbol and type. On such a plan might not men, after lapse of time, be led by their form of worship away from the truth, and forget all the other functions of the promised Saviour, save the shedding of his blood ? If it be said that symbols and types of his kingly and prophetic offices were afterwards given, the irrefutable reply is, (1) What could guide the faith of those who lived and died before these new types were added ? and (2) How could men understand that the bleeding sacrifice, the Priest, the Prophet, and the King, should all be found in one and the same person, if they only saw the lamb as sacrifice, Aaron as priest, Moses as prophet, and David as king ? Here the diversity of types would mislead, unless

preceded and accompanied by a comprehensive type, in which all were joined.

But bear in mind the germinant nature of revelation having Gen. iii. 15 for the germ, and remember the use of symbols and types in developing revelation, and consider the Cherubim as a symbol of Gen. iii. 15, and the type of the person and work of the Messiah, and you will perceive in the chosen method of revelation a beautiful symmetry not otherwise to be seen. Thus, the whole gospel is first propounded in the comprehensive germ. Thenceforth, as God sees fit, truth after truth is evolved, until we behold the full-grown tree of revelation, grown from that one acorn of truth. Of this acorn-like truth, a wonderfully appropriate symbol is given, illustrating all the essential parts of the protevangelism, and therefore at the same time constituting a striking type of the person and work of the promised Seed. And as truth after truth is evolved and elucidated, the system of symbols and types is enlarged *pari passu*, which is accomplished, as far as possible, by unfolding the central type, that being all the while preserved in order that the unity of the Mediator's person and work may not be obscured by the multiplicity and diversity of types necessary to the setting forth of the different phases thereof.

That the Cherubim did constitute such a comprehensive symbol and type, we now proceed to argue affirmatively from the names applied, the forms, the positions, and the agencies ascribed thereto. We shall see that in each respect what was said of the Cherubim, appertained preeminently to the promised Seed, and was well calculated to point to some truth concerning his person or work.

II. Let us first examine the names applied to the Cherubim.

It is said that a hopeless obscurity hangs over the term "Cherubim," which was the first term by which this object was designated, and that we can therefore see no appropriateness in the application of this particular name.

When we reflect, that significant names were at that time almost universally employed, and that such usage nicely corresponded to, if it did not really spring from, the then existing circumstances, it seems incredible that this term, applied as it was to that which

was so important and was to be used till time should end, should have been wanting or obscure in significance. An erroneous idea of the object named might greatly obscure the appropriateness of the name; but we can hardly believe that the name lacked significance. The following derivation (see Gesenius) gives a meaning very appropriate, if the Cherubim was what this thesis claims. כְּרוּבִים is equivalent to קְרוֹב (a derivative of קָרַב to draw near.) כְּרוּבִים signifies, therefore, “the ones near.” As applied to the wonderful object placed at the east of Eden, it would indicate nearness, or the ones near to God, for Eden was God’s earthly dwelling-place; it was there that Adam had enjoyed daily access to God ; and driven from Eden man had been driven from God. That, therefore, which stood just outside the garden eastward in the way by which man had been expelled, might well be called “the ones near” to God. If Eve was taught to see in the Cherubim a type of the promised Seed, there was surely rich comfort to her in the very name by which she was taught to call it, for it signified that he, the promised Seed, should dwell near to Jehovah. The appropriateness of this name to the type of Christ is too obvious to need remark.

Another term afterwards applied to this type was in the Hebrew חַיִּים. The corresponding Greek term is ζῶα. The true rendering of each is “the living ones,” or “the living creatures.” These terms are applied to this object by the prophets Ezekiel and John. If the Cherubim was intended to represent the person and work of the promised Messiah, this name, indicative of a plenitude of life, was peculiarly appropriate, for as the Father had life in himself, so he gave to the Son to have life in himself (John v. 26). See also John xi. 25; 1 John i. 2. These and many other passages show beyond doubt the appropriateness of applying a term denoting life, or plenitude of life, to the type of the promised Messiah. He who was to be revealed as the fountain of life might well be called “the Living One.”

There is still another term which was applied to this symbolical representation, for, as Fairbairn clearly shows, that which Isaiah (vi.) saw in his vision was the Cherubim. Isaiah called

them the Seraphim (i.e., “the burning ones”). Examine the passage and you will perceive at once the appropriateness of this new name. The feature of God’s dealing with his people presented in this vision is his vindictive justice. Hence the attributes most prominently displayed are holiness and justice. The promised Messiah was to have to do with distributing justice and displaying the holiness of Jehovah. Hence as the type is seen engaged in this feature of his work, it is given the appropriate name of “*Seraphim*” (burning ones).

Here we would observe that if there was given a symbol of the truth taught in Gen. iii. 15, and that symbol was the type of the fully developed gospel as it was to be seen centred in the cross, then not only would there be, during the development of revelation, the addition of particular symbols and types illustrating the different lines of deduced truth, but we might surely expect some progressive use of the central and comprehensive type. This will be seen to have been strikingly true of the Cherubim, considered as such a symbol and type. While it will appear more evident as we proceed, still it is to be clearly seen in the meaning of the names applied. For a long while the only name applied was “Cherubim,” indicating simply nearness to God. Afterwards, when by the development of revelation it was or might be known that the Messiah was to administer justice, the term Seraphim was applied. Then, when it was or might be understood that he was to be the Fountain of Life, the type is called “the Living Creature.”

Before passing from this part of the discussion, we must remove an evident and seemingly forcible objection. It has been asked, “Why should plural types (Cherubim instead of a Cherub) at the same time and place represent a single Messiah ?” The irrefutable reply is, (1) that the nature of the case demanded just exactly this seeming incongruity. For in that single Messiah there was to be a plurality of natures, and of his work there was to be a multiplicity of parts, and some of these essential parts so diverse, that they should seem to be incompatible, e. g., he, a holy One, was to die for sin, and yet not see corruption. If, therefore, revelation was to make known a plurality in unity

in the person and work of the Messiah, of course there must be a plurality in unity in the typesetting him forth. (It will be shown under the next head that Scripture clearly teaches the *unity* of the Cherubim.) And, of course again, the type being plural, the name would be so too. But (2), if this objection has any force against the Cherubim as types of Christ, it must apply with far greater force against other types which inspiration tells us were types of him and his work. Aaron, Moses, and the bleeding sacrifice, were all at the same time and place types of Christ. Here there is not only a plurality, but a plurality without indicating unity, and such a plurality as must, if not strongly guarded, indicate diversity. Let the plurality of the natures in Christ, and the multiplicity of the parts of his work be remembered, and there will be clearly seen a necessity for *plural* types, and also great beauty in such a compound type as is here argued for. Here it may be well to remove another objection which has been made to the theory of this thesis, viz., If the Cherubim were a type of Christ and his work, why were other types, such as Moses, Aaron, David, etc., afterwards added? The evident and just reply is this: they were added more fully to predict specific parts of the truth. The whole plan of salvation was proclaimed in Gen. iii. 15. Still, this comprehensive germ was to be unfolded by the revelation of many details of the work. The comprehensive type was therefore given to elucidate the comprehensive central truth, and individual types were afterwards appropriately added to elucidate deduced parts of the truth. This is in strict keeping with the acknowledged design of symbols and types as aids to revelation.

III. Let us next consider the forms ascribed to the Cherubim. Until we come to the prophecy of Ezekiel we find very little mention made of the form of the Cherubim. It is everywhere spoken of as something with which the Jews were entirely familiar. It is, however, very clear that the appearance was that of a man with the heads or faces of certain animals joined to it. It is also evident that there was some variety of form. Sometimes the heads of three animals are seen, at other times there are only two. The animals chosen are not in every case the same. Fairbairn shows that there were two points of universal agree-

ment: (1) The predominating appearance was in every case that of a man; and (2) in every case there was the union of two, and only two, different natures, viz., rational and animal. He justly infers that these are two essential features. It was not an accident that these two features corresponded so exactly to the two prominent features in the promised Seed. He was to be in appearance a MAN, and yet he was to have, united in himself, two, and only two, distinct natures; for he was to be "God and man in two distinct natures and yet one person forever." A seeming difficulty here is that the divine nature seems to have been symbolised by the animal nature. But observe, the design of the type was not to show the essence of the nature to be joined in the person of the Redeemer to the human nature, but simply to show the junction of two, and only two, natures in the one person. More than this could not be aptly set forth, for nothing material and created could aptly represent the uncreated and divine nature, even had it been desirable to give to man an image of this. It may be that the excellency of the divine nature was hinted at by the selection of the best from among the animals. But if the worshipper (Abel, Noah, or Moses) would only get clearly these two ideas, that the Messiah was to be man and more than man, then there could be no danger of mistake as to the kind of nature to be joined to the human, for man's conscience told him that the circumstances of the case demanded some nature superior to his own, and didactic revelation everywhere taught that the Saviour should be divine.

Further, this theory explains very clearly why those particular animals were chosen. As revelation unfolded, it became known that the incarnate Saviour should offer himself a sacrifice for sin, should rule as a king, and with divine swiftness and omniscience move among human affairs as the providential Disposer. These different aspects of his work were to the greatest possible extent indicated by the animals chosen: the ox representing the sacrifice, the lion representing the king, and the eagle representing his providential agency. Many types, afterwards added, appear to have been developed from this central one. (An extended examination will show that this theory, more fully than



any other, accounts for the selection which was made of animals to be parts of the type; still we do not push the inquiry on this point, for it seems, on any theory, to be rather the line for the play of fancy than the direction in which valuable truth is to be found.) But to return to the discussion of the form of the Cherubim. We have seen that its manlike appearance and its two natures, and also the animals selected to constitute parts of it, strongly indicate that it was the symbol and type of Christ. There is another fact concerning its form which still further corroborates this view. We refer to its unity. That it was intended to be considered altogether and as one type cannot be overlooked, if we will notice the representations given of it. In Ex. xxv. 18-20, Moses is commanded to make two Cherubim out of the *same piece* of gold from which the mercy seat was made, and to make them on to, or rather *in*, the ends of the mercy seat. Nor can it be said here that no reference is had to the unity in the command to make them of the same lump of gold of which the mercy seat was made, for why else was this command? It had just been said that the mercy seat was to be made of gold, then added that the Cherubim were to be also of gold, then comes the direction that all be made of the same lump. Turn over to chapter xxxvii. 7, and you see that Bezaleel understood it as we do, for he made both of "*one piece*." In Ezekiel's vision the prophet saw them so joined together and moving with such simultaneousness and concert that the unity is evident. Still, lest some one should fail to perceive the unity, he speaks more than once of the whole structure as constituting one thing, and says twice, "This is the living creature that I saw." True, in many places it is spoken of in the plural and no mention is made of its unity. But if it had been previously declared to be *one type* composed of different parts, then while these parts are being separated in their differing directions (the diverging lines of truth), the plural form may be appropriately referred to without militating against its unity.

Let the fact of its unity be fairly considered, and we need have no difficulty about the plurality afterwards ascribed to it. The truth to be taught was a plurality in unity; *ergo*, we have an ex-

actly analogous case in the Revelation of the great doctrine of the Trinity. God at first declared his *unity* and then set forth his own plurality in unity. There are two other facts concerning the form of the Cherubim—its wings and its eyes. It will at once be seen that there was a striking development made in the use of this type, as to its form. Although we are not told so, still the probability is that, as seen before Eden, it was more like the figures placed in the tabernacle and temple than like the creatures seen in the visions of the prophets. We know that there certainly was this development in form after Moses' time ; for while Moses saw them with wings, they had not the multiplicity of eyes, and were inanimate structures. To the prophets they appeared as living creatures and full of eyes, before and behind, and afterwards as having hands.

We conclude, therefore, that the form of the Cherubim clearly indicates that it was the type of the person and work of Christ ; for it presented to the eye of the beholder the union of two natures in one structure (or creature), and the general appearance of that creature was that of a man. while the whole was so compounded and composed of exactly such parts as that it was fitted to predict the different features of his work. Abel could know that the Saviour should offer himself a bleeding sacrifice, because there in the type was the bullock's head on the man's body ; yet Abel could see that this Seed should not be held by death, for the bullock is only one-fourth part; the other three are there still. The Seed should be King, for there in the type is the lion.

IV. We proceed now to argue, from the positions ascribed to the Cherubim, that in every case, as a symbol and type, it pointed to Christ, because, in every instance, it was placed exactly where, under the circumstances, revelation would lead us to expect such type to be found. Just where the mediatorial work required the Mediator to be, there we find this type.

As first seen, the Cherubim was placed at the east of Eden, or "before the garden, eastward." Evidently it was between man and God, and therefore between man and the tree of life. It stood *in the way*, so that man could not go back to the Eden of bliss unless he passed by this curious structure (or possibly, creature). Jesus said, "I am the way," and, "I am the door; by me,

if any men enter," etc. He has ever stood in the way, and between man and God. Never since Adam sinned has an humble penitent drawn near to God and not gone through Jesus Christ ; and never since Cain has any rebel sinner attempted a new method of approach, who has not found an awe-inspiring obstacle to hurl him back as a thief and a robber ! The exactness of the type here is so remarkable, that it is curious why every one has not always beheld it.

The next position in which the record states that the Cherubim was placed, is that to which it was assigned in the tabernacle. Not to mention the figures painted on the curtains, though the position of these too is best explained on this theory, we will perceive at a glance that the position of the Cherubim placed over the mercy seat, and joined to it, is exactly the position in which we should expect to find the type of Christ. Where has he ever been found, save hovering over the mercy seat ? He not only bought it for us with his blood, but keeps it always for us.

"Beneath his shadowing wings' defence,  
We find our only confidence."

Does not this evince new beauty and force in the appurtenances of the Ark ? Within is the holy inviolable law. Above and upon this rests the mercy seat. Into the ends of this, and hovering over it, is the curious representation of the One who bought and preserves this place of safety for his people. And above the mercy seat, but between the Cherubim, hangs the Shekinah. It need not, indeed, it ought not, to be here inquired, why the Shekinah, in addition to the Cherubim, was placed above the ark. For whether the Shekinah was a symbol (or, as we think, the real presence) of the Father, or was the symbol of the Son, it matters not. Since the Son is the same with the Father, and therefore must receive as well as open the way for and present the prayers of his people; since he as God must be reconciled, and as the Son must make the reconciliation, such complexity belongs to the doctrine to be set forth, and therefore must be found in the types used. Recognise this complexity, and then apply the theory here presented to the furniture of the most holy place, and it will stand forth in new light.

Again, there are quite a number of passages which can only be fully apprehended on this theory of the Cherubim (see Ex. xix. 4 ; Deut. xxxii. 11; Psalms xvii. 18, etc., etc.; and Matt, xxiii. 37); for they were all written with reference, at least in the wording of them, to this type of Christ. *E.g.*, see Matt, xxiii. 37, in connexion with preceding context. Jesus is about to be slain by men who say that they would not have slain the prophets. He uses two singular expressions in his dreadful rebuke of these true descendants of those who had killed the prophets: (1) "Fill ye up the measure of your fathers," *i.e.*, their iniquity, verse 32; and (2) "that on you may come all the righteous blood," etc., verse 35. Allow us to interpret by the following paraphrase : "Your fathers, standing near by, or in sight of many types of me, your true Messiah, slew the prophets, who pointed them through those types to me. Blinding their own eyes to the types, they slew the righteous ones, who saw the true meaning of the types; and also blinded your eyes to the great Antitype; so that you are, in rejecting me, carrying out what they began. On you is come the fruit of their sin. Poor Jerusalem! through age after age I stood in your heart of hearts with outstretched wings (the wings of the Cherubim above the mercy seat) longing to gather in thy children ; but they would not. Now it is too late."

But to return. We have seen that as placed before Eden and in the tabernacle and the temple, the position of the Cherubim clearly shows that it was intended to be the symbol and type of the person and work of Christ.

The discussion of other positions in which they were placed will be more appropriate under the next head of this thesis.

V. Let us proceed now to examine the agencies ascribed to the Cherubim ; and we are persuaded that the evidence from this source, for this theory concerning the Cherubim, will be found conclusive. Let us again follow the order of revelation and examine these agencies as they were revealed, that we may perceive the progress which was made in the use of the type.

The work assigned to it at first was to keep the way to the tree of life.

At this point we could, on several accounts, sincerely wish  
VOL. XXXIII. NO. 4.—8.

that we were told more of the particulars of the Cherubim as first seen. It was placed there with the naming sword to keep the way, etc. Was the sword held in the hand of one of the Cherubim (or of the Cherub), and by the Cherub turned every way ? Or was the sword seen above the heads of all the figures, and turning of its own accord ? However this may have been, it is evident that it was the Cherubim, and not the sword, which was to keep the way. The sword must have been, as it has ever been, and indeed could only be, the instrument with which some agent was to work. Perhaps, since revelation had not yet declared how burning fiery justice should be administered by the same hand which should bleed with mercy, God saw fit not to place the sword in the hand of the symbol. To have done so at that stage, might have unduly terrified some trembling believer. Still it was evidently the work of the Cherubim to “keep the way of the tree of life.” How clearly the type spoke on this point! It might appropriately have uttered the very words which afterwards fell from the lips of the great Antitype; “I am the way ; . . . no man cometh unto the Father but by me.” See also Rev. i. 18, and iii. 7. The Saviour says that he holds the “keys of hell and of death.” He has ever kept the way to life. For every penitent soul, however weak and trembling, he has kept it securely opened; against every impenitent one since Cain he has kept it closed by the flaming sword of justice. The evidence from this first agency alone is too clear to be misunderstood. As placed in the tabernacle, and afterwards in the temple, but little advanced truth was set forth by the agency ascribed to the Cherubim. This is as we should expect. For from Moses (we might say from Abel) to Isaiah developing revelation had to do chiefly with unfolding the truth concerning the different parts of the work of Christ. The details of his priestly, his prophetic, and his kingly offices were to be given, for the most part, separately. Hence it was fit that the advance in the system of symbols and types during this period should be by the addition of individual types, setting forth those individual and deductive truths ; and very much advance in the use of the comprehensive type was not to be expected. It fulfilled its appointed work, if it

remained as it did, setting forth the unity in plurality of the person and work of the Redeemer, and showing how he stood in the way, and kept the way to God. There was, however, even during that period, some slight advance made in the use of this central type. This we learn by "good and necessary inference" from such passages as Ex. xxv. 22. Here we learn that God would deliver to Moses decrees for the people, as he dwelt upon the mercy seat and above the law and between the Cherubim. Have we not here a typical prediction of 2 Cor. v. 19, where we learn that God dwelt in Christ to reconcile the world unto himself? It was only when sitting on the blood-bought mercy seat that he would allow sin-ruined creatures to draw near to him. Here, then, was the agency of the Cherubim. Made into the ends of the mercy seat, and hovering constantly over it, some advanced light was thrown upon the doctrine of reconciliation (*i.e.*, the keeping the way to life for sinners). Still, during all this long period, while different aspects of the mediatorial work were being revealed, there was but little advance made in the use of the central type. Little, if any, change is seen in the names applied, or in the forms, positions, or agencies ascribed thereto. But when revelation had proceeded in its divergent lines of truth, and declared that to Israel should be given a bleeding sacrifice like the lamb, a priest like Aaron, a prophet like Moses, and a king like David, etc., etc., and the prophets began to see these lines converging again upon one person, and to tell how the same one who "cometh with dyed garments from Bozrah," and has trodden "the winepress alone," shall tread down the people with fury, and bring salvation with his own arm (Is. vi. 3); then the comprehensive type is again needed. It is brought forward, in the visions of the prophets, to throw new light upon that grand central truth which it typifies, and to which all these other lines of truth are to converge. Doubtless Ezekiel had carefully studied the truth set forth by the Cherubim in the temple. The Spirit of inspiration shows him this same wonderful type in a vision. No longer, however, as a mere material and inanimate and motionless structure, but as living creatures, and endowed with such active and untiring energy, filled with such plenitude of life, and per-

forming at its own instigation such agencies, as belong not to created beings, but are prerogatives of the Deity himself.

Let us examine the visions in the order in which they are recorded, and see how clearly the agencies, and sometimes the positions, therein ascribed to the Cherubim, prove it to have been the type of the person and work of Christ.

If the Seraphim seen by Isaiah were the same with the Cherubim (which ought not longer to be doubted), then the first to be examined is recorded in Isa. vi.

In this vision the position in which the Seraphim are seen is not appropriate (if our Version be correct) to any but the Messiah. Redeemed souls and angels stand around the throne, but not above it.

The first acts recorded of these typical creatures are the covering of the face and feet with their wings, flying, and crying "holy," etc. This part of the vision has been so universally understood of angels, that most of us have grown up actually believing that in heaven some (and those, too, the highest orders) of the angels do really veil their faces in the presence of the Deity. Since, so far as we know, this idea is gathered from this passage alone, we would modestly inquire, would other Scriptures lead us to believe that in heaven angels do really veil their faces? The adoring cry of "Holy, holy," would be very appropriate; but would the *highest* order, and that, too, when in a specially favored position, veil their faces? They have never sinned, and therefore never had cause to cover or lower their countenances. Nor should it be said that "thus they indicate their inability constantly to behold divine glory." Were this so, then the arrangement of heavenly hosts would be more propitious to some, if they were not so close to the throne. We hide our eyes from the sun-light when it pains us. Surely God is not like the haughty tyrant, who delights in the lowered countenance of an innocent subject. True, we are taught that holy angels bow before God; but many passages of Scripture expressly teach this, and it is perhaps the most common posture to indicate inferiority simply, and not sinfulness; thus it is among men, but not so with covering the face. Suppose, however, the Seraphim to have repre-

sented the coming One; then this act, as well as all the others, is highly appropriate. Thus the work immediately in hand is the administration of dreadful justice. Judicial blindness is to be visited upon the rebellious Jews. Their covenant-keeping God is to shut out from their eyes the light of saving truth, and this in fulfilment of repeated threats. In Deut. xxviii. 28, 29, it had been said: "The Lord shall smite thee with madness and *blindness* and astonishment of heart, and thou shalt grope at noonday as the blind gropeth in the darkness," etc. Not an infrequent repetition of such threats as this had taught others among the Jews besides David and Isaiah to conceive of God as angrily hiding his face from his people, and thus causing them to wander in darkness.

Now, observe that in Isaiah's day the light of truth was ready to beam brightly. True, the sun was not yet at high noon ; but the morning had far advanced, and now the great and glorious central light was about to burst through the clouds, behind which it had so long been sending forth diffusive light, and to pour down its concentrated rays upon the earth beneath. The holy prophet's humble, faithful, longing heart looked quickly, and before the clouds again gathered, learned his fifty-third chapter and many other precious truths. While, however the Sun of Righteousness is thus ready to shine forth, the people are grovelling in their sins, and unwilling to look at him. He justly determines to darken their eyes, so that when he comes to shine forth in the zenith, and the whole world is to see him, they shall not be able. Under these circumstances, what more appropriate than that the type of Christ should be seen hiding itself, and adoring the holiness of Jehovah ? If a traitor is before his king, to hear his doom, and begins to sue for pardon, and sees his majesty hide his face by holding up the arm covered with the royal robe, and hears him extol the impartial justice of the throne, well may the condemned wretch skulk away, for all is lost.

But further, consider the next act (verses 6, 7). "Then flew one of the Seraphim unto me, having a live coal," etc. Here we have the twofold work of forgiving sin and qualifying man to preach. What creature, save the God-man, ever did either ? It



is worthy of special notice here and at other places, that these Cherubim act as if on their own authority. Angels are *sent*; Christ comes. If the blinded Jews could have understood the type in this vision, they might have understood how the "Son of man should have power on earth to forgive sins." Here we meet again the oft-returning objection, Why the plurality of types or representations ? If the Seraphim represented Christ, who is it seen on the throne ? The answer is the same that has already been given, viz., the nature of the case demanded it. So long as there was a complex work for the Mediator to perform, just so long must there have been a complexity of representation. Pictures can only show one set of features at a time; therefore, if the front and back are both desired at once, there must be *two* pictures.

We shall not turn aside here to show how the different parts of the Mediator's work are in this vision ascribed to the Seraphim, and thus centred on Christ. It is sufficient if it has been shewn, as we think it has, that the agency here ascribed to the Cherubim (Seraphim) was appropriate only to the type of Christ.

The vision next in order is that of Ezekiel (see chapters i. and x). At the very outset we would confess a felt lack of apprehension of many parts of this vision, and also of the prophecies of Ezekiel. It may, however, be readily shown that in this vision the Cherubim typifies the person and work of Christ.

The prophet begins by saying (i. 1) that he had seen "visions of God;" not one only, but more than one representation of God. Then he describes the whole, as it had appeared to him. First, a whirlwind coming out of the north ; then a great cloud; then a fire unfolding itself. Recall the scene on Sinai, where the holy law had been given, and reflect that God's design in manifesting himself to Ezekiel at this time, was to show the prophet that the threats made from Sinai had already begun, and should continue, then say what should we naturally expect to find coming out of the cloud and the fire ? Would not such scenery fitly precede Jehovah's appearance, and especially so now, when his coming is to judgment? But what did come next? The four living creatures; and Ezekiel "knew that they were the

Cherubim” (x. 20). Then follows a lengthy specific description of these living creatures ; it is, indeed, so full that it constitutes the greater part of the vision. If it be said that this was the representation of angels, the appropriate attendants of Jehovah, the reply is twofold : (1) That such view is out of keeping both with the prophet’s assertion concerning the visions, and with the visions themselves. Ezekiel says he is going to record, not visions of God and of angels, but more than one representation of God. And then these living Cherubim appear exactly where we would expect to behold one of the representations of God. These creatures constitute by far the greater part of the vision, and beside them there is only seen *one* representation of God. Moreover, there is a connexion between the throne and the creatures far more intimate than other Scripture would lead us to believe exists between God and angels. (2) Most of what is said of these creatures is inapplicable to angels, while some things said are entirely inappropriate. It has been already shown that the new name here applied to the Cherubim, and the new form in which it is seen, strongly indicated that it was the type of Christ. It may be clearly seen that the position and the agencies here ascribed to it, **corroborate** this view.

Only a brief outline of the agencies and the position can here be noticed.

Four living creatures are seen. They are recognised as being the Cherubim, but are now seen under new circumstances, with additional features, and engaged in new and wonderful employment. They stand under the throne which rests on their upstretched wings. Between them is fire and over their heads is a firmament, very like the fire and firmament round and above the throne seen above them. Each one of these creatures is attended by a mysterious wheel. This frame-work of wheels moves always exactly in unison with the creatures, for the spirit of the creatures is in the wheels. The movements of the creatures are self-directed and with divine energy, precision, and power. The noise of their wings is as the voice of the Almighty, and when the noise of their wings is heard, no voice is heard from the throne, above. They take fire from between themselves and give it to

the man clothed in linen (the angel serving) to scatter it over the city. Now let the Cherubim (here called "living creatures") be the type of the person and work of Christ, and the vision is strikingly plain and instructive. Here are two distinct but closely allied representations of the Christ. The living creatures beneath and supporting the throne, represent him as he should be until the end, when he shall have subdued all things to himself. As thus set forth, he is engaged in the administration of providence. His Spirit is in the wheels. He sends out his ministers of judgment or mercy. On the throne he is seen as he shall be when he has finished the work of redemption and comes again in glory. The throne which he will then occupy shall be the purchase of his mediatorial work; therefore it is appropriately seen resting on the wings of the Cherubim. All the details of this vision will be seen to correspond accurately with this view. So, too, the verbal prophecies afterwards given are entirely consonant; for in those prophecies we have an outline of the work of Christ as Head over all things for the Church until the Church is brought home to the heavenly city. We would press the point that the position of these creatures in this vision is entirely incompatible with any other view. The throne of God cannot be appropriately represented as resting (either in its origin or continuance) on any created agency. The Redeemer's throne is to be the purchase of his mediatorial work.

We come now to the last visions in which the Cherubim appear. (Rev. iv. and v.) It is worthy of notice that this type, whatever it was intended to represent, was given to man immediately after the Fall, and *right along with the Protevangelium*; and was kept in use through the whole Mosaic dispensation, and continued under the Christian dispensation, for it is seen in the Apocalyptic visions, and never disappears until the mediatorial work is finished; after which nothing more is heard of it. This fact is very significant.

There is another significant fact. Types are always more difficult of application and clear apprehension before the fulfilment is seen in the antitype than afterwards. If we mistake not, this is strikingly true in the case discussed. This type of Christ's

person and work only becomes obscure when it sets forth those parts of his work which are still but vaguely understood, because they are now transacting or are in future to be transacted.

But let us examine the vision, and we shall find clear evidence on some points, indeed, almost demonstrative proof, that the living creatures appear here again as types of the Mediator. We read, Rev. iv. 6, that these living creatures were seen “in the *midst* of the throne and round about the throne.” Here the proof is almost demonstrative, because (1) the context clearly shows that all other inhabitants of heaven (redeemed souls and angels) are seen in their respective and appropriate positions around the throne, therefore the living creatures do not represent any part of them. (2) Because these living creatures are seen not only around about the throne, but also *in the midst of the throne*. What else can this be than the type of the Messiah? Who else has the privilege or occasion to occupy positions around and in the throne?

Here we must meet two objections: (1) The old one as to a double type. How can the Cherubim and the Lamb represent the same person? This has already been several times answered saying that the nature of the case demanded just such complexity of the type. The Church was yet militant. The wonderful book of God’s providences was yet to be opened. The slain Lamb, the Lion of the tribe of Judah, was to unloose its seals. But the poor struggling saints were also to be guided in their worship, and their prayers poured out as sweet incense before the throne. Hence, while the Lamb opens the book, another type of the promised Messiah is seen at the head, and as the Head of the Church presenting the whole body, and each patient suffering soul, to the throne of the heavenly grace. Such plurality of work called for a plurality of type. Moreover, let it not be forgotten that Moses, Aaron, and the lamb, had long ago been given as plural types of Christ. (2) Another and far more troublesome objection is, that the living creatures are represented as saying to the Lamb (v. 9), “Thou hast redeemed us to God.” How could the type of Christ speak thus? If Tischendorf (8th ed.) has given us the true text of this passage (the late revisers have so

determined), there is no room for the objection, for vs. 9, 10 are found to read thus: “. . . Worthy art thou to take the book and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and didst purchase unto God with thy blood (men) of every tribe and tongue,” etc. So that the creatures are not heard to praise the Lamb for their own redemption. We would not reason in a circle by saying the living creatures were types of Christ, and therefore could not have been heard to praise the Lamb for their own redemption, therefore the revision must be correct, and then claim the revised rendering to substantiate this theory of the Cherubim. Still we do claim justly that whatever evidence has been from other passages adduced in favor of this theory of the Cherubim, does to the same extent establish the revision, and thus aids in proving that which will in its turn constitute good evidence for the theory.

Let us offer in favor of this revision of this passage this further exegetical proof: the expression as given in our Version was not appropriate even for the elders and the redeemed, who were heard to follow the living creatures in this song of praise for redemption. For the book to be opened contained God’s decrees which concerned directly, not the elders and souls already redeemed, but those who were in future to be brought to glory—many thousands of them to come from nations yet unborn. How, then, could the fact that the Lamb had redeemed those already in glory, render him worthy to open decrees concerning others yet to be saved, and the persons most concerned in the book? Nor can it be said that the elders, etc., represented the whole body of redeemed, for the context shows the contrary. But if the decrees in that book were directly concerning those yet on earth, or to come on earth, and whom the Lamb purchased, then surely he was the one worthy to unloose the seals. This, we think, is sound presumption in favor of the revision. If the new reading is correct, then the objection is null.

But even should it be proved that the living creatures did use the language attributed to them, still this would not constitute an insuperable objection to the theory herein contended for. Let it be remembered that while the Church is yet militant, the Saviour

is her Head and Leader, and it will not appear strange that he be represented as leading the saints in a song of praise for redemption. While on this earth he led them in prayer, and taught them to say, "Our Father, which art in heaven, . . . forgive us *our sins*," and yet did not mean to imply that he was a sinner. Why should it be thought incredible, therefore, that he be represented as teaching them to sing a song of redemption appropriate only to themselves? We take it that, as our gracious and divine Teacher, he is doing this very thing in our hearts constantly. This is a part of his work as our Head and Guide. There is, therefore, no force in this objection after all. But to return from these objections to the vision. There is one agency ascribed to the Cherubim which is again well-nigh a demonstration of this view. It is said that the living creatures held in their hands vials full of odors (*the prayers of the saints*), and that they poured out these vials before the throne. Here, surely, is an agency which belongs exclusively to our great Intercessor; and the type is hereby emphatically declared to be the type of Christ. There is not within the lids of Holy Writ any intimation that any one except the Christ ever thus intercedes. It is everywhere declared that he does do thus for his people, and we are taught that this is one of the most prominent phases of his work since his resurrection and ascension. Hence it must be he who is here represented. Utter and dangerous confusion must ensue if any other party or parties be represented as doing that which is so emphatically *his prerogative*.

We have seen, therefore, that the chosen plan of revealing truth by evolving the whole from one germ, and the use of symbols and types in this development as aids thereto, strongly indicates that there would have been given some comprehensive symbol illustrative of the germ, and which should at the same time constitute a type of the person and work of the promised Seed. And that if such symbol and type were given, it was the Cherubim. And, also, that the names applied, and the forms, the positions, and the agencies ascribed to the Cherubim, everywhere clearly indicate that the Cherubim was such a symbol and type.

An article longer even than this might be written contrasting

this theory favorably with others; but if this is established, such an article is not needed.

We shall conclude with the mention and removal of the only other objection which has yet been raised to this view. It may be asked, "If this theory of the Cherubim is correct, why do we not find some use made of it by New Testament writers?" The reply is, (1) The writers of the New Testament did not, at any time, profess to be writers on Typology. They only used the types to further reveal or establish truth. Therefore it was not to be expected that they would expound all the types. Evidently they did not do so. (2) Whether they would or would not make use of any given Old Testament type in elucidation of truth, depended not solely on the fitness of the type to be thus used, but also, and to a great extent, upon the amount of the knowledge on the part of those to whom they wrote or spoke. Paul expressly states this concerning Melchisedec (Heb. v. 11, etc.). Melchisedec would have served a most excellent purpose in Paul's argument, had it not been for the lamentable and dangerous fact of the extreme ignorance of those to whom he wrote. We need not be surprised, therefore, that no mention at all was made of this type, which had not yet met its entire fulfilment in its prototype, and to which the eyes of the Jews had been judicially shut. This type had long ago, even in Isaiah's day, veiled its face with its wings. They could not now see even the Sun himself in his noon-day splendor. No wonder that the blessed Jesus wept as he thought how the same loving wings which would so tenderly have hovered over every self-ruined Hebrew, had to be folded back upon and shut out from their eyes their only Saviour ! May God hasten the day when those wings will unfold, and show to poor perishing Israel the loving face of Immanuel, and spread in divine love and mercy over all nations.

Fly abroad, thou mighty gospel,  
Win and conquer, never cease;  
May thy lasting, wide dominions  
Multiply, and still increase  
Sway thy sceptre,  
Saviour, all the world around.

R. K. MOSELEY.

## ARTICLE VI.

## A CALL TO THE MINISTRY.

Ever since Jesus Christ commissioned his apostles, there have been intruders into the gospel ministry, pretending to a call which they never received. It is to be supposed there are such now, and will be such to the end of the world. Meanwhile, in every age God has his true ministers whom he calls to the work. How are the true to be distinguished from the false? How is the Church to know the men Christ has given to her to be her ministers and his? How is an individual to know whether he in particular is or is not called to be a minister of Christ and his Church? A man may err on either side, may run unsent or refuse to go when commanded. On the one hand, he may take to himself the honor of the ministry, not being called of God; may aspire without divine warrant to the priesthood, like Korah whom God swallowed up in the earth; may touch the ark unbidden and not "after the due order," like Uzzah upon whom God made a deadly breach<sup>1</sup> for this merely uncommanded and therefore unhallowed touch. Or, on the other hand, like Moses, he may be reluctant to obey the call; like Jeremiah, may plead to be excused through excessive diffidence; like Jonah, rise up to flee unto Tarshish from the presence of the Lord and from the commission to go and preach to Nineveh. Upon which side of the question it is the greater error and the greater sin to stray from the right path, who shall undertake to decide? And yet the prevailing tendency in the Church appears to be towards urging young men into the glorious ministry of reconciliation—towards persuading them to undertake the awful care of souls.

It is clear that a call to the ministry must be from God. The Lord of the harvest alone must thrust forth laborers into his harvest. If, when God passed over Israel on the night when the first-born of Egypt's men and beasts were destroyed, he set apart as a memorial of this deliverance the first-born of men and beasts in Israel as sanctified to himself; and if afterwards he exchanged

<sup>1</sup> 1 Chron. xv. 13.