was wrapt round with scarlet wool to  
make it absorb the blood, being tied with  
the same wool to a staff of cedar-wood to  
keep it stiff. On *hyssop* itself, there are  
various opinions. The most approved  
makes it to be a plant growing on walls,  
‘hyssopus officinalis,’ with small lancet-formed woolly leaves, about an inch long,  
a knotty stalk from 1 to 1 ½ foot high,  
with blue [sometimes white] flowers), **he  
sprinkled both the book itself** (nothing is  
said of this in Exod. xxiv. The book is  
of course that out of which he had just   
read the ordinances of God. If, as Stier  
supposes, Moses took the book [Exod.  
xxiv. 7] from off the altar where it was  
lying when he sprinkled the altar with  
blood, then the book was sprinkled likewise: but nothing in the text of Exodus  
implies this), **and all the people** (of course  
the words *all the people* are not to be  
taken to mean that he sprinkled every individuals; but merely the whole mass, as  
they stood), **saying, This is the blood of  
the testament** (in Exod. xxiv. 8, *“Behold  
the blood...”* It has been suggested,  
that the change has been made by the  
Writer after the tenor of the New Test.  
inauguration of the testament by our  
Lord, “This cup is the New Testament  
in my blood,” Luke xxii. 20) **which God**(in Exod. xxiv. 8, *“the Lord;”* Jehovah:  
changed apparently to preserve more completely the Old Test. character of the  
saying) **commanded in regard to you** (it  
is much disputed, how the logic of this  
passage can cohere: seeing that how properly soever the latter *diatheké* may be  
spoken of and argued on as being a testament, the former one could have no such  
character, and consequently cannot be thus  
argued on. And the question is very variously answered according to the standing point of different Commentators. The  
matter seems to stand thus. The word  
*diatheké* has the double sense of a covenant  
and a testament. Both these senses may  
be applied to both *covenants:* to the latter  
more properly belongs the testamentary  
sense, but to the former also in as far as it  
was typical of and foreshadowed the other.  
In the latter, all is clear. Christ, the heir of all things, has bequeathed to us His  
people an everlasting inheritance ; has died,  
sealing the testament with His blood. In  
the former all this is formally, though inadequately represented. The *inheritance,*  
faintly shadowed forth by temporal possessions, had yet a recognized blessed meaning far beyond those possessions: the testator was imperfectly, but still was formally  
represented by the animals slain in sacrifice: *there* was a death, *there* was a  
sprinkling of and sealing by blood: and  
surely it requires no more stretch of  
concession to acknowledge the victim in  
sacrifice to represent the Lamb of God in  
his sonship and his heritorship, than it  
does in his innocence and propitiatory  
power. The one idea is just as poorly  
and inadequately set forth by it as the  
other. But in both cases there is an  
inheritance, and in both it is the same.  
In both it is bequeathed: in the latter  
actually by One who has come in person  
and died: in the former, only typically, by  
the same One ceremonially present. So  
that, if our **whence** in ver. 18 were to be  
filled up, it would be, “Whence, i.e. since  
the former covenant also had its testamentary side, and thus was analogous to as well  
as typical of the latter.”

The charge  
brought against the Writer on account of  
his transition of meaning in *diatheké*, is  
equally without foundation. He is thinking  
in Greek. In Greek, the word has these  
two meanings: not divided off from one  
another by any such line of demarcation  
as when expressed by two separate words,  
but both lying under one and the same  
word. What more common, or more  
ordinarily accepted, than to educe out of  
some one word its various shades of meaning, and argue on each separately as regards the matter in hand? Take the very  
word “Testament ” as an example. In our  
common parlance it now means a *book;*  
the *Old Testament*, the book of the former  
covenant, the *New Testament*, the book of  
the latter. But we do not therefore sink  
the other and deeper meaning; nay, we  
rather insist on it, that it may not become  
lost in that other and more familiar one.  
I cannot see how the Writer's method of