

The Beatitudes & the 10 Commandments - G.V. Growcott

"IT HATH BEEN SAID BY THEM OF OLD TIME... BUT I SAY UNTO YOU..."

The 6 Great Contrasts between Christ's Teaching and that of the Law of Moses
(Matt 5:21, 27, 31-32, 33, 38, 43)

Recent Clapham literature indicates that they have completely lost the picture of Matt. Ch.'s 5-7 as the most powerful and comprehensive and transforming presentation of Christ's glorious new way of life, as contrasted with the Law of Moses, and have now swung right around to regarding these chapters as a defence of the Law of Moses against the traditions of the Pharisees.

Christ, they now say, is not quoting the Law, and then giving his new law: "But I say unto you." Rather (they say) he is quoting the traditions of the Pharisees, and then defending the Law against them. How utterly impossible a theory this is, will be apparent to any who unbiasedly consider these three chapters, especially the six contrasts in Matt. 5:27-43, as we shall see.

In their obsession to get rid of one verse (Matt. 5:32) that destroys their theory, they have lost the living force of the three most beautiful and powerful chapters of the Bible. Truly they speak diffidently about the address having 'present day applications': the 'principles' they say, remain, but there is clearly none of the fervour and enthusiasm about these three chapters that we find in the writings of bro. Roberts and other sound writings on the Truth. There is clearly no perception of the perfect unity of all Christ's life and teachings, of the undeviating, single minded purpose of all his teachings. He was, out of all the ages, as he said in the synagogue at Nazareth, anointed to preach the Gospel of Salvation - to preach it in every act and word and thought of his perfect life, right up to his nailing the law of carnal commandments to the cross in his death.

To 'prove' Christ is teaching and defending the Law and not contrasting it with his own new law, Clapham points to the words: "Think not that I am come to destroy the Law, but to fulfil." (Matt. 5:17) How beautifully true this is, properly understood! The whole Law, every ordinance, every sacrifice, pointed straight to him as its glorious fulfilment. He was everything in reality that the Law in shadow foreshadowed and portrayed. The Law was nothing - meaningless - without him. Truly, he did not come to destroy the Law, any more than the flower 'destroys' the seed, or the blossom the bud.

But he did not come to perpetuate the Law. He did not come to teach the Law. He came to take it away. The Law was old wine in old bottles. The Law was "waxen old and ready to pass away." As soon as he appeared, the Law had fulfilled it's purpose and run it's course:-

"The Law and the prophets were until John: since that time the Kingdom of heaven is preached."

- note the significance in the contrast of what was 'preached' or taught.

"The Law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ."

Throughout, we have the emphasis on this sharp contrast between what had been preached and what was now being preached. In the face of this, can anyone assert that in his most notable address he was teaching and defending the Law of Moses?

Let us perceive the true picture. Let us perceive the sharp deliberate contrast between the old wine and the new. He did not come to destroy the Law, to break it down, to teach a less rigid holiness, but he did come to terminate it, to "take it out of the way", and to nail it to his cross, not to teach it.

Again, those who teach the theory of Christ preaching the Law of Moses in Matt. 5:32, point to his words (Matt 5:19):

"Whosoever shall break one of the least of these commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be the least in the Kingdom."

True indeed! It was the law of the land. And it was the Law of God, still in full force for 3½ more years, and as a national legal code for another full generation. He taught obedience to it, and he obeyed it perfectly himself, even as he did everything perfectly. But in the end, despite his perfect obedience to it and submission to it, it cursed him in his very hour of greatest submission and obedience, to show that it was indeed a "ministry of condemnation".

At the very hour when he was - at the turning point of all the ages - fulfilling in perfect obedience the reality of every shadow sacrifice that had ever been offered under the Law, and in the very act of supreme obedience and sacrifice itself, the Law cursed him, and thereby 'destroyed' itself.

It broke itself upon the impregnable rock of his divinely fortified holiness. The full force of it's curse came upon him, and he suffered it and bore it away.

It had to be removed. It was a barrier to life. It cursed everyone who ever came under it's power, even the perfect son of God himself, and as long as it stood, no one could attain to life - only to cursing and condemnation. I am showing how impossible is this theory that he was ever teaching the Law of Moses.

Truly, the Law was "holy, just and good" (Rom. 7:12). Truly, the Law was "ordained to life" (Rom. 7:10). Truly, it is said, "He that doeth these things shall live by them." But it could not give life, only death..."If there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been given by the law." (Gal. 3:21).

When the Law came on the scene, mankind was already under curse. And the Law, of itself, provided no way of escape from that curse, but rather added to it - doubled the burden of curse upon mankind. The Law required an offering of purification for the very circumstance of birth itself. By that very ordinance, it demonstrated its own inability to give life. It demonstrated that for anyone born of Adamic flesh,

there must be a sacrifice, not a shadowy typical animal sacrifice, but a true sacrifice, even the "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world."

In the very birth of Jesus himself, the Law required that Mary be purified, and that a sacrifice be offered (Luke 2:22-24). Even Christ himself had to be circumcised (Luke 2:21) -the cutting of the flesh. Even Christ himself had to be baptised (Matt. 3:15) - the washing away of sin, the burial unto death: "I have a baptism to be baptised with..."

The great message of the New Testament is the contrast between the Law of Moses, the 'ministration of death and condemnation' (2 Cor. 3:7-9), and the glorious new law of Christ, the 'ministration of righteousness' (vs. 9 - read Romans, Galatians and Hebrews). Christ's glorious "Sermon on the Mount" is not a teaching of the Law of Moses, the "Law of carnal commandments" imposed 'until the seed should come.' He was the seed. The seed had come. He came proclaiming a glorious new law.

This new law did not contradict or violate the law of Moses. Rather it went far beyond it. It was infinitely higher and deeper and broader and more heart-searching in every respect. The Sermon on the Mount is its most beautiful and comprehensive exposition, and right in the midst of this glorious new message we have Matt. 5:32, given in direct contrast to the hard-hearted provision of Moses' Law.

How essential, then, as he began his mission to Israel, as he began to publicly proclaim this Law-superseding, glorious new message of life - how essential that he carefully warn them that he was not come to destroy the Law, but to fulfil! They must understand the true relation of his new wine to the old wine in the perishing old bottles of the law. It was not conflict, but consummation. It was not destruction of the Law, but fulfilment and absorption.

How essential that he solemnly warn against breaking the least commandment of the Law and teaching men so! This was not the way of escape from the Law's burden which "neither they nor their fathers were able to bear."

Jesus came proclaiming liberty, but not licence. In exchange for the death bringing servitude of the Law's external and mechanical bondage, he offered the true freedom of an infinitely more searching and demanding law - a law that required every fibre of energy and zeal and love and devotion that man could ever possess. This was the freedom of complete bondage to holiness - the freedom from the "freedom" of licence and indulgence and sin and at last, death. Paul had to contend with this same danger, and this warning:

"Ye have been called unto liberty, only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh." (Gal. 5:13).

How beautifully this contrast between the external law of carnal commandments and the inward law of Christ is brought out in these six examples that Jesus quotes in Matt. 5:21-42. What a loss when we have to throw them aside - completely reverse their true meaning and deepest teaching, just to get rid of a verse that does not

fit our theories! We look again briefly at the introduction...

"And seeing the multitudes, he went up into a mountain, and his disciples came unto him, and he opened his mouth and taught them, saying..." (Matt. 5:1-2)

We look at 5:3: "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the Kingdom of heaven." Here, in it's fullness, he lays out before us the Gospel of the Kingdom.

"Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted"... "In thee and in thy Seed shall all nations of the earth be blessed."

"Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth."... "Thy Seed shall possess the gates of his enemies"... "All nations shall serve him."

"Blessed are they which hunger and thirst after righteousness."... "As truly as I live, saith the Lord, the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the glory of God."

And so we could go throughout this whole glorious Gospel teaching. Let us then look at the six great contrasts with the Mosaic Law. We shall note that Christ does not contradict the Law. Rather in each case he goes infinitely beyond it's requirements to the eternal principles of which the Law is but the most elementary and partial and external expression.

Contrast No. 1 (from Matt. 5:21).

"Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time." First of all, this word "by" should be "to". This makes it much clearer and more conclusive that he is quoting the Law of Moses. If we retain the "by", it must be in the sense of "by means of" - that is, "God said by means of" the ancients: Moses and the prophets. I have checked this in every version of the Bible I have and every one (except just one of little authority) other than the A.V., uses "to" and not "by": "It was said to them of old time." The list using "to" includes: Revised Version, American Rev. Stan. Rev., Diaglott, Rotherham, Bagster, Nestles, Weymouth, Goodspeed, Berkley, New Century, New English, Basic English, Douay, Geneva, (1560 AD, before AV), Moffatt, Berry, Amplified, Young. I suggest you look them up and convince yourself.

There is no preposition (to or by) in the original, but the article "the" is in the dative case (tois). The dative case is that which indicates the indirect object. "Them of old time" (literally "the ancients" - tois archaiois) is the indirect object here. A "Greek Grammar" (Jays) says...

The dative case is used for the indirect object, and may be translated "to" or "for". That is: "It was said to (or for) the ancients."

I desire to make this conclusive because this makes it even more inescapably clear that Jesus is quoting the Law. To say, "It was said to them of old." And then to directly quote the Law, "Thou shalt not kill:" - surely can mean only one thing, unless we have a theory to defend which requires us to deny the clear meaning.

So in this first case we find Jesus is undeniably quoting the Law, word for word, then contrasting it with his new higher law: "But I say unto you." Check the Clapham rule here - that Jesus is quoting the false Jewish traditions ("Thou shalt not kill") and then explaining the Law of Moses ("whosoever is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgement"). It creates an absurdity. Can anyone believe that in this series of six very parallel contrasts, in some of them Christ is contrasting the traditions of men with Moses Law, and teaching the latter; and in some of them (without any indication of change) he turns right around and quotes Moses' Law and then contrasts his own law with that? What confusion! How would anyone know what to follow?

Contrast No. 2 (from Matt. 5:27).

Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time, "Thou shalt not commit adultery." Again, an obvious and undeniable direct word for word quotation from the Law, followed by: "But I say unto you." Again check the Clapham rule: Jesus is quoting the false Jewish traditions (Thou shalt not commit adultery") and answering them by teaching the Law of Moses ("Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her in his heart"). Again, absurdity.

Contrast No. 3 (from Matt. 5:31).

It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a bill of divorcement," again followed in exactly the same pattern by the direct contrast, "But I say unto you". Even standing alone (but especially in the light of the first two cases and the general background of the whole address to his disciples), how can anyone assert with a straight face that he is just quoting false Jewish traditions, and then teaching the law of Moses?

Now - if he is - let us, just for a moment, just for the sake of the argument, suppose that he is teaching the Law of Moses. We have noted the tremendously searching character of his first two "But I say unto you" pronouncements. They forbid the very inner hidden roots of anger, even though unexpressed; they forbid the slightest inner incipient thought of impurity, calling it adultery (adultery was punishable by death under the law he is supposed to be explaining).

Now this third "But I say unto" must be in harmony with the high spiritual teaching of the first two. We are told by the proponents of this theory that: "A Jew who faithfully and sincerely carried out all the teachings of Christ in this chapter would be fulfilling the precepts of the Law in the way most pleasing to the Father." (Clapham booklet on divorce.).

Note then the dilemma this theory creates. We must interpret Jesus' answer here (as in 1, 2, & later contrasts) as the deepest expression of the true meaning of the Law of Moses, "the spirit behind the Law", we are told. What does Jesus say?

"But I say unto you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of

fornication, causeth her to commit adultery." Now the article tells us elsewhere with great vehemence that whoever took advantage of this was hard-hearted, that God was not pleased, that a man of God would never do this. But here Clapham tells us (and this article is Clapham arguments from Clapham literature) here we are told that a Jew who followed Matt. 5:32 would be "fulfilling the Law (of Moses) in the way most pleasing to the Father."

But getting back to the true meaning in this third case (Matt. 5:31-32). It is quibbled in Clapham literature that vs. 31 is not word for word from the Law of Moses. (Note that contrast one and two are word for word, but they still tell us they are just the false traditions of the Jews). They say here of contrast three...

"These words (Matt. 5:31) will be found nowhere in the Pentateuch. They were tradition."

Now we are dealing with three languages of transmission: Hebrew, Greek and English, and Christ is summarising four verses (Deut. 24:1-4) into one, and yet to any reasonable person it must be perfectly obvious that he is referring to the provision of Deut. 24. There are many quotations from the Old Testament in the New Testament where the wording differs much more than here, but a direct quotation is attributed. Compare Deut. 18:19 with Acts 3:23; Amos 9:11-12 with Acts 15:16-17; Matt. 21:5 with Zech. 9:9 and many many others.

To any reasonable mind, Matt. 5:31 is an obvious reference to, and a correct summary of Deut. 24:1-4. I find no evidence anywhere that anyone has ever questioned this until this new theory was developed. This is strengthened by the same pattern and the same contrast in the very parallel passage in Matt. 19:8-9. There Jesus specifically attributes the permission to Moses.

The Clapham theory, and the theory of this article, has to have Christ teaching the Mosaic Law in Matt. 5:32. If this cannot be established, this theory collapses. We have to believe that Christ, out of the blue sky, without any external questioning or controversy, right in the middle of a planned and systematic teaching of his own disciples - it has to have him, without warning or explanation, introduce as his teaching a precept of the law contrary to his own law, and then again, without warning or explanation, go back to teaching everything that is in harmony with his own law.

And we are warned by this theory that we must of ourselves discern that in this one spot he is teaching contrary to his own law which we must not follow on pain of disfellowship. How can anyone ask us to believe that? What confusion if we can say, right in the middle of any discourse by Christ: "That does not apply to us. We must not follow that: just the verses before and the verses after."

Note too, that this theory tells us that in the other five contrasts, he is bringing out the deep spirit of the Law, well-pleasing to God, and in harmony with his own law, but here, and here alone, he is teaching a precept of the Law of Moses that was displeasing to God even as part of the Law of Moses, and completely out of harmony

with his own law.

Let us follow the pattern of these six contrasts through to further confirm the truth that Jesus is quoting Moses' Law, then giving his own in contrast.

Contrast No. 4 (from Matt. 5:33).

"It hath been said to them of old time, thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths." See Num. 30:2; Deut. 23:21; Lev. 19:12.

Is this the Law of Moses, or the false traditions of the elders? Note for this theory to be true, these cases of "It hath been said" must be false traditions that Jesus is correcting by giving the true teachings of the Law. By this theory, "Thou shalt not kill", "Thou shalt not commit adultery", "thou shalt perform thine oaths" must be false traditions needing to be corrected. Jesus continues in vs. 34...

"But I say unto, Swear not at all...but let your communication be yea, yea and nay, nay, for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil."

Is that a teaching of the Law of Moses in contrast with the false traditions that oaths must be honoured? Did the Law forbid oaths - or did it in some cases require them? Do we have here the Mosaic Law, or do we have Christ's own glorious, new, infinitely higher, never-before-heard-of principles of perfection? No wonder the people "were astonished at his doctrine" - no anger, no first beginning of impure thought, a plain, simple, never-violated Yea and Nay, no resistance to evil, blessing and loving everybody.

Truly in the marvellous wisdom of God we can dimly discern these glorious principles of perfection deep-hidden in all previous Scripture, beginning with the coats that covered Adam and Eve in their sin and shame. And this includes the whole Law of Moses, as everything else. The sacrifices, the ever-present deaths and reminders of death, were the most glorious part of the Mosaic Law. Every sacrifice was an expression of hope, and a promise of peace, and an exhortation to love, if men could but see it.

But we must keep the Law of Moses in Scriptural perspective. It was a "ministration of condemnation" added because of transgressions, "that every mouth may be stopped and all the world be guilty before God." It was a strict penal code, a "ministration of death," necessary to the regulation and control of unregenerated flesh, but of itself powerless to the flesh's reformation and purification. The Law strictly commanded...

"Thou shalt consume all the people which the Lord thy God shall deliver thee: Thine eye shall have no pity upon them." (Deut. 7:16).

"If thy son, or wife, or friend, which is as thine own soul, shall entice thee (to

serve other gods)...thine eye shalt not pity, neither shalt thou spare, neither shalt thou conceal him, but thou shalt surely kill him: thine hand shalt be first upon him." (Deut. 13:6-9)

"Thine eye shall not pity; but life shall go for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth; hand for hand; foot for foot." (Deut. 19:21).

This is the Law of Moses, and we are not under it. Judgement will truly be carried out by God on all wickedness, but not by us in this present dispensation. This "eye for an eye" Law is not a matter, as Clapham suggests, of man "demanding the maximum penalty." It is a matter of faithfully fulfilling the Law of God (like Saul and the Amalekites) that gave the responsible individuals no scope one way or the other: "Thine eye shall not pity." A private individual, faced by the case of Deut. 13:6-9, must carry it out. He could not follow the spirit of the Law and bless and spare the offender. Matt. 5:38 (to which we now come) is the Law of Moses, and not the "false traditions of the Jews."

Contrast No. 5 (from Matt. 5:38).

"Ye have heard that it hath been said, an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth."

In the light of what I have just quoted (Deut. 7:13 & 19) can anyone dare to assert that Jesus is here quoting the false traditions of the Jews, and that in vs. 39 he is teaching the Law of Moses: "But I say unto you that ye resist not evil"? Surely it would be impossible to be more clear that he is quoting the Law of Moses word for word, and then giving by contrast his own new law, for an entirely new dispensation, now being heralded, and very soon to begin. The Law of Moses, of course, presupposed an enlightened nation with righteous rulers and true teachers - a nation centred in the Holy High Priesthood as the supreme court of appeal, and with the immediate presence of God manifested between the Cherubim. This is the essential foundation of the Law of Moses. Conditions were far from this in the days of Christ. Both the Law and the nation were on the verge of death, breathing their last, utterly broken down and corrupted.

Contrast No. 6 (from Matt. 5:43).

"Ye have heard that it hath been said, thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy."

This is the highest and final contrast. Here he leads into Godlikeness and perfection (vs 45-48). Here Christ's law reaches its supreme pinnacle in universal love and benevolence. It is the last and greatest contrast in which the proponents of the new theory believe they have the strongest argument that Christ is condemning the false traditions of the Jews, and teaching the Law.

Their whole argument rests on the word "hate". It is said that the Law never commands "Hate thine enemy", and such precepts of the Law are quoted as "If thou meet thine enemy's ox going astray, thou shalt surely bring it back to him." (Exod.

23:4)

This objection, raised to prove Christ was not talking of the Law of Moses, completely collapses when we note two facts. First, Christ uses this exact same word "hate" (miseo) as a requirement of his own law: "If any man hate not his own father, wife, etc...he cannot be my disciple" (Luke 14:26). No intelligent believer rejects this part of Christ's law, just because it has this word "hate", nor do they have any difficulty in understanding how Christ uses it here to emphasise the complete necessary supremacy of devotion to him.

So if we argue that Christ cannot be referring to the Law in Matt. 5:43 because of this word "hate", then we are reasoning that the Law of Moses was a higher and more loving law than the law of Christ. This, of course, is absurd.

And second, there are many passages in the Law to which the comparison of Christ (love neighbour, hate enemy) can very properly and naturally be applied, as...

"Thou shalt not seek their peace nor their prosperity all thy days forever" (Deut. 23:6) - spoken of the Ammonites and the Moabites.

"Thou shalt smite every male thereof with the edge of the sword." (Deut. 20:13)

"They warred against the Midianites, as the Lord commanded Moses, and they slew all the males." (Num. 31:7)

"Ye shall chase your enemies and they shall fall before you by the sword." (Lev. 26:7)

"Smite Amalek: utterly destroy all: spare not, slay man, woman, infant, suckling." (1 Sam. 15:3 - see Exod. 17:14)

In the light of these passages, how can anyone deny Matt. 5:43 is a clear reference to the Law, just as the previous five were? But it is argued, "That all refer to national enemies, not personal enemies." Very true, but where is the difficulty? How does that help to prove Jesus is not talking of the Law? Jesus does not specify personal enemies. In fact, his contrast here between "neighbours" and "enemies" would point, if anything to group enemies.

The Law of Moses was a narrow, restrictive, national law. It made a distinction of treatment between some people and others, merely on the basis of whom they happened to be ("Love neighbour, hate enemy"). It commanded the destruction of certain enemies.

The Law of Christ sweeps all such distinctions away, and commands universal benevolence, after the example of God who sendeth His rain on the just and the unjust, and who has blessed the wicked and rebellious nations on earth infinitely more than they deserve or appreciate.

GVG The Beatitudes & the 10 Commandments.txt

It does not mean that wickedness will be unpunished, but it emphasises the glorious fact that the present dispensation is one of love and entreaty and blessing and non-resistance, after the example of Jesus himself: "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of: the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them." (Luke 9:55) - See John 3:17.

In five previous places, Christ's quotation of the Law, and contrasting it with his own law, is obvious and inescapable. In this sixth and highest and culminating contrast, there is absolutely no ground for breaking this consistent pattern, and interpreting it otherwise. It would be utterly incongruous.

This was the great new lesson - of sweeping away all barriers and radiating universal benevolence - that his disciples (and we ourselves) find hardest to fulfil. One thing is sure: the more we understand the depths of the teachings of Christ in these three chapters, and the more we live that teaching in our lives, the less we could possibly believe that he is simply explaining the Law of Moses.

The Law of Moses, like the rest of Scripture, truly carried within it the seeds of the law of Christ, but it had certain restrictions and ordinances and principles of action - suited for their own time and circumstance - that were utterly incompatible with the full and universal manifestation of the spirit of Christ's law. So the Law had to be taken away. The enmity had to be taken away. Paul sums it up in saying (Eph. 2:14-16)...

"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."

Surely here is an inspired and inspiring commentary on this sixth and greatest contrast between the Law of Moses and the law of Christ! So the pattern throughout the six is consistent and beautiful, culminating in this last.

Christ is always, with perfect unity and consistency, living and teaching his own new law of life, never the "ministration of death." His life was a perfect, harmonious, single minded entity. Therein lies its irresistible power and beauty. Do this. Find a red letter Bible, and read all Christ's words straight through.

You will be deeply impressed by the utter unity of all he said - always the new wine in new bottles. Never any confusion with the old. Even in cases where he is most directly confronted with the Law of Moses, he goes back beyond and up above it: "Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath?" What is the answer? "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath" (Going back to God's original appointment in Genesis 2:3)

"The Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath." (by whose law, - Moses' or Christ's?)

"It is lawful to do good on the Sabbath" (as applicable today as the moment it was

spoken).

Christ's law reiterated nine commandments, but not the Sabbath. But Christ did not did not "destroy" the Sabbath: he absorbed it - he spread it seven days wide. He made every day a Sabbath, a day of God's work and not our own, every day a refraining from one's own natural interests and desires and advantage.

Let us remember that when they asked him, "Is it lawful...?", they were not asking him to explain Moses' Law. They were quite satisfied they knew that. They were saying, in effect, "We know what Moses said about this: do you say it is lawful to do so and so...? - trying to set him against Moses. Consider again, faced even more directly with the Law...

"Which is the greatest commandment of the Law?"

Again his answer goes earlier, higher, the first law of Eden -

"This is love, that we keep his commandments.... On these two commandments (love God, love neighbour) hang all the law and the prophets."

These were greater, older, higher than the Law. They stood eternally above it's passing carnal commandments "imposed until the time of reformation". The Law simply was a temporary appendage, for a temporary purpose, hanging from them.

Clapham quotes "Leave thy gift before the altar" (Matt. 5:24) to "prove" Christ was teaching the Law of Moses in the Sermon on the mount. Surely this is childish! Altars go right back to the beginning, to the beginning of sin and the divine provision for sacrifice and atonement. The principle is timeless, from the promise in Eden of the slain lamb, to the great culmination in the Paradise of God: "We have an altar whereof they have no right to eat which serve the Tabernacle." We cannot cut the infinite scope and beauty of Christ's teaching down to fit merely into the narrow literal confines of the temporary Mosaic ritual.