

ly common, representations of the branched candlestick taken from the written description have been common also. The candlestick on the arch of Titus, though not deemed an exact representation of the original one described in the Pentateuch, is now regarded—correctly, it cannot be doubted—as at least the nearest approximation to it extant. Public attention was first drawn to this interesting piece of sculpture in comparatively modern times ; and it was then found that all the previous representations taken from the written description were widely erroneous. They only served to show, not the true outlines of the golden candlestick, but merely that inadequacy of verbal description for artistic purposes which must have rendered *vision*, or, in other words, optical representation, imperative in the case of Moses. Some of our most sober-minded commentators take virtually the same view of this necessity of vision for ensuring the production of the true pattern of the Tabernacle. “The Lord,” says Thomas Scott, “not only directed Moses by words how to build the Tabernacle and form its sacred furniture, but showed him a model exactly representing the form of every part, and the proportion of each to all the rest.” There must have been clear optical vision in the case,—“vision without dark speeches.” Such, too, was the character of other of the Mosaic visions besides that of the “pattern” seen in the Mount. The burning bush, for instance, was a vision addressed to the eye ; and seemed to come so palpably under the ordinary optical laws, that the prophet *drew near* to examine the extraordinary phenomena which it exhibited.

The visual or optical character of *some* of the revelations made to Moses thus established, the writer goes on to inquire whether that special revelation which exhibits the generations of the heavens and earth in their order was not a visual revelation also. “Were the words that Moses wrote,” he