PREFATORY NOTE.

The seven Lectures contained in this volume were delivered in the course of the winter in Blythswood Church, Glasgow, being the Baird Lectures for 1879. The subject discussed in them is of supreme importance; it is a fundamental point both of Christian evidence and Christian doctrine; and should these Lectures lead to its more thorough investigation by some of those scholarly divines who are numerous in England and not unknown in Scotland, they will not have been delivered in vain. The author has to apologise for some repetitions which he found it impossible to avoid. To each Lecture he has appended Supplements on certain points which could not well be discussed in public discourses.

Manse of Galashiels,
April 1879.
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MESSIANIC PROPHECIES.

LECTURE I.

NATURE AND IMPORTANCE OF PROPHECY.

In this course of Lectures it is proposed to direct attention to Jesus as the Christ or the Messiah of ancient prophecy. Throughout the Old Testament there appears to be frequent allusion to some mysterious Being whose advent is future, to whom is given, both by Jews and Christians, the name of Messiah, and whose appearance was to be essentially connected with the culmination of Jewish history and the redemption of mankind. This Being is made known to us under various characters: sometimes as the ideal King, who, as theocratic monarch, will sit on the throne of David and rule the world in righteousness; sometimes as the Servant of Jehovah, who will communicate the knowledge of the true God to the Gentiles; sometimes as the anointed Prophet, who will reveal the will of God and secure the obedience of the human
race. At one time He is represented as the Man of Sorrows, marred in His visage, rejected by His people, and at length put to an ignominious death; but more frequently He is announced as a victorious Prince who will command the allegiance of the world. Now the question to be discussed in these lectures is: Was Jesus of Nazareth, whom we honour as our Lord, that Messiah? Did the Messianic characters find their realization in His person? This question is answered in the negative by two different parties: by those theologians who hold that there are no real Messianic predictions in the Old Testament, and who regard the utterances of the prophets as the mere longings, often discordant, for a happier future in seasons of national depression and misfortune; and by the Jews, who still admit the reality of the Messianic predictions, but deny their application to Jesus. The investigation of this question is not a subject which may occupy the attention of the student of theological science merely; it lies at the foundation of our religion, and is a matter of supreme importance to all. If there be no Messianic prophecies in the Old Testament, or if there be such prophecies which, however, have not received their realization in Jesus of Nazareth,—in other words, if Jesus be not the Messiah of the Jews, He seems to have advanced claims which are unfounded, our faith in Him is shaken, and the evidence in favour of
Nature and Importance of Prophecy. Christianity is weakened. This is a subject which has been more or less discussed in every age of the Church from the time when Justin Martyr wrote his celebrated dialogue with Trypho the Jew down to the present day; and which, after a period of recent indifference, is again coming into greater prominence in theology, and will continue to meet with increased attention. As yet, however, in recent times it has not perhaps been fully and systematically discussed, but only incidentally and in a partial manner. Our attention has been frequently directed to the human nature of Jesus as the Son of man, and to His divine nature as the Son of God; but His Messianic character as the Christ, and all those important inferences which arise from that character, are not adequately dwelt upon even in the contemporary theological discussions concerning His Person; and yet this was the great subject not only of the prophets' predictions, but also of the apostles' discourses.¹

I intend this lecture to form an introduction to the subject, and propose to consider—first, The Nature of Prophecy; and secondly, Its Importance. The general principles now to be unfolded under these heads will be exemplified and applied in the following lectures.

¹ Supplement I.
I. The Nature of Prophecy.

The common notion of prophecy is that it consists in the supernatural prediction of the future. Prophecy and prediction are regarded as synonymous terms. Thus the learned Vitringa defines prophecy to be 'a prediction of some contingent circumstance or event in the future, received by immediate and direct inspiration.' But such a definition is too narrow, and indicates a partial and defective view of the nature of prophecy. Prediction is only a part of prophecy. There might have been inspired prophets who never uttered a single prediction. Indeed, the two greatest prophets, Moses and our Lord, have left but few predictions. So also prophets are frequently mentioned in the New Testament, but it does not appear, except on rare occasions, that the prediction of the future constituted any part of their office. They seem rather to have exercised their gifts in supernatural teaching, having an insight into religious truths, piercing with the eye of the soul into spiritual realities. And the same appears to have been the case with the prophets of the Old Testament; they were inspired teachers of the present as well as predicters of the future. This is evident from the prophetical books, in which we find that actual predictions constitute

1 Fairbairn on Prophecy, p. 18, second edition.
but a portion of their contents, though it may be the larger portion.

The prophets are rather to be considered as announcers of the will of God, whether it were a moral duty, or a doctrine, or a prediction of the future. They were mediators between God and man, giving forth to the people what they received from God. That this is the meaning of the term prophet, evidently appears from the fact that Aaron was called a prophet to Moses, because he communicated the message of Moses to Pharaoh. 'I have made thee a god to Pharaoh, and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet' (Ex. vii. 1). Thus, then, the prophets are well described as 'messengers or media of communication between the upper and the lower world.'

There were two prerequisites to constitute a prophet: he must have an insight into the will of God, a spiritual intuition or a divine revelation; and he must communicate that will to others. Hence the prophets, rather than the priests, were the great teachers of the Jewish people. The religion of Israel—that knowledge of the true God, that recognition of Him as the Governor of the world, that pure morality, and that spiritual insight into religious truth which distinguished the Israelites from all the other

---

1 Cremer's *Biblico-Theological Lexicon* (second English edition, 1878), ἡγήσις.
nations of the world—is chiefly connected with the teaching of the prophets.

But especially the prophets were the maintainers of the spiritual worship of Jehovah. The kingdoms of Israel and Judah were in their normal state theocracies; and hence idolatry was not only a delinquency, but high treason to Jehovah their King. Now, the prophets were the representatives of God, His appointed ministers. They were God's advocates, who from time to time were raised up to plead His cause. They took an active part in the politics of the country, often coming into direct collision with the powers of the state, upholding the worship of Jehovah in seasons of national apostasy, threatening divine judgments in the case of wickedness, rebuking apostate kings, and encouraging pious monarchs in the service of God. They were the great reprovers of the people. Hence their repeated calls to national repentance, their burning attacks against wickedness, and hypocrisy, and a dead formality; they were bold men, who spared not to rebuke the vices, and faults, and errors of their countrymen; and hence they frequently met the reward of true reformers in persecution and martyrdom. Thus Isaiah commences his prophecy with a call to national reformation: 'Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek judgment,
relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow’ (Isa. i. 16, 17). ‘I am,’ says the prophet Micah, ‘full of power by the Spirit of the Lord, and of judgment, and of might, to declare unto Jacob his transgression, and to Israel his sin’ (Mic. iii. 8). We see the traces of this political power of the prophetical order exerted throughout the whole history of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah; but nowhere is it more marked than in the reign of Ahab, when there was an open collision between the court and the prophetical order. Ahab endeavoured to exterminate the prophets of the Lord, whilst Elijah stood at their head, as the great reformer, the restorer of the worship of Jehovah. And so also, toward the decline of the Jewish kingdom, the prophets took an active part in the politics of the state; Isaiah stood forth, in the days of Hezekiah, as the encourager of that virtuous monarch; whilst Jeremiah, in the reigns of Jehoiakim and Zedekiah, endeavoured in vain to bring the people to repentance, and to arrest the downfall of the nation.

But although the prediction of the future does not constitute the whole of the prophetical office, yet it was not a subordinate, but an essential portion of it; and we are led from the subject of these lectures to use the term prophecy in this somewhat restricted sense. It is fully admitted that this does not exhaust the import of the term;
but as it is its common meaning, it is also that in which it will be generally employed in these lectures. And, indeed, when we apply the term to the Messianic predictions,—to the foretelling of the advent of the great prophetic King and of the kingdom which He was to establish,—it will appear that, viewed in this light, the predictions of the Messiah are the greatest characteristic of Hebrew prophecy. It is thus that the prophets are described by St. Peter in his epistle. They were the announcers of the gospel salvation; they testified beforehand the sufferings and the glory of Christ; they ministered unto us the things which are now revealed in the gospel (1 Pet. i. 10–12). Thus, whilst their great office consisted generally in being the announcers of the will of God, yet this will was inseparably connected with the Messiah. He was the great subject and medium of communication; the Mediator between God and man under the Old Testament, as well as under the New; and hence the prophets were the predicters of the Messiah. 'To Him gave all the prophets witness.' Prophecy culminated in Him, and has reference either directly or indirectly to His Person, or to that spiritual dispensation which He came to establish.¹

A prophecy, considered as a prediction, may be defined to be an announcement of a future event

¹ Supplement II.
Nature and Importance of Prophecy.

whose occurrence could not possibly be foreseen by the power of natural human sagacity, but which must have been disclosed to the prophet by a divine communication.

1. We must carefully distinguish between a predictive prophecy and natural human foresight. To a certain extent, and within certain limits, men anticipate and make provision for the future. We may depend on the stability of physical laws, and to a considerable extent on the uniformity of human motives, and thus we may predict with some approach to truth what will be the issue of a certain series of events. And the more sagacious a man is, so much the more far-seeing will he be; he will be enabled to assert with considerable accuracy how men will act under certain circumstances. This, indeed, is the great office of diplomatists in watching the great game of life, in judging what their antagonists will do if certain movements are made; and in many instances the future has been anticipated with a degree of accuracy which appears almost prophetic. But in all instances of human foresight there are data to proceed upon, elements of calculation which lead to a certain result; and although the calculation may be complicated, yet a master mind may be able to attain to a satisfactory solution in many of the great problems of life. But when there are no data to proceed upon; when the prophecya
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relate to events in the distant future, and are connected with persons still unborn, or with nations which have not yet appeared on the theatre of this world's history, it is evident that these announcements of the future cannot be accounted for on the ground of mere human sagacity.

The late Dr. Hofmann of Erlangen has advanced a view of prophecy which, so far as it excludes the supernatural element, appears to resolve itself into the mere anticipations of human sagacity.\(^1\) He puts subordinate stress on the oral announcements of the prophets, and dwells chiefly on the typical form of prophetical prediction. In his view, history itself is prophecy. The past contained within itself the present, and anticipated the future. As every triumphal procession which passed through the streets of Rome was a prophecy of Augustus Cæsar, the universal monarch; so the sacrifices under the law, and especially that of the paschal lamb, were predictions of Jesus Christ. 'The meaning of the triumph,' he observes, 'was not fully realized in the constantly-recurring triumphal processions; and so also the meaning of the Passover was not fully realized in the yearly paschal meals; but the essential meaning of both was to be fully developed at some future period, when the prophecy con-

\(^1\) Weissagung und Erfüllung im alten und neuen Testamente und Schriftbeweis. See also Hengstenberg's Christology, vol. iv. pp. 383-395.
Nature and Importance of Prophecy.

The view of Professor Kuenen of Leyden is different, and certainly less vague. It consists essentially in the denial of divinely-inspired prediction as an element in prophecy. According to Kuenen, prophecy was not a supernatural phenomenon, and can be accounted for from ordinary

1 The Prophets and Prophecy in Israel. Compare also The Religion of Israel.
causes; it is 'a human phenomenon proceeding from Israel and directed to Israel.' It is only from God, as all things are from Him. The prophets spoke not under divine inspiration, but from their own subjectivity. They were earnest-minded men, who were indeed fully convinced that they had a call from God, and were acting under a divine commission; they believed that what they uttered were communications from God; they were also much further advanced than their countrymen in religious truth, and proclaimed an ethical monotheism to a people naturally inclined to polytheism. Their great office was to be the reprovers and the reformers of the people, to maintain the worship of Jehovah, and in doing so they uttered predictions of judgment against the enemies of Jehovah and of blessing to His faithful worshippers. These predictions, however, possessed only a subordinate importance for the prophets themselves, and were the mere anticipations of fallible men; most of them were unfulfilled, and those which were fulfilled may be accounted for as the result of accident, or sagacity, or natural insight, without the intervention of supernatural influence. To enter into an examination of this extreme form of at
tionalism, is not within the limits of these lectures, re restricted to the Messianic predictions; 

1 Weissagung Schriftbeweis. S-395. uenen's Prophets in Israel, p. 4.
we trust, demonstrate the utter futility of this theory to account for the predictions of the Hebrew prophets. We shall find that there is a series of prophecies pointing to the same Person concerning whose life several particulars are stated, some of them apparently contradictory, and which prophecies are not merely contained in the works of one prophet, but scattered throughout the prophetical books, and announce events whose occurrence depends on unforeseen and complicated causes; so that to deny the predictive element in these prophecies would be as if one should call in question the luminous quality of the sun. And in cases to which we shall presently refer, we shall find instances of genuine prediction.

2. The heathen had their prophets as well as the Israelites, but the difference between them is very apparent; nor must the false prophecies of the heathen prejudice us against the prophecies of the Israelites. The predictions of the heathen, when they were fulfilled, can easily be accounted for without the aid of supernatural intervention. A great amount of artifice accompanied them; they were secretly divulged; they were seldom delivered, and then only after great preparations were made; they ministered to the passions and wishes of men; they were expressed in equivocal language; their fulfilment generally depended on chance; they were as often wrong as right; and
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when they failed, the fault was not laid to the charge of the prophet, but was imputed to some error committed by the inquirer. Several of their predictions were the result of a far-seeing sagacity, similar to the prediction of Josephus that Vespasian would ascend the throne of the Cæsars. The answers of the heathen oracles also were often so cunningly devised, that whatever way the event happened, the credit of the oracle would be maintained. Indeed, among the numerous predictions of the heathen, not a single authentic case of a true prophecy can be produced, of a prediction the fulfilment of which cannot be accounted for from purely ordinary causes, either as a happy guess or as the anticipation of sagacity. Those which have been adduced are so vague, so obscure, and so general, that no reasonable man can class them among the number of genuine prophecies.¹

The predictions of Scripture are widely different. They were openly published; they were delivered without solicitation; they were expressed in no artful language; the events predicted were beyond the power of human sagacity to foresee, or even when the general event might have been foreseen, yet minute circumstances were added which were beyond the wisdom of man to predict; and there was a particularity in these prophecies which clearly distinguished them from the conjectures of wise men.

¹ Supplement III.
In short, the prophets of the heathen prophesied, as Jeremiah expresses it, 'a false vision and divination, and a thing of nought, and the deceit of their heart' (Jer. xiv. 14), whereas the true prophets of Israel 'spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.'

3. In all true prophecy the supernatural element is implied; the prediction is placed out of the sphere of human sagacity or foresight: it relates to contingent matters, the knowledge of whose futurity cannot be accounted for without the aid of supernatural illumination. The divine foreknowledge is here implied; to God only can the future be accurately known; He only can predict events ages before they happen; He only can 'call the things that are not as though they were.' Hence, the prediction of the future is declared to be a characteristic distinction between Jehovah and the false gods of the heathen. 'Assemble yourselves and come; draw near together, ye that are escaped of the nations: they have no knowledge that set up the wood of their graven image, and pray unto a god that cannot save. Tell ye, and bring them near; yea, let them take counsel together: who hath declared this from ancient time? who hath told it from that time? have not I the Lord? and there is no God beside me' (Isa. xlv. 20, 21).

In short, a genuine prophecy is as much a miracle as to give sight to the blind or to raise the dead; for as miracles, commonly so called, are exertions of
power above human, so prophecies are exertions of knowledge above human; both involve the supernatural. This element in a prophecy does not consist in the event predicted, but in the spiritual communication of the knowledge of that event to the prophet; and this can be tested and ascertained by the correspondence between that event and the prediction, provided the prediction was made at a time or under circumstances when the event could not be ascertained by human sagacity. And thus, it is not only the assertion of Scripture, but it results from our idea of genuine prophecy, that 'prophecy came not in old times by the will of man,'—proceeded not from human sagacity,—'but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost' (2 Pet. i. 21). Negatively, then, prophecy is not the result of human foresight; positively, it is the result of divine communication.

4. The method of divine communication to the prophets is a point which has occupied the attention of writers on prophecy, but about which little more than mere conjecture can be offered. Philo considers that the prophets were in a state of ecstasy or trance, that their consciousness was suspended, and that they were the mere organs of the divine communications. This theory identifies Hebrew prophecy with the divination of the heathen. It was adopted by the Montanists.
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They held the ecstatic idea of prophecy and the entire passivity of the human judgment and will. 'We maintain,' observes Tertullian, 'in the cause of the new prophecy, that to grace ecstasy or rapture (amentia) is incident. For when a man is rapt in the Spirit, especially when he beholds the glory of God, or when God speaks through him, he necessarily loses his consciousness, because he is overshadowed by the power of God.'¹ In opposition to the Montanists, the early Fathers insisted on the direct opposition and dissimilarity between prophecy and heathen divination, and maintained the presence of the consciousness of the prophet during a divine communication. The powers of the human mind, so far from being suspended, were elevated by prophecy, 'and the judgment and the will remained in a state of normal activity.

The Montanist view of prophecy has recently been revived by Hengstenberg. He regards all prophecy as communicated to the prophets whilst they were in a state of ecstasy, though he does not affirm that they lost their personal consciousness. A few passages taken from his Christology will show the nature of his view: 'They (the orthodox theologians) contended with perfect justice against the amentia or unconsciousness attributed to the prophets, but they also denied their ecstasy, and

¹ Adv. Marcion, iv. 22.
thus lost sight of the distinguishing characteristic of the prophetic state.' 'The condition of the prophets was an abnormal one, just as much as that of the madman, if our ordinary consciousness be taken as the standard.' 'After all that has been adduced, it will be impossible to arrive at any other conclusion than that it was in an ἐκστασίς that the biblical prophets prophesied, as well as the heathen seers.'¹ In proof of this view, Hengstenberg refers to the description of the ecstatic states which occurred in the prophetic school of Samuel at Ramah, to the accounts of the various visions and dreams made to the prophets, and to the consecrations of the prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. Now it is not denied that ecstasy or trance was sometimes the accompaniment of divine communication: there are several examples of it both in the Old Testament and in the New; as in the vision of Isaiah when called to his prophetic office, and in the rapture of St. Paul when taken up to the third heavens. But it is affirmed that this was not the usual medium of divine communication. Visions and dreams and ecstasies were the exceptional modes; the prophets, it would seem, were generally in full possession of their faculties. Thus, for example, there is no trace of ecstasy in the later prophecies of Isaiah; they are evidently the product of a calm and

¹ Hengstenberg's Christology, vol. iv. pp. 397, 403, 408.
Nature and Importance of Prophecy.

Elevated state of mind. 'The spirits of the prophets,' says St. Paul, 'are subject to the prophets' (1 Cor. xiv. 32).

In opposition to this theory of ecstatic communication, Oehler maintains that prophecy is the result of an inward intuition; the prophets were supernaturally enabled to discern truths of which they would otherwise have been ignorant; their mental vision was enlarged to discern spiritual realities. 'The psychical form of prophecy,' he observes, 'is rather that of an inward intuition, taking the word in its wider signification. It belongs to external perception that the subject is aware that the object is directly given, and not produced by his own agency; and this is just what the prophets affirm with respect to their prophecies. Hence the prophets designate themselves as seers.'

An inward sight or spiritual enlightenment was according to him the ordinary means of divine communication to the prophets. This theory is modified by Riehm, who uses the phrase 'inward speaking' in preference to 'inward intuition.' 'The method of revelation with respect to God,' he observes, 'is to be described as inward speaking, and in relation to the psychological function of the prophets as an inward perception of His words. The prophet hears the voice of God speaking to

him. God puts His word into his heart in such a way, that if he makes the attempt to keep it to himself, it is like a burning fire within him' \(^1\) (Jer. xx. 9). The difference here, however, is merely verbal. This view of internal intuition or inward speaking is by these authors illustrated by several analogies in religious experience. One of these analogies is the living convictions of faith which are sometimes imparted to us; the assurance communicated of the truth of certain Christian doctrines, altogether independent of reason or reflection; the direct witness of the Spirit to their truth. Another analogy is the assurance of answered prayer felt in some crisis of life, so that the prayer which commences in distress and agony ends in joy and thanksgiving, as if God Himself had spoken to us.\(^2\) Of course, in the case of the prophets, the supernatural element is to be recognised and maintained; nor must these analogies be pushed too far.\(^3\)

Many examples might be given to illustrate this idea of predictive prophecy as necessarily implying the supernatural. We might allude to the

\(^1\) Riehm's *Messianic Prophecy*, pp. 21, 22.

\(^2\) 'There are moments in the life of man, when he is nearer to the spirit-world than at other times' (Schiller).

remarkable predictions concerning Tyre, Nineveh, Babylon, and Egypt, or to Daniel's predictions relating to the four empires—the Babylonian, the Persian, the Greek, and the Roman; but, for the sake of brevity, we restrict ourselves to two examples. The prophet Jeremiah foretold the Babylonish captivity in the following terms: 'And this whole land shall be a desolation, and an astonishment; and these nations shall serve the king of Babylon seventy years. And it shall come to pass, when seventy years are accomplished, that I will punish the king of Babylon, and that nation, saith the Lord, for their iniquity, and the land of the Chaldeans, and will make it perpetual desolations' (Jer. xxv. 11, 12). 'Thus saith the Lord, That after seventy years be accomplished at Babylon I will visit you, and perform my good word toward you, in causing you to return to this place' (Jer. xxix. 10). Now human sagacity might foresee that in a war between the Jews and the Babylonians, the Jews would be conquered and Jerusalem taken; it might also foresee, taking into consideration the Babylonish policy, that the Jews would be transported from Judea and settled in the Babylonish empire. But no human sagacity could by any possibility foresee that this young and flourishing kingdom of Babylon, presided over by one of the mightiest monarchs who ever appeared in this world, against whose arms resistance
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was in vain, and to whom all the nations of the East became tributary, would last only for seventy years, and that the time would arrive when Babylon, then the greatest city in the world, would become a desolation. Nor could any human sagacity foresee that the Jews, after being transported to Babylon, would again in the course of seventy years be restored as a nation to their own land. It may be true that from want of historical data we cannot fix the period to precisely seventy years, though most of the calculations that have been made come very close to it. But the most remarkable feature in the prophecy, and that which demonstrates its divine origin, is the restoration of the entire Jewish nation to their own land, after being transported to Babylon—an event so rare as to be almost unparalleled in history.

The other example is the remarkable prediction of our Lord concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, recorded in three of the gospels. Now, here also it is admitted that human sagacity might go a certain length. Considering the relations between the Jews and the Romans; that the Jews were always resisting the Roman yoke; that riots and tumults were not unfrequent; that there was a strong

1 The commencement of the seventy weeks is dated from B.C. 606, when Jehoiakim became tributary to Nebuchadnezzar; and consequently the close is B.C. 536, when permission was given by Cyrus to the Jews to return (Tholuck's Propheten und ihre Weissagungen, p. 112).
Nature and Importance of Prophecy. 23

patriotic party who advocated national freedom; it might be foreseen that a war would arise, and that if so, the Romans would inevitably prove victorious. It might also be anticipated, considering the fanaticism of the Jews, that they would make a vigorous resistance, and that their rebellion would be crushed with great severity and bloodshed. But this is the utmost extent to which human sagacity could go. To predict all the circumstances of the siege so minutely described by our Lord, the number of false Christs and false prophets, the total destruction of the temple, the dispersion of the Jews among all nations, and above all the previous publication of the gospel among all the tributary nations of the Roman Empire; to foresee all these results, and to describe them with such minuteness as if it were a history of the past rather than a prediction of the future, making no allowance for future contingencies, but announcing the certainty of these events without hesitation,—this is surely beyond all human sagacity: the knowledge here displayed is not human, but divine. Jesus here proclaims Himself a prophet mighty in words as well as in deeds; a predictor of the future as well as a worker of miracles. In the words of Eusebius: 'On comparing the declarations of our Saviour with other parts of the work of Josephus, wherein he describes the whole war, how can one fail to acknowledge
and wonder at the truly divine and extraordinary foreknowledge of our Saviour?"  

II. The Importance of Prophecy.

The importance of prophecy is of a twofold nature; it has an importance before the occurrence of the event predicted, and it has an importance after its occurrence.

1. Of course, before its fulfilment, prophecy cannot be adduced as an evidence of an original revelation: the miracle of knowledge is, so to

1 Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. iii. 7. It has been asserted that our Lord's prophecy was promulgated after the event, that Jerusalem was destroyed and the Jewish war ended before the gospels were written. We cannot here enter into any critical inquiry concerning the age of the synoptical gospels. But there are two considerations, or at least presumptions, that the prophecy was uttered by our Lord before the events which it foretold. There are embodied in the prophecy, directions and warnings given to the disciples how they should conduct themselves in anticipation of the Jewish war, so that they might escape all those calamities which were to befall their countrymen. Now, it is most improbable that after the war such directions would have been inserted in a supposititious prophecy, and especially should have occurred in three narratives of that prediction. So also, the acknowledged obscurity that hangs over part of the prediction—the apparent confounding of the second advent of Christ with the destruction of Jerusalem, the seemingly twofold sense attributable to the prophecy—would certainly have been avoided if this were not a prediction at all, but a mere statement of what had already taken place. In this case the prediction would have been unencumbered with what might appear to be extraneous matter; and especially the assertion, which to some is apparently made, that the second advent would occur in that generation, would certainly have been avoided as not being in accordance with fact.
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speak, incomplete; but still it serves many important purposes. It preserves faith in God; the predictions are the objects at once of faith and hope; God is brought near to the people; He is made known as the Ruler among the nations, in whose hands are the destinies of the future. Thus the Jews were led to recognise God; to realize His presence and superintending providence: this was a characteristic of their national piety. And so also, when as a nation they were bowed down with oppression and sorrow, they were often cheered with the prospect of future deliverance and victory over their enemies. And thus they were enabled to strengthen themselves in Jehovah their God, and to exclaim with the heroic Psalmist, 'God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble' (Ps. xlvi. 1).

Examples of this importance of unfulfilled prophecy are innumerable. The first promise made to our first parents, that 'the seed of the woman should bruise the head of the serpent,' is an instance of this nature. Without such a prediction, it is hard to see how their religion could have been preserved; this was the only thing that saved them from despair. It may be that the prediction was in a great measure incomprehensible, but still they would comprehend this much at least in it, that there was a promise of deliverance; and this was sufficient to raise their hopes, to sustain their
faith, and to console them in their sorrows; they felt that, notwithstanding their sin and fall, God had not forsaken them; that still there was mercy with Him, that He might be feared. And so also when the kingdom of Judea was overthrown by Nebuchadnezzar, and the Jews led captive to Babylon, it must have lessened the misery of their captivity, kept alive their patriotism, and preserved their hope and trust in God, to be told, as they were by Jeremiah, that there was a limit to their banishment, and that after seventy years the Babylonish empire would be destroyed, and they would be restored to the land of their fathers. And accordingly, we actually find Daniel, one of these exiles, calculating these seventy years, consoling himself in God, and thus turning the prophecy, though yet unfulfilled, to a direct practical application: 'I Daniel understood by books the number of the years, whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem' (Dan. ix. 2).

But of still greater importance were the Messianic prophecies to the Jewish church and nation. A great Messianic King was held forth to their view. The golden age was to the Jews not past, as it was to the heathen, but future. 'The King to reign in righteousness' was the great object of

1 Supplement IV. 2 See also Zech. i. 12.
Jewish faith and hope; in His days Judah was to be saved, and Israel was to dwell safely. This, more than anything else, preserved the fidelity of the nation to Jehovah their God. Though crushed and oppressed by their enemies, though carried captive into foreign lands, yet their spirits rose with the hopes of final deliverance and future greatness. They looked forward to a time when Messiah their anointed King, to whom the heathen would be given for an inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession, would rule over them. It may be that they mis- took the nature and meaning of their prophecies; it may be that they overlooked the predictions relating to the sufferings of the Messiah, as their minds would naturally be attracted to the predictions of His glorious reign; and it may be that their interpretations were national and exclusive, but still these Messianic hopes were the life of the nation, and the source of all that was great and good in it.

It was also around the notion of the Messiah that the spiritual elements of Judaism clustered. Were it not for this, the Jewish religion would have degenerated into a dry performance of certain rites and ceremonies, without any spiritual insight into their meaning, without any recognition of the nothingness of mere formalism and of the necessity of spiritual worship. It must be confessed
that the ritual religion of the Jews, when the Messianic idea was overlooked, had a tendency to degenerate into formalism, and often actually did so; and hence we find an apparent antagonism between the prophetical and the priestly orders. The prophets appear to denounce sacrifices and offerings, to depreciate their value, and to foretell their discontinuance. They were the great spiritual preachers among the Jews; sacrifices were worthless unless performed by pure hands; fasts, and assemblies, and new moons, if mere formal observances, were worse than useless. 'To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord: I am full of the burnt-offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he-goats. Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me; the new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with; it is iniquity, even the solemn meeting' (Isa. i. 11, 13). The Messianic future was to be an era of moral purity; war was to cease, and peaceful days were to dawn upon the earth; God's Spirit was to be poured upon all flesh; the stony heart was to be taken away and a new heart implanted; and 'righteousness was to go forth as brightness, and salvation as a lamp that burneth' (Isa. lxii. 1). And thus it was by the Messianic prophecies that true religion was preserved and nourished among the Jews, that
spiritual worship with which alone God is well pleased.

2. But still greater is the importance of fulfilled prophecy. Unfulfilled prophecy forms a part of revelation; but fulfilled prophecy is both a part and an evidence. Our faith and hope rest on a still surer foundation; the fulfilment seals the prophecy with the stamp of divinity: the miracle is then complete. It then becomes 'the sure word of prophecy.' That which was to the Jews as a light shining in a dark place, is to us as the dawning of the day, the rising of the day-star in our hearts.

And if, among all the prophecies in the Old Testament, the Messianic predictions were of special importance to the Jews, of still greater importance are they to us, who believe that we see their fulfilment in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. Whether this belief is correct or erroneous is reserved as the subject of future discussion; but its supreme importance to us Christians is undeniable. All other prophecies are of minor consequence. Whether we can discover an exact correspondence between the present state of Babylon, Nineveh, and Tyre, and the prophecies concerning these cities, in the writings of the Jewish prophets, is of less importance; but the prophecy concerning the Messiah is so interwoven with Christianity, that it cannot be sepa-
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rated from it without destroying the whole fabric; its truth is not merely an important, but an essential evidence of our faith. And not only so, but the chain of the Messianic prophecies—the Messianic idea—is the great bond of connection between the Old and the New Testaments, between Judaism and Christianity: it is an evidence in favour not only of the religion of Jesus, but of the religion of Moses; it so binds these two religions together as to convert them into one and the same, both Messianic—Christianity under the law and Christianity under the gospel; in short, it teaches us that Judaism is but Christianity in embryo, and Christianity is but the development of Judaism.

And lastly, fulfilled prophecy confirms our faith in the accomplishment of those predictions which are yet unfulfilled. The fact that prophecies have been made and fulfilled, is to us a guarantee that events predicted by the same prophets, which have not as yet occurred, will assuredly take place. The bright prospect which prophecy holds out of the universal spread of Christianity, of the entire cessation of war, of the reign of righteousness and peace, of the conversion of the Jews and the ingathering of the Gentiles, of the diffusion of the Spirit upon all flesh, comforts us amid much that is dark, and distressing, and bewildering in the political and religious aspect of this world. We
are enabled even in the midst of abounding error, falsehood, and infidelity, to entertain the firm conviction that the truth will yet prevail, and that all the nations of the world will own Jesus as their Lord and King; and we can thus discern the supernatural in history, and see the Lord ruling over all, and so directing all events for the accomplishment of His gracious predictions.

SUPPLEMENT I.

RECENT LITERATURE ON THE MESSIANIC PROPHECIES.

DURING the deistical controversy of last century, the question of the Messiahship of Jesus was discussed with considerable fulness, and several books of great value were added to the apologetic theological literature of our country. Several of these may still be perused by the theological student with advantage, as they are distinguished by profound scholarship and acute reasoning. Among these may be particularly mentioned the able defence of Christianity by Bishop Chandler, the ingenious sermons on prophecy by Bishop Sherlock, and the Warburton Lectures of Bishop Hurd. Bishop Kidder's *Demonstration of the Messiah*,
written in the seventeenth century, and with special reference to the views of the Jews, is a storehouse of learning and information on the subject.

Until a comparatively recent period, the subject was not again resumed; but of late several important books on prophecy have issued from the press. Besides the various commentaries on the prophets, and which necessarily treat of the Messianic idea, the following books directly bearing upon the subject may be mentioned. Davison's *Discourses on Prophecy* contains a clear and excellent statement of the nature of prophecy in general, and considers its condition in the various stages of its development. Pye Smith's *Testimony to the Messiah* is a work of great erudition; it discusses seriatim the different Messianic predictions with special reference to the divine nature of the Messiah, and gives the views of Jewish writers concerning these predictions. Stanley Leathes' *Witness of the Old Testament to Christ*, being the Boyle Lectures for 1868, is an able investigation of the character of the testimony to Christ which the Scriptures of the Old Testament supply, and a defence of the Messianic nature of Hebrew prophecy. Principal Fairbairn's two works relating to prophecy—the one on *Prophecy* in general, and the other on the *Typology of Scripture*—are a credit to Scotch theology; they are both works of great
value, showing an accurate acquaintance with and appreciation of the theological literature of Germany not usual in this country. Drummond's *Jewish Messiah* exhibits much erudition both as regards Jewish writings and German theology. Its design is to ascertain the Messianic views of the Jews at or about the time of our Lord. The work is divided into two parts—the first being an examination of the sources of information, and the second a statement and classification of that information. Higginson's *Ecce Messias*, written in imitation of the *Ecce Homo*, is, like Drummond's *Jewish Messiah*, from a Unitarian standpoint. It is divided into two parts: first, the Messianic prophecies in the Old Testament; and secondly, the realization of these prophecies in Jesus. The prophecies are given in full, and in order of time. Most of the prophecies which are usually considered as Messianic, are, however, interpreted as having no reference to our Lord. Payne Smith's *Prophecy a Preparation for Christ*, being the Bampton Lectures for 1869, is an examination of the preparatory nature of prophecy. Dean Smith considers not so much its predictive character as its bearing on spiritual development; and, viewing prophecy in this light, he traces it from its first origin in the Patriarchal Age to its climax in the prophecies of Isaiah. Bishop Alexander's *Witness of the Psalms to Christ and Christianity*, being the Bamp-
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ton Lectures for 1876, has some good remarks on the Messianic psalms, though the references to the Messiah are carried to an unwarrantable extent.

In Germany the subject of Messianic prediction has recently received much attention; we can only enumerate a few of the most important works. We omit all mention of the prophetical commentaries, the most important of which, bearing on our subject, are the commentaries on Isaiah by Gesenius, Knobel, and Delitzsch, and the commentary on Daniel by Keil. Hengstenberg's *Christology of the Old Testament* is a thorough treatment of the particular Messianic prophecies, with important appendices, discussing the importance of the Messianic prophecies, the Messianic expectations among the heathen, the divinity of the Messiah in the Old Testament, and the nature of prophecy, or the mode of divine communication. This work must always occupy a high position in theology, as being perhaps the most complete investigation of the subject. Tholuck's *Die Propheten und ihre Weissagungen* is an examination of the Messianic prophecies from a positive standpoint, but conducted in a free and impartial manner. Hofmann's peculiar view of prophecy, as developed in his *Weissagung und Erfüllung* and in his *Schriftbeweis*, has already been mentioned in our lecture. He places peculiar stress on the historical
character of prophecy; and his theory may be considered as an attempt to mediate between the rationalistic and the orthodox views of prophecy. He has had several followers in Germany, although his views do not appear as yet to have influenced to any considerable extent the theology of this country. Oehler has three excellent articles on Prophecy in Herzog's *Real-Encyklopädie,*—'Messias,' 'Prophetenthum des alten Testaments,' and 'Weissagung,' —and the subject is discussed at length in his posthumous work, *The Theology of the Old Testament.* He especially examines the nature of prophecy, and distinctly recognises the supernatural element in it. Riehm's *Messianic Prophecy* is an able and ingenious work, belonging to the school of Hofmann. He admits the supernatural element in prophecy, and considers it to be a development of three germs found in Judaism—the idea of a covenant, of a kingdom of God, and of a theocracy; and, like Hofmann, he asserts that the state of the nations of Israel and Judah exerted a powerful influence on the prophetic communications, and determined their character. Ewald, in his *Prophets of the Old Testament,* has some profound remarks on the nature of prophecy, though it is doubtful if he ascribes to it a supernatural character. Anger's *Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der messianischen Idee* is rationalistic in character and tendency. According to Anger, the Messianic idea is a natural
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development; most of the so-called prophecies are no prophecies; and the apostles were mistaken in their application of them to Jesus. Gustav Baur's *Geschichte der alttestamentlichen Weissagung* is a development of the Messianic idea rather from a negative than from a positive point of view. Wünsche's *Die Leiden des Messias* is a very valuable tractate, being a work of much erudition and full of rabbinical learning. Its design is to prove that, although the doctrine of a suffering Messiah is now rejected by the modern Jews, yet it is in agreement not only with the statements of the Old Testament, but also with the views of the ancient Jewish church.

I am not aware of many recent works on Messianic prophecy in French literature. The point is discussed more or less fully in the Lives of Jesus that have been published by Renan, De Pressensé, and others; but the only work which I know that treats directly on the subject is Colani's *Jésus Christ et les croyances Messianiques de son temps*. Colani considers that the Messiah, represented by the prophets, is to be a King, at once a reformer of religion and a conquering warrior; that this Messianic idea sprang naturally from the patriotic hopes of the nation; and that Jesus adopted and spiritualized it. He is very arbitrary in the correction of passages in the gospels to suit his preconceived opinions.
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In Dutch theology we have the works of Kuenen—his History of the Religion of Israel and his Prophets and Prophecy in Israel, both recently translated. Of all recent rationalistic writings, these works of Kuenen are, from peculiar circumstances, the best known in this country. I have already alluded to the theory of Professor Kuenen, and shall not repeat the remarks then made. It is a bold and undisguised attack upon the supernatural. Kuenen, however, regards himself as a Christian, and, as he himself admits, the recognition of the supernatural origin of prophecy by the writers of the New Testament, and their assertion of its fulfilment in Jesus, come into direct collision with his views; but he attempts to meet the difficulty by maintaining that the opinions of the New Testament writers are not to be acquiesced in, but to be critically estimated, and, if so, that it will be found that they do not satisfy the requirements of modern exegesis; in short, that the New Testament writers were mistaken in their views concerning prophecy. According to Kuenen, the real importance of the prophets consisted in the inculcation of an ethical monotheism. 'Ethical monotheism,' he observes, 'is their creation. They have themselves ascended to the belief in one only, holy, and righteous God, who realizes His will or moral good in the world; but they have by preaching and writing
made that belief the inalienable property of our race.'

Besides these recent works on the Messianic prophecies by Christian writers, we have a valuable series of discourses on the chief points of dispute between Jews and Christians by Dr. Hermann Adler, the distinguished Jewish minister of Bayswater Synagogue. These discourses will be frequently adverted to in these lectures. In them the Messianic idea, as contained in the prophecies of the Old Testament, is fully maintained. But the passages which Dr. Adler adduces in proof of it, are chiefly those which predict a reign of universal peace and the restoration of the Jews to their own land, and which are generally regarded by Christian writers as predictions still unfulfilled. On the other hand, almost all those predictions which are usually considered as Messianic, and as having received their fulfilment in Jesus, are regarded as non-Messianic. I have only to add, that although some expressions are grating to our Christian ears, yet no fault can be found with the spirit in which Dr. Adler writes, and that the discourses are frequently extremely eloquent. The work is entitled to a respectful and careful consideration, and is interesting as being a discussion of the Messianic prophecies from a modern Jewish standpoint.

1 Kuenen's Prophets and Prophecy, p. 585.
SUPPLEMENT II.

THE PROPHETICAL OFFICE.

The nature of the office of a prophet may be ascertained from a consideration of the etymology of the terms employed to denote it. These terms have reference to the inspired nature of the prophetic utterances, without any regard to the futurity of the announcements made. In the Hebrew there are three terms used to denote the prophetic office—nābhī (נָבִי), ro'eh (רוֹעַ), and chozeh (חֹזֶה). The most common of these terms is nābhī. This has been variously derived, but the most approved derivation is that given by Gesenius from the verb נָבַל, signifying 'to cause to bubble up,' hence 'to pour forth words abundantly.' The nābhī was a person who gave vent to divine utterances, who poured forth the declarations of God, and thus exercised his office in revealing the will of God. The term ro'eh, translated in our version 'a seer,' is derived from the verb 'to see,' and has reference to the mode in which prophetical revelations were sometimes made. We are informed that this was the ancient term for a prophet. 'He that is now called a prophet (nābhī) was beforetime called a seer (ro'eh)' (1 Sam. ix. 9). The word occurs only ten times in Scripture, and in seven of these it refers to
Samuel. The term *chozeh* is a word of similar import, being derived from a verb signifying 'to behold.' All three terms are used together in 1 Chron. xxix. 29: 'Now the acts of David the king, first and last, behold, they are written in the book of Samuel the seer (*ro'eh*), and in the book of Nathan the prophet (*nāḥālî*), and in the book of Gad the seer (*chozeh*).’ The Greek term ἀποφήμι in its original and classical sense does not denote a foreteller of the future, but one who speaks for another, an interpreter of the gods, an announcer of a divine message. Hence the ἀποφήμι was a person who declared the will of God. In our days the English word 'prophecy' is used as almost synonymous with prediction; yet in the earlier stage of the language, it was used in the comprehensive sense to denote the declaration of the will of God. Every one is familiar with the title of Jeremy Taylor's famous work, *The Liberty of Prophesying.*

The prophetic order was founded, or at least revived, by Samuel. He appears to have established the so-called 'schools of the prophets.' These were fixed in various cities—in Ramah, in Gibeah, in Jericho, and in Gilgal. They appear to

---

1 For the discussion on the meaning of these terms, see Tholuck's *Die Propheten und ihre Weissagungen*, pp. 21-23; Bleek's *Introduction to the Old Testament*, vol. ii. pp. 4-8; and Kuenen, *The Prophets and Prophecy of Israel*, chapter iii.

2 Samuel is spoken of in Acts iii. 24 as the first of the prophets.
have been of the nature of theological institutions, wherein young men were trained to exercise the prophetic office in stirring up the people to the spiritual worship of God, in warning them against apostasy, and in rebuking the vices of the nation. From the time of Samuel to the reign of Ahab, there is no mention of these schools; but in the reign of that monarch and his successors, they are regarded as established institutions, and were presided over by Elijah and Elisha. It is not meant that the so-called 'sons of the prophets'—the students of these institutions—were all endowed with the supernatural gift of prophecy, but that they formed a special class of men who exercised an important influence in the country. The inspired prophets were, in general, taken by God from this class, though this was not always the case. Thus the prophet Amos says of himself: 'I was no prophet, neither was I a prophet's son; but I was a herdsman, and a gatherer of sycamore fruit: And the Lord took me as I followed the flock, and the Lord said unto me, Go, prophesy unto my people Israel' (Amos vii. 14).

1 For a discussion on 'the schools of the prophets,' see Dean Smith's Bampton Lectures, Lecture iv.
SUPPLEMENT III.

THE HEATHEN ORACLES.

Two well-known instances of the ambiguity of the heathen oracles are recorded in ancient history. When Crœsus, king of Lydia, made war on the Persians, he was informed by the oracle of Delphi that he would overthrow a great empire,¹—a prediction which would be verified whether the Persian Empire was overthrown, or whether, as was the case, Crœsus was defeated and his own kingdom destroyed. And when Pyrrhus, king of Epirus, consulted the oracle as to whether he should make war on the Romans, the answer was so cunningly expressed as to admit of a twofold interpretation:² either, 'I say that thou, Pyrrhus, art able to conquer the Romans; thou shalt go, thou shalt return, thou shalt never perish in war;' or, 'I say that the Romans shall conquer thee, O Pyrrhus; thou shalt go, thou shalt never return, thou shalt perish in war.'

The pretended predictions of the heathen are even more unworthy of examination than their pretended miracles. Astonishing deeds might be

¹ Κροῖος Ἀλων διαβὰς μεγάλην ἐρχὴν καταλύει.
² 'Αιο τε Ακαίδα Romanos, vincere posse,
Ibis, redibus nunquam in bello peribis.'
Nature and Importance of Prophecy. performed through a secret knowledge of the laws of nature; but the future, beyond the narrow limits to which human sagacity could reach, was entirely concealed from the view of mortals. Hence the predictions of the heathen oracles ended in miserable failure, and were held in bad repute by the worshippers themselves. The most noted prediction is one which occurs in the Medea of Seneca, the tragedian, wherein it is asserted that the discovery of America was foretold. But that this assertion is a gross exaggeration is evident from the words themselves:

"Venient annis
Saecula seris, quibus oceanus
Vincula rerum laxit, et ingens
Pateat tellus, Tiphysque novos
Detegat orbes: nec sit terris
Ultima Thule."

(Medea, verse 374).

What is here asserted is that the time will come when Thule, supposed to be the Shetland Islands, will cease to be the utmost boundary of the world. But what an immense difference is there between this statement and the assertion that it is a prediction of the discovery of America! It is not necessary to contrast this, as Bishops Hurd and Horsley do, with the predictions of Scripture. It is evidently a mere indefinite assertion of what
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will be the probable result of increased improvement in the art of navigation. Already before the time of Seneca new territories had been discovered, and it was natural to suppose that these discoveries would in future ages be increased.

SUPPLEMENT IV.

THE FIRST PROMISE.

'will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel' (Gen. iii. 15).

The chief point in the exegesis of this verse is to determine the correct meaning of the verb ἐπιθύμησιν, rendered in our version bruise. It occurs only in two other passages of the Old Testament,—in Job ix. 17, 'For he breaketh me with a tempest;' and in Ps. cxxxix. 11, 'Surely the darkness shall cover me.' Gesenius supposes its meaning to be 'to fall upon in a hostile manner,' and hence he renders the passage, 'he shall lie in wait for thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for his heel.' A similar meaning is given to the word in the Septuagint: αὐτὸς σοι τηρήσει κεφαλὴν καὶ σοι τηρήσεις αὐτοῦ πτέραν. Dr. Pye Smith renders it 'to attack,' a
meaning which suits the two other passages where the verb occurs. On the other hand, Fürst derives its meaning from the cognate words in Chaldee and Syriac, and renders it, as in our version, 'to bruise' or 'crush;' and in this he is supported by most versions and by Jewish writers. St. Paul also in Rom. xvi. 20, provided his words are an allusion, adopts the same meaning: 'The God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly.' The Vulgate takes the pronoun 

'she shall bruise thy head,' and hence the Roman Catholics attribute the victory to the Virgin Mary; but this is in evident contradiction to the grammatical construction of the verse: the pronoun is undoubtedly masculine, as is seen in the masculine termination of the verb, and must be rendered 'it' or 'he.'

The general meaning of this prediction is a promise of final deliverance and victory to the seed of the woman, and consequently a message of consolation to our first parents in their distress, in consequence of the successful temptation of the serpent. It does not appear on the face of the promise that the word 'seed' is to be considered as having a personal signification, and thus as denoting the Messiah; it rather appears that it is to be primarily understood in a collective sense, as denoting the descendants of the woman—the

\[\text{1 'Ipsa conteret caput tuum.'}\]
human race in general. It is in this sense that St. Paul regards the passage, when he applies it to Christians in general (Rom. xvi. 20). But still in a secondary and higher sense, the passage is decidedly Messianic, as the human race only obtained the victory through Him who is in a peculiar sense 'the seed of the woman,' the great representative of humanity. It is only in Him that the prophecy attains its full realization. This is the view which Calvin takes of the passage: 'I explain therefore the seed to mean the posterity of the woman generally. But since experience teaches that not all the sons of Adam arise as conquerors of the devil, we must necessarily come to one head, that we may find to whom the victory belongs. So Paul, from the seed of Abraham, leads us to Christ, because many were degenerate sons, and a considerable part adulterous, through infidelity; whence it follows that the unity of the body flows from the head. Wherefore the sense will be that the human race, whom Satan was endeavouring to oppress, would at length be victorious. Meanwhile we must keep in mind that method of conquering which the Scripture describes. Satan has, in all ages, led the sons of men captive at his will, and to this day retains his sad triumph over them, and for that reason he is called "the prince of this world." But because One stronger than he has descended from heaven to subdue him, the
whole Church shall fight under its Head and like Him be victorious.'

The promise contains the germ of Messianism, and is well entitled to the name *protevangelium*. It is admitted that it is in itself obscure and general; the ‘seed of the woman’ points to the race rather than to an individual. But still the use of the masculine pronoun ‘he,’ and the very expression ‘seed of the woman’ instead of the posterity of Adam, are indications of Him who is virgin-born. And we find in subsequent prophecies a gradual unfolding and developing of this promise in a series of limitations, first to Abraham, then to Jacob, then to Judah, then to David; and a revelation, becoming gradually more and more clear, that this seed of the woman was to be taken in a personal sense, ‘not seeds, as of many, but as of one, that is, Christ’ (Gal. iii. 16), so that we have reason to believe that this promise was intended by God to point forward to the final redemption of the human race which has been accomplished through Jesus Christ. And hence all subsequent Messianic prophecies may be considered as a development of this primeval promise made to our first parents to save them from the despair into which they had fallen on account of their apostasy.

The passage does not seem to have been re-

1 Calvin’s *Commentary on Genesis*, *in loco*.
garded as Messianic by Jewish writers, though in the Targum of pseudo-Jonathan, and in that of Jerusalem, its accomplishment is referred to the days of the Messiah. Thus in the Targum of pseudo-Jonathan we read: 'I will put enmity between thee and the woman, between the seed of thy children and the seed of her children; and it shall be, when the children of the woman shall keep the precepts of the law, they shall smite and bruise thee on thy head; but when they forsake the precepts of the law, thou shalt smite and bruise them on their heel. Nevertheless there shall be a remedy for them; but to thee there shall not be a remedy, for they shall hereafter perform a healing of the heel in the days of King Messiah.'

The Jerusalem Targum is in all respects similar.

1 Young's Christology of the Targums.
LECTURE II.

ARGUMENT FROM THE MESSIANIC PROPHECIES.

In our last lecture our attention was directed to the nature and importance of prophecy in general, without any special reference to the prophecies regarding the Messiah. The remarks then made were chiefly of an introductory character. We now come to the special subject of these lectures—the consideration of the Messianic prophecies.

The term 'Messiah,' or, more correctly, according to the Hebrew letters, Mashiach, represented in the Greek by Μεσσίας, denotes 'the Anointed One.' It is formed from the passive participle of the Hebrew verb 'to anoint.' In the Septuagint and New Testament it is rendered by Χριστός, a word derived from a Greek verb of similar import. Its Latin form is Christus, being simply adopted from the Greek. The word 'Messias' only occurs twice in the New Testament, in the Gospel of John, and in both cases the Greek equivalent is given by the Evangelist for the information of his readers, who were in general ignorant of Hebrew.
in the address of Andrew to his brother Peter: 'We have found the Messias, which is, being interpreted, the Christ' (John i. 41); and in the address of the Samaritan woman to our Lord: 'I know that Messias cometh, which is called Christ' (John iv. 25). The name Christ, then, was originally an apppellative, being an official title denoting the Jewish Messiah, whilst Jesus is our Lord's proper name. Jesus Christ means Jesus, the Messiah. Christ is used as an apppellative chiefly in the Gospels and in the Acts of the Apostles, but was soon transformed into a proper name, and is generally so used in the Epistles, whether with or without the article, and whether alone or in conjunction with Jesus.

The title 'the Messiah,' or 'the Anointed One,' arose from a practice among the Jews of anointing their prophets, priests, and kings to their respective offices: the prophets representing the spiritual, the priests the ceremonial, and the kings the political departments in the theocracy. We have only one instance of the anointing of a prophet, namely, the commission of Elijah to anoint Elisha as his successor (1 Kings xix. 16), and so cannot tell whether this was a usual ceremony in the consecration to the prophetical office. But of the great future prophet, the Messiah, it is expressly said: 'The Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek' (Isa. lxi. 1). Anointing was regularly employed in the consecration to the
priestly office: 'Thou shalt put the sacred garments upon Aaron thy brother, and his sons with him; and shalt anoint them, and consecrate and sanctify them, that they may minister unto me in the priest's office' (Ex. xxviii. 41). The high priest especially was thus solemnly consecrated, being anointed with the sacred oil prepared for that purpose. Hence he is called, 'the priest that is anointed' (Lev. iv. 3); rendered in the Septuagint, 'the Priest, the Christ.' And one of the chief ceremonies at the coronation of a monarch was his being anointed with the holy oil. Thus Samuel was commissioned to anoint Saul and David, and Elisha to anoint Jehu.

But whilst the title 'Messiah' might be applied to all the three offices, it was especially attached to the royal dignity. The king was pre-eminently 'the Lord's Anointed.' This title was frequently applied to Saul: 'Wast thou not afraid to stretch forth thine hand to destroy the Lord's Anointed?' (2 Sam. i. 14); and to David: 'Shall not Shimei be put to death for this, because he cursed the Lord's Anointed?' (2 Sam. xix. 21). And in the book of Lamentations it is applied to the last of the Davidic race of Jewish monarchs: 'The breath of our nostrils, the Anointed of the Lord, was taken in their pits' (Lam. iv. 20). Indeed, the Jewish kings might be termed Messianic: they were not absolute monarchs, but the anointed vicegerents
or representatives of Jehovah, the true King of Israel. And thus the title Messiah having reference to the anointed king, we may understand the primary though subordinate meaning of several passages in the Messianic Psalms; as in the second Psalm: 'The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord, and against His Anointed' (Messiah), that is, the king (Ps. ii. 2); and in the twentieth Psalm: 'Now I know that the Lord saveth His Anointed' (Messiah), or king (Ps. xx. 6). And in a remarkable passage, the title Messiah is given in prophecy to the heathen monarch Cyrus, as being set apart by God to be His instrument for the accomplishment of His purpose to deliver the Jews from Babylon: 'Thus saith the Lord to his Anointed (Messiah), to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him' (Isa. xlv. 1).

At length the term, which was at first the official title of the Israelitish monarchs, came, especially after the dissolution of the Jewish monarchy and the Babylonish captivity, to be restricted to the future Deliverer, the expected Redeemer. He is revealed in the prophets as the ideal King, the true Representative of Jehovah, who was to sit on the throne of David, and to rule over the house of Israel. Hence the royal title of Messiah was applied to Him. It has indeed been affirmed by Gesenius,
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that this title is never used of the future Messiah in the Old Testament. But we shall afterwards prove, even apart from the expressions in the Messianic psalms, that it is so employed by Daniel in his prophecy of the seventy weeks, wherein he speaks of Messiah, the Prince (Dan. ix. 25). And, at all events, it became the usual appellation of the future Messiah in the later Maccabean Age. Indeed, all the three offices to which men were formerly anointed were to meet in the future Deliverer: He was to be anointed to be at once Prophet, Priest, and King—the true Vicegerent of Jehovah. And thus it has come to pass that the title Messiah is now restricted to Him both by Jews and Christians—the one looking forward to a Deliverer yet to come, and whom they recognise under the title of King Messiah;¹ and the other regarding that Deliverer as having already appeared in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, the Messiah of the Jews.

I propose in this lecture to consider—first, the claim of Jesus to be the Messiah; and secondly, to inquire on what this claim was founded,—or, in other words, to examine the nature of the argument from the Messianic prophecies.

¹ Supplement I.
I. The Claim of Jesus to be the Messiah.

It is manifest from the perusal of the Gospels that Jesus claimed to be the Messiah, the Anointed of the Lord. He not merely affirmed that there were Messianic prophecies in the Old Testament, but that these prophecies received their accomplishment in His person. He not only professed to be a messenger from heaven, a teacher sent from God, a divinely-commissioned prophet who came to reveal the will of God, but He asserted that He was the Messiah or the Christ, to whom all the prophets bore witness as the future Redeemer of the human race. Whether this claim was just and true is another question, which is to be judged by a comparison between His character and life and the predictions concerning the Messiah in the Old Testament; but that this claim was made by Him is an unquestionable fact, which no biblical critic, however extreme be his negations, can dispute.1 It is to be found in all the gospels: we have not

1 Thus Strauss observes: 'Jesus held and expressed the conviction that He was the Messiah: this is an indisputable fact. Not only did He, according to the evangelists, receive with satisfaction the confession of the disciples that He was the Christ, and the salutation of the people, "Hosanna to the Son of David"—not only did He, before a public tribunal as well as to private individuals, repeatedly declare Himself to be the Messiah; but the fact that His disciples after His death believed and proclaimed that He was the Messiah is not to be comprehended, unless when living He had implanted the conviction in their minds' (Life of Jesus, vol. ii. p. 6).
Argument from the Messianic Prophecies. 55

here to distinguish, as is the favourite practice of certain critics, between the fourth and the synop-
tical gospels. It pervades the whole of our Lord's teaching; it is presupposed in His actions; it is often directly maintained by Him. Among numerous other occasions, we shall only adduce five on which this Messianic claim was expressly made by Jesus. At an early period of His ministry, when teaching in the synagogue of Nazareth, He applied the Messianic prediction of Isaiah, 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me; because He hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor,' directly to Himself: 'This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears' (Luke iv. 21). When the Samaritan woman said to Jesus, 'I know that Messias cometh, which is called Christ: when He is come, He will tell us all things,' He plainly and directly replied, 'I that speak unto you am He' (John iv. 25, 26). When, on the road to Caesarea Philippi, He questioned the disciples concerning the opinions which were entertained about Him by the multitude, and when they replied, 'Some say that Thou art John the Baptist; others, Elias; others, Jeremiah, or one of the prophets,' He asked them, 'But whom say ye that I am?' Peter replied, 'Thou art the Christ (the Messiah), the Son of the living God.' And so far from rejecting the title, He pronounced a blessing on Peter for having first uttered it, and emphatically pointed out the essen-
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Tial and lasting significance of the great confession: 'Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood have not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it' (Matt. xvi. 16–18). At His public entrance into Jerusalem, at the last pass-over, He received with approbation the plaudits of the multitude, who hailed Him as the Messiah, the anointed King: 'Hosanna to the Son of David: Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord' (Matt. xxvi. 9). And when the question was directly put unto Him by Caiaphas, 'Art Thou the Christ (the Messiah), the Son of the Blessed?' He without hesitation replied, 'I am' (Mark xiv. 61, 62).

Jesus then possessed the consciousness that He was the Messiah. He claimed to be so, the greatest claim that can be made by man. No period of His life is mentioned when this Messianic consciousness arose within Him; no crisis can be named as the occasion when this idea was fully developed. He appears never to have been without it. When He entered upon His public ministry, He felt that He was the Messiah, and was so pointed out by the Baptist to his followers. But even before this, in the only record which we have of his youthful years, this Messianic
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consciousness appears to have been present with Him: it gleams forth in His reply, 'Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?' (Luke ii. 49). We cannot trace, as Neander and others do, a growth or development of Messianic consciousness.¹ This may have been the case in the human mind of Jesus: we are not forbidden to imagine it, for He grew in wisdom; but there are no traces of it in the sacred narrative. It is undoubtedly true that Jesus exercised a certain reserve as to His Messianic claim; He did not openly announce it until near the close of His life. On the contrary, as on the occasion of the confession of Peter, He charged His disciples that they should tell no man that He was the Messiah (Matt. xvi. 20). But this reserve did not arise from any personal hesitation as to the truth of His claims, but was chiefly occasioned by the false notions which the Jews entertained concerning the character of the Messiah as one who should deliver them from the tyranny of Rome, and actually sit on the throne of David. Publicly to assert that He was the Messiah might stir up rebellion against the Roman government. He, however, never repudiated the title; He did not, like the Baptist, deny that He was the Messiah.²

Conformably with this claim of Jesus, His

¹ Neander's Life of Christ, pp. 33, 34, Bohn's edition.
² Supplement II.
disciples make a like appeal; they frequently assert that their Master was the Messiah, the predicted Deliverer of Israel. All the four evangelists who record His life expressly affirm that this Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah or the Christ. St. Matthew begins his gospel with these words: 'The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham' (Matt. i. 1). St. Mark prefaces his gospel in the following terms: 'The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God' (Mark i. 1); and then follows a Messianic quotation from the prophets. St. Luke repeatedly affirms that Jesus is the Messiah, and he represents Him as expounding to the disciples in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself (Luke xxiv. 26). And St. John mentions that the design of his gospel was to convince his readers of the truth of the Messianic claim of Jesus: 'These are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ (Messiah), the Son of God' (John xx. 31).

The Messiahship of Jesus was also the great subject of the preaching of the apostles. Thus St. Peter concludes his address to the Jews on the day of Pentecost with these words: 'Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Messiah' (Acts ii. 36). After the miracle performed in the temple
on the lame man, he makes the same declaration: 'All the prophets from Samuel, and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of these things' (Acts iii. 24). In his address to Cornelius, he makes the same appeal: 'God commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it was He who was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead. To Him give all the prophets witness, that, through His name, whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins' (Acts x. 42, 43). And in his first epistle he writes: 'Of which salvation the prophets have enquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: searching what, or what manner of time, the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Messiah, and the glory that should follow' (1 Pet. i. 10, 11). The martyr Stephen boldly asserts before his accusers that Jesus, of whom they had been the betrayers and murderers, was that Just One whose coming all the prophets predicted (Acts vii. 25). Philip, one of the seven deacons, beginning at the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, preached Jesus to the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts viii. 35). And we are informed of Apollos that he mightily convinced the Jews, and that publicly, showing by the Scriptures that Jesus was the Messiah (Acts xviii. 28).
St. Paul especially, the great apostle of the Gentiles, grounded his gospel upon the fact that Jesus was the predicted Messiah. Immediately after his conversion, he confounded the Jews who dwelt at Damascus, proving that Jesus is the very Messiah (Acts ix. 22). At Thessalonica he reasoned with the Jews out of the Scriptures, opening and alleging that Christ must needs have suffered and risen again from the dead, and that this Jesus, whom he preached, was the Messiah (Acts viii. 23). At Corinth he was pressed in the Spirit, and testified to the Jews that Jesus was the Messiah (Acts viii. 5). In his defence before Agrippa, he uses these words: 'Having obtained help of God, I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come: that Messiah should suffer, and that He should be the first to rise from the dead, and should show light unto the people and to the Gentiles' (Acts xxvi. 22, 23). When he arrived as a prisoner at Rome, he assembled the chief of the Jews, and at their request expounded and testified the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus both out of the law of Moses and out of the prophets (Acts xxviii. 23). And in all his Epistles he proceeds upon the acknowledged assumption that Jesus is the Messiah.
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It is a fact, then, that cannot possibly be questioned, that Jesus claimed to be the Messiah predicted by the prophets, and that this claim was insisted on by the first teachers of Christianity. So far as it appears to us, this is a fundamental point in Christian evidence. If there are no predictions of a Messiah in the Old Testament, the claim of Jesus is a delusion, founded on a false interpretation of Scripture, or arising from the erroneous notions of the Jews concerning a coming Messiah which were prevalent at that period. The Messiahship of Jesus is inseparably connected with the truth of Christianity, and all attempts to explain away the repeated assertions of our Lord and His apostles on this point must end in failure. And it must not be overlooked that this Messianic claim of Jesus is founded not so much on His miraculous powers, or on the authority of His own declarations, as on the prophecies of the Old Testament. Our Lord appealed to His miraculous deeds as proofs of the divinity of His mission. If He had made no further claim than that He was a divinely-commissioned prophet like to Moses, these proofs would have been perfectly sufficient. There are no predictions concerning Moses, and yet the want of them does not impair the divinity of his mission; if we admit his miracles, we must also admit that he was a prophet sent from God. But Jesus made a far more exalted claim: He
claimed to be the great and mysterious Messiah; not only a prophet, but the Prophet whose advent was foretold. Now the question of the Messiah-ship must rest on its own special evidence. We must here have recourse not to the miracles of power which Jesus performed, but to the prophecies concerning the Messiah. We must take the record of these prophecies and compare them with the circumstances of the life of Jesus; it must be determined whether there is a correspondence between them, whether the one is the fulfilment of the other, whether, in short, the life and character of Jesus is the only key to the interpretation of the prophecies. This is the method which our Lord recommended to the Jews: 'Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me' (John v. 39). And this is the method which He took with His disciples: 'Beginning at Moses and all the prophets, He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself' (Luke xxiv. 27).

II. The Argument from the Messianic Prophecies.

Before examining into the truth of the claim of our Lord to be the Messiah by an actual comparison between the prophecies and the circumstances of His life, some observations are necessary
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on the nature of the argument from the Messianic prophecies. This will clear the way by enabling us to understand the exact state of the question, and by removing certain ambiguities which have gathered round the subject.

1. My first observation is of a negative character. It has been plausibly asserted that if the Messianic claim of Jesus is founded on the prophecies of the Old Testament, then before examining this claim we must first ascertain the divine origin of these prophecies; for in reasoning from them we virtually assume that they are real prophecies, and if we do not prove them to be so, we are guilty of reasoning in a circle. Accordingly, a previous question must be discussed: Were the prophets of the Old Testament inspired? Had they a divine commission? The argument from the Messianic prophecies may be valid with reference to the Jews who believe in the inspiration of their prophets, and may prove them to be inexcusable in continuing in their unbelief; but, it is asserted, it can be of no force to those who do not admit that inspiration. Hence, then, it is affirmed, that in order to become Christians, men must first become Jews; they can only be the disciples of Jesus by first becoming the disciples of Moses. ‘Christianity,’ observes Anthony Collins, ‘is founded on Judaism, and the New Testament on the Old; and Jesus is the person said in the New Testament to be
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promised in the Old, under the character of the Messias of the Jews, who, as such only, commands the obedience and submission of the world.' And from this he draws the inference that our belief in Christianity is founded on our belief in Judaism. 'The truth of Christianity depends on ancient revelations, which are contained in the Old Testament.' 'Christianity is wholly revealed in the Old Testament, and has its divine authority from thence.' 'Converted Gentiles must be converted by allegory, and become allegorists or mystical Jews.'

'Prophecy,' as Gibbon somewhat sneeringly expresses it, 'might serve to edify a Christian or to convert a Jew, since both the one and the other acknowledge the authority of those prophecies, and both are obliged with devout reverence to search for their sense and accomplishment. But this mode of persuasion loses much of its weight and influence, when it is addressed to those who neither understand nor respect the Mosaic dispensation and the prophetic style.'

The objection of Collins is very artfully stated, but it is sophistical and fallacious; it is not so much a false statement as a perversion of the truth. If the assertion is to be taken in its full meaning, if we must first be convinced of the

1 Collins' *Grounds and Reasons*, pp. 4, 25, 91, 92; Supplement III.
2 Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*, vol. ii. p. 377.
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	ruth of Judaism before we are convinced of the
truth of Christianity, the evidence derived from
prophecy would be greatly complicated and in-
volved in much obscurity. Still there is this truth
in the assertion that the argument in favour of
the Messiahship of Jesus is founded on the pre-
dictions of the Old Testament; and thus, in a
certain sense, it may be loosely affirmed that the
New Testament is founded on the Old. We do
not, however, presuppose the truth of the Old
Testament, but only what is admitted on all
hands, that the predictions contained in it were
made before the events said to be their fulfilment.

Let us put ourselves in the position of the
first converts who embraced the gospel on the
preaching of the apostles, and let us see how the
argument derived from prophecy affected them.
These converts were either Jews or Gentiles; and
the position of these two classes was different
with regard to the argument from prophecy. To
the Jews, the chief evidence was from prophecy:
their own religion was founded on miracles, and
therefore miracles alone could not convert them
from Judaism to Christianity. But they had in
their hands the books of the prophets: they were
intimately acquainted with them: they were read
in their synagogues every Sabbath day: they
acknowledged their authority and believed in
their inspiration; and therefore the fulfilment of

E
their prophecies, in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, was to them a convincing proof of His divine mission.

But the position of the Gentiles was quite otherwise. The chief evidence to them was from miracles: they were ignorant of the prophecies, or at least did not believe in them, and therefore the argument from prophecy could, in the first instance, exert no influence over them; but miracles arrested their attention: they saw in them the evidences of supernatural power, and were thus convinced that the religion which the apostles taught was of divine origin. A Gentile who had never heard of the prophecies of the Old Testament, but was an eye-witness of the miracles of Jesus, might with justice come to the same conclusion that Nicodemus did: 'We know that thou art a teacher come from God: for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him' (John iii. 2). Afterwards, indeed, as a subsequent consideration, when they had been convinced from miracles that Jesus was an inspired prophet, the attention of the Gentiles would be directed to the prophecies of the Old Testament; they would naturally compare these prophecies with the life of Jesus, and thus would arrive at a conviction of the inspiration of the prophets. 'To the Jew,' observes Bishop Sherlock, 'prophecy was the first proof; to the
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Gentile, it was the last. The Jews believed in Christ, because foretold by the prophets; the Gentiles believed the prophets, because they so exactly foretold Jesus Christ. Both became believers, having, each in his own way, a full view of all the dispensations of Providence towards mankind.¹

Our position is somewhat different from the first converts, whether Jews or Gentiles. We are not the eye-witnesses of the miracles, but neither are we ignorant of the prophecies; but still in reasoning from them, we have not first previously to assume their divine origin. At the outset, we have nothing to do with the divine origin of the books of the Old Testament; for our argument, it is a matter of comparative indifference by whom they were composed: their origin might be wholly unknown, and they might be brought under our notice merely as ancient Hebrew writings. All that we are required to prove is, that the books containing those prophecies existed some time before the events said to be their fulfilment; that there is a real correspondence between these prophecies and the events; and that this correspondence is of such a nature as could not be foreseen by human sagacity. Our only data are the records containing the prophecies, and the history containing an account of

¹ Sherlock's Discourses on Prophecy, Discourse vi.
the events. But notice now what follows. Having come to the conviction that Jesus is the Person whose life is described in those prophetical books, written ages before He was born, we then reason backwards, and draw the inference that the books containing these prophetical statements must necessarily be of divine origin. Our belief in the inspiration of the Old Testament is not a preliminary postulate, but a subsequent inference; so that it would be more correct to affirm that our belief in Judaism is founded on a belief in Christianity, than that our belief in Christianity is founded on a belief in Judaism.

2. It is a fact beyond dispute, and which it would be mere loss of time to demonstrate, that the prophecies were published before the events which are said to be their accomplishment—in other words, that the Old Testament existed and was known to the world a considerable time before the days of our Lord. The books to which Jesus and His disciples so constantly referred, were not some secret manuscripts accessible only to the priests, like the Sibylline oracles of the heathen: they were not prophecies brought to light and only heard of after the events; but they were incorporated in the public records of the Jews, and constituted part of their religion and their laws. They were publicly read every Sabbath in their synagogues. Besides, the Jews,
in the providence of God, were before the Christian era dispersed by trade or commerce, by emigration or exile, throughout all the nations of the civilised world. Multitudes of them had settled in all the principal cities of the Roman Empire. Wherever they went, they retained their religion, built synagogues, and carried with them the books of the law and the prophets. As has been well said, 'The Jews have been our librarians:' their enmity to Christianity has furnished the surest ground for knowing that there could have been no collusion; and the diffusion of the copies of their books has prevented the possibility of interpolation.

The early versions of the Old Testament demonstrate, not only its existence before the Christian era, but also its publication and diffusion. The translation of the Septuagint was made about two hundred years before the birth of our Saviour. It was publicly read in the synagogues of those Jews who, dwelling for generations in foreign countries, had lost the use of the Hebrew. Still further back, more than three hundred years before Christ, a transcription of the law of Moses was made in Samaritan characters, and is known by the name of the Samaritan Pentateuch. Josephus also gives us a list of the sacred books of his nation, and asserts their high authority and the reverence with which they were regarded. Add to this, that
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throughout the whole history of the Jews from Rehoboam downwards, there have been rival tribes and sects, both of whom recognised the authority of the Old Testament, and watched and guarded it with jealous care. And thus, as it is perfectly certain that the Old Testament was in existence long before the days of our Lord, so there is no reason to doubt that it has come down to us comparatively pure and uncorrupted; at least, it is certain that no interpolations have been made favourable to Christianity, and no one with whom we are concerned will call this in question. As Professor Kuenen observes: 'Critical objections are of no avail here. Although the prophecies were denied to be the works of those men whose names they bear, or were assigned to a much later period than that in which the historical narrative places them, yet chronologically they precede the establishment of Christianity and the birth of Jesus.'

3. We have in our gospels a record of the events said to be the accomplishment of the Messianic prophecies. We are entitled to assume that the four gospels contain, in general, a sufficiently accurate account of the life of Jesus. The existence of the Christian Church is a proof of this. And the most extreme critics ground their Lives of Jesus on the admission of the truth of the history, with the

1 Kuenen's Prophets and Prophecy of Isaiah, p. 449.
exception of the miraculous element. Of course, if the facts be not granted, no argument drawn from the circumstance that these facts have been predicted will be able to establish them. Not only must the prophecies previously exist, but the facts said to be their fulfilment must also be admitted. Thus, in arguing from prophecy with those who call in question the miraculous works of Christ, we are precluded, in the first instance, from having recourse to those predictions which assert that the Messiah would work miracles. It would, for example, be no argument to an unbeliever to prove that the prophecies assert that the Messiah was to be raised from the dead, and that therefore Jesus is the Messiah; because the fact of the resurrection of Jesus is disputed by him. Such an argument would only convince one who is already a believer in the resurrection of Jesus, and consequently in His divine mission, of the additional truth that He was the Messiah.

We are here met by a subtle objection of Strauss. He admits that there is a substratum of fact in the narratives of the life of Jesus; but he thinks that especially those facts with which we are at present most closely concerned are doubtful, if not mythical. According to his theory, the evangelical history arose in a great measure out of the Messianic beliefs of the disciples. Their intercourse with Jesus had impressed them with a sense
of the truth of His claim to be the Messiah: they believed Him to be that victorious Messiah whom the Jews expected. His death, however, was directly opposed to the idea which they formed of the Messiah, and for a time destroyed their faith. But, after the first shock was over, their faith revived; and they endeavoured, by a more careful study of the prophecies, to reconcile their former views of the Messiahship of Jesus with His sufferings and death. Hence they applied to Him the intimations of a suffering Messiah; they transferred to Him the circumstances stated by the prophets; they made His history to suit the predictions: so that the events recorded in the gospels were not historically real, but were the result of a more or less unconscious application of the Old Testament. For example, the account of the visit of the Magi had its origin in the Jewish Messianic notion, built upon the prophecy of Balaam, respecting the star that should arise out of Jacob; and the narrative of the burial of Jesus in the sepulchre of Joseph had its origin in the words of Isaiah, that 'in His death the Messiah was brought in connection with the rich.' Even the belief of the apostles in the resurrection of Jesus arose in this manner. 'When,' he observes, 'the apostles had received into their Messianic idea ignominy, sufferings and death, the ignominiously-executed Jesus

1 Strauss' Gesammelte Werke, Band iv. p. 351.
was not lost, but still remained to them: by His death He had only entered into His Messianic glory (Luke xxiv. 26), in which He was invisibly with them always, even unto the end of the world (Matt. xxviii. 20). But how could He fail, out of this glory in which He lived, to give tidings of Himself to His followers? And how could they, when their mind was opened to the hitherto hidden doctrine of a dying Messiah contained in the Scriptures, avoid conceiving this to be an influence shed on them by their glorified Christ, an opening of their understanding by Him—nay, an actual conversing with Him? Lastly, how conceivable is it that in individuals, especially women, these impressions were heightened, in a purely subjective manner, into actual vision; that on others, even on whole assemblies, something or other of an objective nature, visible or audible,—sometimes, perhaps, the sight of an unknown person,—created the impression of a revelation or appearance of Jesus: a height of pious enthusiasm which is wont to appear elsewhere in religious societies peculiarly oppressed and persecuted. But if the crucified Messiah had already entered into the highest form of blessed existence, He ought not to have left His body in the grave; and if, in precisely such Old Testament passages as admitted of a typical relation to the sufferings of the Messiah, there was at the same time expressed the hope,
“Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt Thou suffer Thine Holy One to see corruption” (Ps. xvi. 10),—while in Isa. liii. 10, He who had been represented as led to the slaughter and buried, was yet promised a prolongation of His days,—what was more natural to the disciples than to reinstate their earlier Jewish ideas, which the death of Jesus had disturbed, namely, “that the Christ abideth for ever” (John xii. 34), through the medium of an actual revivification of their dead Master, and, as it was a Messianic attribute one day to call the dead bodily from the grave, to imagine Him also as returning to life in the manner of a resurrection?

But such a theory is utterly unreasonable and contradictory: the mere statement of it proves its extravagance. According to Strauss, the apostles first adopted the Jewish notion of a Messiah into which suffering does not enter; they believed that their Master was the victorious Messiah predicted in the Old Testament, though how this impression was produced on their minds by Jesus in His poverty and loneliness, and, according to the view of Strauss, without His performing a single miracle, it is difficult to conceive. Such an impression was destroyed by the death of Jesus; but we have to believe that this event, instead of demonstrating the vanity of the hopes

of the apostles, and leading them to see how greatly they were mistaken in recognising a victorious Messiah in the crucified Nazarene, had a precisely opposite effect. Notwithstanding their disappointment, they were led without any reason to reject their own and the universal belief of their nation concerning the Messiah, and to adopt the notion of a suffering Messiah, although, as Strauss asserts, contrary to the representation of the Old Testament. They were further led to believe not only that their Master would rise again, but, according to Strauss, contrary to fact and to the evidence of their senses, that He had risen and had actually appeared, and they had succeeded in imposing this belief on others. Certainly this is an instance of credulity, both on the part of the apostles and of their converts, unparalleled in history. In opposition to these unreasonable conjectures, we have four different accounts, distinguished by simplicity and apparent truthfulness, which record the chief facts of the life of Jesus; we have the early history of the Christian Church, as recorded in the Acts, which grew out of these facts; and we have the writings of the apostles, which presuppose their truth.¹

4. The predictions and their fulfilment cannot be accounted for from human sagacity. We must

¹ Supplement IV.
not only prove the existence of the prophecies before the events said to be their fulfilment, the reality of the events, and the correspondence between them, but also that the events predicted could not possibly have been foreseen. Now, in the case of the Messianic prophecies, this pre-requisite has abundantly been fulfilled. This is evident when we consider the number, the combination, and the complexity of these prophecies. If there had been but one prophecy, as that a certain man belonging to the Jewish nation should propagate a new religion, such a prediction might be accounted for without having recourse to a supernatural illumination; but had it been, moreover, foretold that that man should be born of a particular family, at a certain fixed time, and in a certain fixed place, that he should undergo certain definite sufferings, and at length be put to death by his countrymen, and that his religion should overspread the world,—and were these particulars not all given by one prophet, but by many persons professing themselves to be prophets and living at different periods of time, each announcing different circumstances in the life of that person,—such a combination of events and particulars would certainly remove the prediction out of the sphere of human sagacity. And such particulars, as we shall afterwards endeavour to demonstrate, were predicted of the Messiah and
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were fulfilled in Jesus. Moreover, we have to take into account the circumstances on which the fulfilment depended: on the enmity and malice of the Jewish rulers, on the fickleness of the multitude, on the caprices of the Roman Government, and chiefly on the will and providence of God. Such being the case, human sagacity and foresight are here entirely out of the question: the foreknowledge of such events is not human, but divine.

5. It is a self-evident conclusion, that the fulfilment of the Messianic prophecies is a convincing proof of the Messiahship of Jesus. If there be prophecies in the Old Testament concerning the Messiah of circumstances which no human sagacity could foresee, and if there be a correspondence between the life of Jesus and these prophecies, then the conclusion is inevitable that He must be the Messiah, that Prophet who should come into the world. Whether there are such prophecies, and whether the life of Jesus corresponds with these prophecies, will form the subject of future lectures; all that we at present affirm is, that if there be such prophecies and such a correspondence, then it follows that Jesus is the Messiah. There are only two possible methods of avoiding this conclusion—by denying either the existence of the prophecies, or the correspondence of the life of Jesus with these prophecies. The
Messianic Prophecies.

Jews, in the days of our Lord, adopted the latter alternative: they clung to the prophecies, they recognised and asserted them, they never thought of doubting them; but they denied the application to Him whom we believe is their great subject: they saw the portrait on the canvas, but they failed to discern whose image it was. Modern unbelievers have in general adopted the former alternative: they do not see in the books of the prophets any Messianic predictions; they regard them only as the natural outbursts of Jewish patriotism, coloured perhaps with oriental exaggeration, referring merely to the passing events of the day, but without any divine insight into futurity; they too gaze on the canvas, but on it they see no portrait depicted, and therefore they cannot possibly discern any resemblance.¹

SUPPLEMENT I.

THE JEWISH ADMISSION OF A MESSIAH.

We do not here advert to the Jewish Messianic notions, whether those entertained by the Jews in the days of our Lord, or those adopted in modern

¹ Supplement V.
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times. We shall afterwards have frequent occasion
to advert to them. What we merely observe at
present, is that the reality of the Messianic pre-
dictions, and consequently the expectation of a
Messian, are generally admitted by the Jews. This
was unquestionably the case in the days of our
Lord; and throughout the whole history of the
Jews from that period to the present day, the idea
of a Messiah constitutes a chief element in their
religion. It is undoubtedly true that there are
many Jews in recent times who have lost their
faith in a Messiah, and regard the Messianic hope
as a delusion, the result of the natural craving of
the human heart, in seasons of depression and
persecution, after a happier future: as the dream
of a golden age supposed to be in store for them.
Modern rationalism has not been without its influ-
ence on the Jewish people. Such Jews are simply
Deists, who consider that the only value of the
Old Testament is the revelation and maintenance
of the doctrine of the divine unity in opposition to
the polytheism of the Gentiles. But the Jews who
entertain these views are regarded by their country-
men as rationalists, and do not represent the belief
of the Jewish nation. The great body of the Jewish
people still adhere to the Messianic idea.

In Dr. Adler’s Course of Sermons, formerly ad-
verted to, the Messianic idea is fully maintained:
the Messiah is yet to come; He will exalt the
Jews to a priority among the nations; He will establish a kingdom of virtue and peace. The following extract will give some idea of the modern belief of the Jews, and will show with what tenacity they still cleave to the Messianic idea:—'Far be it from me to allow you to imagine that the Bible does not contain predictions, couched in plain and distinct language, concerning the advent of the true Redeemer. The doctrine of the coming of a personal Messiah is the purple thread that runs through the writings of our prophets and historians. This belief in the coming of a Redeemer, at whose appearance Israel will be gathered together from "the four corners of the earth," and again be united so as to form a happy and flourishing nation,—this belief has been a precious heirloom, handed down from generation to generation. It was this hope that upheld our forefathers amid all their sufferings: this hope was the silver lining of the darkest and gloomiest cloud that ever lowered upon them. When, under the sway of the Roman emperors, and, later, through the dark Middle Ages, their lives were sacrificed, their blood was ruthlessly shed, and their substance plundered; when they were surrounded on all sides by cruelty, ignominy, and contempt: this was the balm that healed their wounds, the solace that lightened the burden that rested on their weary shoulders.'

1 Adler's *Course of Sermons*, pp. 125, 126.
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In like manner, in the Hebrew prayer-book used in the synagogues, there is frequent reference to the Jewish belief in a Messiah. It may not be without interest to extract a few passages where the Messianic idea is directly asserted. One of the thirteen fundamental articles of faith, which every Israelite is enjoined to rehearse daily, is: 'I believe with a perfect heart that the Messiah will come; and although His coming be delayed, I will still wait patiently for His speedy appearance.' In their morning service the following prayer occurs: 'O be mercifully pleased to return to Jerusalem, Thy city, and dwell therein, as Thou hast promised. O rebuild it shortly, even in our days, a structure of everlasting fame, and speedily establish the throne of David thereon. O cause the offspring of Thy servant David speedily to flourish, and let His horn be exalted in Thy salvation.' The following expression occurs in one of their most frequent prayers, a prayer enjoined to be used at all their festivals: 'Mayest Thou be pleased to grant that the memorial of the Messiah, the Son of David, Thy Servant, may ascend, come, and be remembered in Thy presence.' In the Sabbath morning service the following Messianic prayer occurs: 'O Lord our God, cause us to rejoice in Thy servant Elijah, Thy prophet, and in the kingdom of the house of David, Thine anointed. May He come speedily and gladden our hearts. Suffer no stranger
to sit on His throne, nor let any other inherit His glory: for by Thy holy name hast Thou sworn unto Him that His lamp shall never be extinguished. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the Shield of David.' So also, in another prayer, a similar hope is expressed: 'Elijah, the prophet, shall speedily come with Messiah, the Son of David.' In the Sabbath evening service, the following is part of the sacred hymn which is chanted: 'Shake off the dust; arise, O my people, and adorn thyself with thy beautiful attire: for by the hand of Jesse, the Bethlehemite, redemption draweth nigh to my soul.' And in the order of prayers for the New Year, there is the following petition: 'Grant joy unto Thy land, gladness unto Thy city, a revival of the kingdom of Thy servant David, and an ordination of renewed splendour to the son of Jesse, Thine anointed, speedily in our days.'

These extracts from the Jewish liturgy might be greatly increased; but those given sufficiently show that the hope of the Messiah is still cherished by the Jewish people. In short, the doctrine that the Messiah shall come is as essentially a part of the Jewish creed as the doctrine that the Messiah has come is of the Christian creed. And thus this Messianic notion forms a common ground of meeting between Christians and Jews in the present day, as it did in the days of our Lord and His apostles—a point of contact between us; and
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SUPPLEMENT II.

MESSIANIC CONSCIOUSNESS OF JESUS.

Nearly all recent biblical critics, however opposite their views on other points, agree that Jesus claimed to be the Jewish Messiah; and, with a few exceptions, they admit that this claim was honestly made, without any intention on His part to deceive. They allow a Messianic consciousness in Jesus. Jesus claimed to be the Messiah, because He was conscious that He was the Messiah. But here the agreement stops. They differ materially both as to the nature of this Messianic consciousness, and as to the period when it first arose in the mind of Jesus. Those who admit the supernatural element in His life refer it to a divine origin, though among them there is a difference of opinion as to the precise period when Jesus became fully conscious that He was the Messiah; whilst those who eliminate the supernatural element from His life are constrained to affirm that this Messianic conscious-
ness had its origin in our Lord's own imagination, taken in connection with the spirit of the times in which He lived. The expectation of the Messiah was then general among the Jews; and Jesus caught the spirit of His nation and persuaded Himself that He was the Messiah, although not the triumphant Messiah whom the Jews expected, but a spiritual Reformer, an Apostle of love, a Teacher of righteousness.

We have stated that, according to Neander, there was a growth or development of Messianic consciousness in the mind of Jesus. It by degrees dawned upon Him that He was the Messiah; nor were external events without their influence in the development in the mind of Jesus of the consciousness of His Messiahship. Thus, when commenting on the incident in the early life of Jesus, when Joseph and Mary found Him among the doctors, and when, to their inquiries, He replied, 'How is it that ye sought me? wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?' Neander remarks: 'We see an opening consciousness of the peculiar relation in which He stood to the Father as the Son of God. We delight to find in the early lives of eminent men some glimpses of the future, some indications of their after greatness; so we gladly recognise in the pregnant words of the child a foreshadowing of what is afterwards so fully revealed to us in the discourses of the completely-
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manifested Christ, especially as they are given to us in John's Gospel. Neander, however, does not mention any peculiar crisis in the life of Jesus when this Messianic consciousness was fully developed. Lange, on the other hand, supposes that such a crisis took place at the baptism of Christ: the presentiments of His own mind were then confirmed by an audible voice from heaven, and He then attained to a full consciousness of His Messiahship. 'The rose at last requires only a single sunbeam to complete its unfolding. The unfolding of the Messianic consciousness of Jesus was completed at His baptism; but equally so the public certainty of His Messiahship.'

Different from this is the view of Colani in his Croyances Messianiques, though somewhat vaguely and indistinctly expressed. Jesus, he supposes, was full of the Messianic hopes of His times; but His gentle nature recoiled from the popular idea of a triumphant and victorious Messiah,—a man of war; and rather dwelt upon the prophetical predictions of purity and peace. At first He considered Himself to be but the precursor of this kingdom of peace, whose advent He proclaimed; then the thought gradually dawned upon Him that possibly He might be the Messiah Himself; but it was not until on the road to Cæsarea-

1 Neander's Life of Christ, p. 35, Bohn's translation.
Philippi, when Peter acknowledged Him to be the Messiah, that the great crisis in His life took place. 'Jesus,' observes Colani, 'had certainly from His earliest years nourished the apocalyptic hopes which then agitated Palestine, and especially Galilee. But a soul such as His pictured the deliverance of Israel as moral and religious. The Messianic kingdom doubtless imprinted itself early upon His imagination with the colours which He found in Himself: this was, He thought, an epoch when all men will be as He Himself, gentle, humble, pure, pious, and happy. If the Jews at that time reckoned on a political empire founded by fire and sword, Jesus recognised in the ancient prophets other descriptions of the Messianic times which agreed infinitely better with His loving heart. We can suppose that, long before His public ministry, His entirely spiritual notion of the kingdom of God was nearly completely fixed; for, I repeat, it was the reflection of His own nature. . . . Evidently, at first, Jesus believed Himself to be only a simple precursor to prepare the minds of men for these happy times. ¹

There does not seem to be any great difference between this view of Colani and that of Renan.² According to Renan, Jesus is simply an enthusiast who believed Himself to be the Messiah, and felt

¹ Colani's Jesus Christ, pp. 123, 124.
² The Life of Jesus.
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Himself called to preach to the people in the villages of Galilee. Such a belief, however, often put Him in a false position, and forced both Him and His disciples to have recourse to unworthy artifices to maintain it; and though at first filled with pure impulses, He was led by opposition and the necessities of His circumstances to a participation in deception. Renan does not, like Strauss and Baur, repudiate the gospels; but as he, like them, denies the supernatural, he sacrifices the character of Jesus.

Schenkel's view of the Messianic consciousness of Jesus is somewhat different. According to him, Jesus appeared as a religious reformer; He had no intention to claim the Messianic dignity: this was forced upon Him against His better judgment. The confession of Peter became the watchword of His followers, and obliged Him to declare Himself the Messiah. 'Jesus,' he observes, 'assumed the title and dignity of the Messiah only in consequence of an unavoidable accommodation to the ideas and expectations of His contemporaries and co-patriots, because this was the only means to attain the object of His vocation.'

1 Schenkel's Charakterbild Jesu.
SUPPLEMENT III.

COLLINS' 'GROUNDS AND REASONS.'

The objection of Collins—that the argument from prophecy presupposes a belief in the Old Testament, and that consequently, before being converted to Christianity, the Gentiles must first be converted to a mystical Judaism—is an inference drawn from his general argument. That argument is as follows: The apostles lay the whole stress of their reasoning on the Jewish records; they ground and prove Christianity from the Old Testament; and adopt a method common to all religions, of founding their religion on a previous revelation;—in short, the Old Testament is the canon of Christians: Hence their constant reference to the prophecies as the chief proofs of Christianity: if these proofs are valid, Christianity is invincibly established on its true foundation; if these proofs are invalid, Christianity is false. But when we turn our attention to those prophecies, we find that many of them are no prophecies at all; and that those which profess to be so are so vague and obscure as to be altogether unavailing for evidence. And thus it happens that the applications of them by the sacred writers of the New
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Testament are far-fetched, and can only be understood in a secondary, allegorical, or mystical sense.

This work of Collins, published in 1724, made a great noise at the time, and gave rise to numerous replies; the importance assigned to it being altogether disproportionate to its merits. No less than thirty-five answers were written within two years after its publication. Most of these replies have sunk into oblivion; but there are especially three books, written in opposition to Collins, which still remain as monuments of logical acumen, suggestive thought, or theological learning. The first of these is the elaborate work of the great critic, Dr Bentley, entitled, Remarks on a Late Discourse on Free-thinking, and published under the feigned name of Phyleutherus Lipsiensis, in a letter addressed to Dr. Francis Hare: it is an answer to an earlier work of Collins, entitled, A Discourse on Free-thinking, occasioned by the Rise and Growth of a Sect called Free-thinkers; the second is the highly-suggestive and philosophical discourses of Bishop Sherlock on the Use and Intent of Prophecy; and the third is the Defence of Christianity from the Prophecies of the Old Testament, by Bishop Chandler. This last work is a masterpiece on the subject, and must be regarded by every unprejudiced mind as a complete refutation of the position and arguments of Collins. It is a work of great learning, candour, and logical force,
being still one of the best books on the Messianic prophecies, altogether independent of the circumstances which called forth its publication. Collins afterwards renewed the controversy, by publishing in 1727 a reply, entitled, *The Scheme of Literal Prophecy considered*. In the introduction there is a curious list of the thirty-five answers that were made to his former book. The answer of Collins was chiefly directed against the work of Bishop Chandler, whom he justly considered as his chief antagonist. This was again replied to by the Bishop in his work, entitled, *A Vindication of the Defence of Christianity*. The controversy, however, drifted away from the main subject of the Messianic prophecies to an attack on, and a defence of, the genuineness of the book of Daniel.¹

SUPPLEMENT IV.

STRAUSS' VIEW OF THE ORIGIN OF THE EVANGELICAL HISTORY.

STRAUSS' *Leben Jesu* was published in 1835, and no book in recent times has raised such a com-
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motion in the theological world. Divines of all opinions felt themselves called upon to take notice of it. This notoriety was chiefly caused by a certain originality in the argument, by the boldness and audacity of the attack on the evangelical history, made without the least scruple or disguise, and by the clearness and vigour of his style. According to Strauss, the narrative of the life of Jesus is transformed and adapted so as to agree with the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament. He lays down the following rule: 'Where not merely the particular nature and manner of an occurrence is critically suspicious, its external circumstances represented as miraculous, and the like; but where likewise the essential substance and groundwork is either inconceivable in itself, or is in striking harmony with some Messianic idea of the Jews of that age, then not the particular alleged course and mode of the transaction only, but the entire occurrence must be regarded as unhistorical' (Strauss' Life of Jesus, vol. i. p. 94). And again he observes: 'The one source of the pure myth is the Messianic ideas and expectations existing according to their several forms in the Jewish mind before Jesus, and independently of Him; the other is that peculiar impression which was left by the personal character, actions, and fate of Jesus, and which served to modify the Messianic idea in the minds of His people' (vol. i. p. 86). That such actions
were to be done by the Messiah, was a sufficient reason for attributing them to Jesus. The nucleus of truth that was contained in these representations was small and distorted by legend, so that it can now seldom be ascertained. Of course Strauss admitted the main facts concerning the lowly life and death of Jesus; and, according to him, the gospel narrative was a reconciliation between this and the Jewish notions of a Messiah—a more or less conscious adaptation of the prophecies of a suffering Messiah to the life of Jesus. The disciples at first entertained the common notion of a triumphant Messiah, but the death of Jesus had constrained them to alter their opinions. This view of the origin of the evangelical history has received the name of the mythical theory, because the Messianic ideas were translated by mental realism into facts.

Such a theory is completely untenable. It cannot explain the historical fact of Christianity. It presupposes the existence of Christianity before these myths were formed; they were afterthoughts; but it assigns no reason for the origin of Christianity. The death of Jesus must have extinguished those Messianic hopes, which, according to Strauss, the disciples entertained; and no cause is assigned for the revival of these hopes, or for the remarkable change which took place in their nature. Strauss merely asserts 'that there
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spontaneously arose in the disciples the psychological necessity of solving the contradiction between the ultimate fate of Jesus and their early opinion of him—of adopting into their idea of the Messiah the characteristics of suffering and death.¹ Indeed, the whole theory was given up by Strauss himself, and in his new edition of the Life of Jesus for the German People, he adopts the tendency theory of Baur to account for the origin of the gospels; and confesses 'to having, chiefly in consequence of the investigations of Baur (who puts the notion of tendency in place of that of myth), allotted more space than formerly to the view of conscious and intentional fiction.'²

¹ Strauss' Life of Jesus, vol. iii. p. 370.
A possible objection to this reasoning is that the whole series of prophecies and their fulfilment may have been the result of a supernatural influence which is evil. Prophecy, it may be argued, involves the idea of supernatural influence; it is the exercise of knowledge above human, but it does not make known to us the nature of that influence; it may be divine, but it may be also diabolical; from above or from beneath. Moses appears to admit that a false prophet may utter true predictions, and yet he is not on that account to be credited. 'If there arise among you a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder, and the sign or the wonder come to pass, whereof he spake unto thee, saying, Let us go after other gods, which thou hast not known, and let us serve them; thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that prophet, or dreamer of dreams: for the Lord your God proveth you, to know whether ye love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul' (Deut. xiii. 1–3). The fulfilment is indeed a proof of the reality of the prophecy, but
it affords no ground for judging as to the nature of the Being from whom the prophecy proceeded.

I do not know if the above objection is seriously brought forward by modern thinkers, except as an objection to the reality of prophecy in general. More has been made of it by former apologists than it deserves. No real prophecy proceeding from evil spirits has ever been attested. The oracles and predictions of the heathen are all avowedly false. The knowledge of the future is the prerogative of God; and we cannot suppose that it inherently belongs to any class of creatures. God only is omniscient, and He only can declare that which shall be, as if it were. Nor are we, in the passage adduced, constrained to believe that Moses taught that a false prophet might utter a real prediction; but only that he might accompany his prophetic exhortation, 'Let us go after other gods,' with a sign or wonder—a miracle, whether pretended or real. Indeed, the word prophet in that passage appears to be taken rather in its general sense, as a revealer of the will of God, than in its restricted sense, as a foreteller of the future. And therefore, for our part, we are disposed to believe that the foresight of the future belongs to God alone, and is beyond the power or knowledge of evil spirits.

But granting that it is otherwise, granting that evil spirits have the knowledge to predict future events, we have still criteria to judge of the nature
of the being from whom the prophecy proceeds. We can judge of the nature of the doctrine to confirm which the prophecies have been given, and from this judge of the moral character of the agent. As we may be certain that evil spirits will neither work miracles nor utter predictions for a benevolent and holy purpose, else they would be divided against themselves, so we are certain that miracles and prophecies wrought in confirmation of a revelation, the design of which is to overthrow the kingdom of darkness, and to establish truth, and holiness, and love on the earth, cannot possibly proceed from the father of lies, but must have proceeded from God, the source of all that is true, and holy, and good. There is an intimate connection between the external and internal evidences; the external evidences prove the existence of a supernatural influence; and the internal evidences prove that the nature of that supernatural influence is divine. 'You complain,' observes Dr. Arnold, 'of those persons who judge of a revelation not by its evidence, but by its substance. It has always seemed to me that its substance is a most essential part of its evidence; and that miracles wrought in favour of what was foolish or wicked would only prove Manicheism. We are so perfectly ignorant of the unseen world that the character of any supernatural power can only be judged of by the moral character of the statement which it sanctions; thus
Argument from the Messianic Prophecies. only can we tell, whether it be a revelation from God or from the devil. If his father tells a child something monstrous, faith requires him to submit his own judgment, because he knows his father's person, and is sure, therefore, that his father tells it him. But we cannot thus know God, and can only recognise His voice by the words spoken being in agreement with our idea of His moral nature.'

1 Arnold's *Life and Correspondence*, Letter 250.
LECTURE III.

NATURE OF THE MESSIANIC PROPHECIES.

In our former lectures we considered the nature of the argument from prophecy, in its application to the proof of the Messiahship of Jesus. The general nature of prophecy was discussed in our first lecture. We defined predictive prophecy to be 'an announcement of a future event, whose occurrence could not possibly be foreseen by human sagacity, but which must have been disclosed to the prophet by a divine communication.' Two conditions are necessary to constitute a realized prophecy—first, that the prediction was made before the event said to be its accomplishment, that it is not a *vaticinium post eventum*; and, secondly, that the correspondence between the event and the prediction cannot be accounted for on the ground of human foresight. In our second lecture, we unfolded these principles in reference to the Messianic prophecies. Our Lord claimed to be the Messiah, or that Anointed King whose coming was foretold in the books of the Old Testament; the truth of which claim can
only be ascertained by discerning a correspondence between the events in His life and the prophecies regarding the Messiah. We proved that the first condition in a prophecy was here fulfilled. The books said to contain these predictions undoubtedly existed prior to the occurrence of the events alleged to be their fulfilment; though the question still remains to be discussed, whether such predictions are actually contained in these books. And the second condition is also beyond dispute. If the circumstances in the life of Jesus were predicted, no human sagacity could foresee them, as their occurrence depended mainly on the will and providence of God, though it is still to be proved, whether there be an actual correspondence between these circumstances and the alleged Messianic predictions.

Two propositions required to be proved in order to apply the argument from prophecy to the claim of our Lord to be the Messiah—the first, that there are Messianic prophecies in the Old Testament; and the second, that there is a correspondence between the events in the life of Jesus and these prophecies. In this and a following lecture, I propose to consider the first of these propositions, and to reserve the second for subsequent consideration.

In this lecture, in considering the Messianic prophecies in the Old Testament, I shall notice—first, their obscurity; and secondly, their reality.
I. The Obscurity of the Messianic Predictions.

The obscurity of the Messianic predictions has been frequently objected to. It has been asserted that the prophecies are obscure in themselves, their meaning vague and ambiguous, and their application doubtful. They are alleged to be the mere anticipations of a golden age—the natural longings after national freedom and prosperity in the time of distress and subjection to some foreign oppressor. Besides, it is maintained that the prophecies admit of a variety of applications: many of them may be verified in David, or Solomon, or Israel, as well as in the Messiah; nor have we any criteria to judge of the precise meaning which the prophets attached to their own predictions. 'Almost all Christian commentators on the Bible and advocates for the Christian religion,' observes Anthony Collins, 'both ancient and modern, have judged these prophecies to be applied in a secondary, or typical, or mystical, or allegorical, or enigmatical sense—that is, in a sense different from the obvious and literal sense which they bear in the Old Testament.'

Now, in answer to this objection, it is admitted that there is a certain obscurity in the Messianic prophecies, though this obscurity has been greatly

1 Collins' *Grounds and Reasons*, pp. 39, 40.
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over-stated. Unfulfilled prophecy must often to a certain extent be obscure. Prophecy is not mere history written beforehand; if so, the statements might be plain, and the meaning, even before the fulfilment, somewhat obvious. But there are reasons, to which we shall afterwards advert, why, until the fulfilment, the prophecies should not be clearly understood; and as long as this key of interpretation is wanting, the nature of the prophecy may easily be mistaken by those to whom it was made. Such a mistake, we believe, was made by the Jews in reference to the Messianic predictions; they either overlooked entirely those predictions which foretold the sufferings of the Messiah, and attended only to those which spoke of His glory, or they resorted to the fiction of a twofold Messiah. And indeed all the interpreters of unfulfilled prophecy are generally mistaken in their views, as is evident from the great diversity in their interpretations, and from the difference of principles on which they proceed—one class of writers interpreting the words of the prophets literally, and another class figuratively.

It is another and more difficult question, how far the prophets themselves understood their own predictions. I am disposed to think that in many cases they had not a clear perception of the meaning of the words which they uttered. Spiritual intuitions were communicated to them; visions
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were often presented before them; and it may have happened that they uttered what they felt and saw, without a full consciousness of its precise import. There were deeper meanings than those which lay on the surface, which even their prophetic minds could not grasp. They were permitted to see into the divine counsels, but often through a glass darkly. 'They knew in part, and they prophesied in part.' Zechariah admits that on several occasions he could not understand the visions communicated to him (Zech. iv. 5). Daniel, after an extraordinary vision, adds: 'I heard, but I understood not: then said I, O my lord, what shall be the end of these things? And he said, Go thy way, Daniel: for the words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end' (Dan. xii. 8, 9); thus intimating that the prediction would not be cleared up until its accomplishment. And St. Peter manifestly affirms that the prophets were at least partially ignorant of the meaning of their prophetic utterances; he represents them as studying their own predictions concerning the Messiah, and endeavouring to understand their meaning: 'Searching what, or what manner of time, the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow' (1 Pet. i. 11). It is to be remembered that the true meaning of a prophecy does not consist in that which the prophets them-
selves attached to it, but in the meaning which
the Spirit of God, who inspired the prophets,
intended, and the key to which is found in the
fulfilment of the prophecy.

It is not the mere element of futurity which
renders prophecy obscure; there are other ob-
scuring elements which enter into the prophetic
language. A prophecy is sometimes the descrip-
tion of a vision. The prophet writes down what he
sees and hears. He often speaks as if the events
were actually occurring at the time, being present
to his inward sense. Thus the advent of the
Messiah is sometimes represented as if it were
about to occur immediately, or even as if it had
actually occurred, because it appeared so to the
prophetic glance. In general, time is left out of
consideration; it was not given to the prophets to
know 'the times and the seasons which the Father
hath put in his own power' (Acts i. 7). Different
aspects of prophecy are revealed at different times
or to different prophets. Sometimes, one prophet
speaks entirely of the glory of the Messiah; at
other times, another prophet speaks entirely of his
sufferings. Sometimes, the Messiah is represented
as the Anointed King; and at other times, as the
suffering Servant of Jehovah. Sometimes, his first
advent, as the Saviour of men, is predicted; and at
other times, his second advent, as the Judge of the
world. And so also events, far distant in point of
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time, are represented as happening simultaneously. Thus the glory of the Messiah in His second advent is represented as if it followed immediately His sufferings, the interval between them being omitted. As has been well observed: 'The prophets looked upon future events with the divine light with which they were illuminated, in the same manner as we look upon the starry heavens. We see the stars above us, but do not perceive how far off they are, nor even which are the nearer, and which are the more remote.' And besides, the prophecies abound in figurative language; the imagination of the prophet is powerfully excited; spiritual blessings are represented by material figures; the reign of peace is described by the image of savage animals losing their ferocity; the universal prevalence of the worship of God, by the exaltation of Mount Zion on the top of the mountains; and the spiritual kingdom of the Messiah, by images taken from the Old Testament theocracy.

The comparative obscurity of Messianic prophecy

---

1 Crusius, quoted in Hengstenberg's Christology, iv. 423. 'The prophecies,' observes Bleek, 'have a perspective character, great developments and catastrophes occurring at considerable intervals of time, appearing to be brought close together, or to be quite intermixed' (Introduction to Old Testament, vol. ii. p. 32).

was wisely ordained. Men are not forced to believe; they are free agents placed in a state of trial, and hence that degree of evidence is not afforded which constrains conviction. Besides, had the Jews been told in plain language that their ceremonial religion would be abolished, and give way to a more spiritual economy, they would have been tempted to neglect the ceremonies of the Mosaic religion, and thus to revolt from Jehovah, their true King. And so also, had they been plainly informed that the Messiah would not appear for many centuries, they would have lost all that support to their religious life, that consolation in affliction, that encouragement to spiritual religion, that expectation of a purer age, which the very indefiniteness of the time of the advent was so well fitted to excite and cherish in the ancient church: not to mention that the clearness of prophecy might perhaps have prevented its fulfilment; for, as the apostle says, if the Jews had certainly known that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah—if no doubt could be entertained about it— they would never have demanded His death; 'they would not have crucified the Lord of glory' (1 Cor. ii. 8).  

It is also to be observed that many of the predictions which must have appeared the most

---

1 Besides, had the prophecies been clear, it might have been said that our Lord and His disciples purposely acted in order to fulfil them.
obscure and enigmatical at the time of their enunciation, appear clear and precise when explained by the events said to be their fulfilment. This is remarkably the case with the Messianic prophecies. Different descriptions of the Messiah were scattered throughout the prophetic books, and it must have been difficult to conceive them realized in one person. A suffering and yet an exalted Messiah must have been to the ancient Jews a subject very difficult of comprehension. Where was the principle to reconcile these two opposite conditions? Take, for example, that remarkable prediction contained in the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. Here there are two different descriptions of the person spoken of, which could hardly have failed to be perplexing. It was foretold that 'he should be despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief;' that 'he should be cut off from the land of the living;' and 'that he should make his grave with the wicked and with the rich in his death:' and it was also foretold that 'he should prolong his days;' that 'the pleasure of the Lord should prosper in his hands;' and that 'he should divide a portion with the great, and share the spoil with the strong.' We do not wonder at the Ethiopian eunuch being perplexed with these contradictory aspects of the prophecy, and inquiring, 'Of whom speaketh the prophet this?' or at the Jews having recourse to the solution
of two Messiahs. But now all this has a plain and obvious meaning, when we apply to the interpretation of the prophecy the fact of the resurrection of Christ. And this is only a specimen of numerous other prophecies, whose obscurity is removed and whose meaning is explained by the events said to be their fulfilment. Such prophecies cannot properly be charged with obscurity: on the contrary, when viewed in the light of their fulfilment, they are plain and obvious.

It is, however, to be observed, that in several instances even the fulfilment does not remove all obscurity or difficulty of interpretation. A figurative description of a future event will remain figurative even after the event occurs; and if men understand a prophecy literally which is intended to be understood figuratively, they may easily misunderstand or overlook its fulfilment. If one forms an erroneous idea of a prophecy, his error may prevent him discerning its accomplishment; and to him the obscurity of the prophecy will remain. Besides, from our defective knowledge of the Hebrew original, or from omissions in history, data may be wanting to give us the true meaning of the prophecy and its application. It is sufficient if we have reason to believe that it has been so generally fulfilled as to afford a proof of foresight more than human, and for which we must have recourse to divine intervention.
Further, partial obscurity does not invalidate a prophecy. The mere obscurity of part of a prophecy is no proof that the foresight of those parts which are clear, and which have evidently received their accomplishment, was not the result of a divine communication. It may be that the prediction is only partially fulfilled, and that those portions of it which are now obscure await their future accomplishment, when the obscurity will disappear. Or the prophecy may have, in the intention of the Divine Author, a secondary sense, and may be destined for another and higher fulfilment; but this is not a denial or refutation of the primary sense and the primary accomplishment. As Bishop Butler, the most cautious and the greatest of English theologians, well remarks: 'The obscurity or unintelligibleness of one part of a prophecy does not, in any degree, invalidate the proof of foresight, arising from the appearing completion of those other parts which are understood. For the case is evidently the same, as if those parts, which are not understood, were lost, or not written at all, or written in an unknown tongue. Whether this observation be commonly attended to or not, it is so evident that one can scarce bring oneself to set down an instance in common matters to exemplify it. However, suppose a writing, partly in cypher and partly in plain words at length, and that in the part one understood there appeared
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mention of several known facts; it would never come into any man's thoughts to imagine, that if he understood the whole, perhaps he might find that those facts were not, in reality, known by the writer.'

The real question at issue is not whether some or many of the Messianic prophecies are obscure, but whether we have prophecies sufficiently clear to prove that Jesus is the Messiah. The argument does not rest on this or that prophecy, but on a conjunct view of the whole, on the combination of numerous prophecies, each of which may in itself be insufficient, but the union of all of which may amount to a proof which is perfectly irresistible. It may be an easy thing to find difficulties and obscurities and vagueness in particular prophecies; but it may be impossible to explain away the whole combination of the prophecies—to destroy their united force. It may be easy to assert that such and such a witness does not prove a fact, but it may be impossible to disprove the conjunct testimony of a multitude of witnesses. As has been well observed by Bishop Sherlock: 'This is the point to be tried on the evidence of prophecy. Is Christ that person described and foretold under the Old Testament, or no? Whether the prophecies relating to Him are plain, or not plain; whether all the ways used by the Jews of arguing

1 Butler's *Analogy*, Part ii. chap. vii.
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from the Old Testament be convincing to us or no, it matters little. The single question is, Is there enough plain to show us that Christ is the person foretold in the Old Testament? If there is, we are at an end of our inquiry, and want no further help from prophecy; especially since we, to use St. Peter's expression, have in this case seen the day dawn, and enjoyed the marvellous light of the gospel of God.'

II. The Reality of Primary Messianic Prophecies.

It has further been objected that not only are the Messianic prophecies obscure and indefinite, but that they are also indirect, and of a secondary nature, and have already received their fulfilment in other events of Jewish history. Now, that there are secondary prophecies—that is, prophecies which relate to some other events or persons in Jewish history, but which, we assert, receive another and fuller accomplishment in the Messiah—we readily admit, and shall afterwards examine their force in the argument from prophecy, whether they are or are not admissible as proofs of the Messiahship of Jesus. But what we at present assert is, that there are direct prophecies of the Messiah and His kingdom which in a primary sense apply to Jesus, and

1 Sherlock's Discourses on Prophecy, Discourse ii.
receive their fulfilment in Him alone. The limits of this lecture will not admit a full enumeration or examination of such prophecies; we merely mention a few of the most remarkable as examples of what we mean.

1. 'The sceptre,' says Jacob, 'shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be' (Gen. xlix. 10). The sceptre is the emblem of authority, and by the sceptre here is to be understood not so much regal as tribal authority—that authority which Judah possessed when these words were uttered, and which was not to depart from him until the advent of Shiloh. The word, translated 'lawgiver,' also signifies a leader; and 'from between his feet' means from among his posterity. 'Until Shiloh comes' denotes that there will be a succession of rulers in Judah until the advent of Shiloh, and then, by implication, that they will cease. 'The gathering of the people' ought more properly to be rendered 'the obedience or submission of the people;' and by 'the people' here are meant either the tribes of Israel, or the nations—that is, the Gentiles. So that the general import of the prophecy is that Judah shall not cease to be a tribe, or to possess a government, until Shiloh comes. The great difficulty of the passage, however, and that with which we are more immediately
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cconcerned, consists in the interpretation of the word Shiloh. Those who give the prophecy an anti-Messianic interpretation take Shiloh as the accusative of place, and render the passage thus: 'Until he (that is, Judah) comes to Shiloh;' and by Shiloh they understand the town of Ephraim, where, after the conquest of Canaan, the ark was deposited (Josh. xviii. 1). They suppose that the allusion is to the precedence which the tribe of Judah had during the journeys of the Israelites in the wilderness, and which precedence came to an end when the Israelites assembled at Shiloh, and afterwards dispersed, every tribe to its inheritance. But such an interpretation gives a feeble meaning to the passage. It is doubtful if the town of Shiloh existed in the time of Jacob. Nor did the tribe of Judah possess the sceptre or the dominion either in the wilderness or during the conquest of Canaan. Moses belonged to the tribe of Levi, and Joshua to that of Ephraim; so that the prophecy or declaration was not in accordance with history. The most approved interpretation is to derive the word Shiloh from the Hebrew verb shalah, 'to rest,' or 'to be at peace,' and to consider it either as a common noun, denoting 'rest' or 'tranquillity,' or as an appellative signifying the 'Peace-maker.' If the latter meaning be correct, then the prediction is a primary prophecy of the Messiah, and corresponds with the predictions of
Isaiah concerning the peaceful reign of the Prince of Peace. In this reference of the prophecy to the Messiah, all Jewish antiquity agrees. The Targums all coincide on this point; the Targum of Onkelos has: 'Until Messias comes, whose is the kingdom, and unto whom shall be the obedience of the nations;' the Jerusalem Targum: 'Until the time that King Messias comes, whose is the kingdom;' and the Targum of pseudo-Jonathan: 'Until the King Messias shall come, the youngest of his sons. How fair is King Messiah, who is hereafter to arise from the house of Judah!' So also in the Babylonish Talmud we have the following passage: 'What is Messias' name? His name is Shiloh; for it is written, Until Shilo come.'

2. 'The Lord thy God,' says Moses, 'will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me' (Deut. xviii. 15). The reference of this prophecy to any particular prophet before the time of our Lord has now been generally abandoned, except by some Jewish writers. The most common opinion of those who adopt an anti-Messianic meaning of the prophecy is that the prediction refers to the prophetic order in general, that God would raise up prophets when necessary, that there would be a succession of prophets in the Jewish Church. There are, however, two considerations which prevent us adopting this view. The

1 Young's Christology of the Targums. 2 Supplement I.
first is, that the word \textit{prophet} is in the singular, and consequently it is a deviation from its meaning to take it in a collective sense. And the second is, that the Prophet in the prediction is particularized; he is to be a prophet like to Moses: one who was to bear a resemblance to their great lawgiver. Now, what especially characterized Moses was his being the author of a new dispensation of religion, and a mediator between God and the people; and none of the Jewish prophets resembled him in these points. It may be truly said in reference to all subsequent prophets: 'There arose not a prophet since in Israel, whom the Lord knew face to face' (Deut. xxxiv. 10). This prediction, then, could only receive its accomplishment in the Messiah. It was so understood by the Jews in the days of our Lord. They are represented as saying of Jesus, after beholding the miracle of the loaves: 'This is of a truth that Prophet that should come into the world' (John vi. 14). And it was on this prediction that the Samaritans grounded their Messianic expectations: 'We know that Messias cometh: He will tell us all things' (John iv. 25); and the Talmud asserts 'that Messiah must be the greatest of future prophets, as being nearest in spirit to our master Moses.'

3. 'For unto us,' says Isaiah, 'a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall

\footnote{1 Supplement I.}
be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace' (Isa. ix. 6, 7). These words have been applied by Jewish and Christian writers to Hezekiah. Flattery has its limits, and certainly the prophets were not given to flattery: this was not a vice of their order. It is only by arbitrary criticism that the exalted and sacred epithets here employed can be so toned down as to be made to apply to Hezekiah; and neither of him nor of any earthly prince could it be said that of the increase of his government and peace there was to be no end, and that he should sit on the throne of David for ever (Isa. ix. 7). The ancient Jews refer these words only to the Messiah. 'The prophet,' says the Targum of Jonathan, 'speaketh of the house of David, because a child is born to us, a son is given to us, and he taketh the law upon himself to observe it; therefore his name is called of old Wonderful in counsel, God the mighty, He who abideth for ever, the Messiah whose peace shall be abundant upon us in His days.'

4. The prophecy in the 53d chapter of Isaiah is too remarkable to be omitted. When read with Christian eyes, it looks rather as a description of the past than a prediction of the future; rather as the writing of an evangelist than as the declaration

1 Supplement I.
of a Jewish prophet. The sufferings and glory of the Messiah are here portrayed. All attempts to explain away this prophecy by referring it to the prophet Jeremiah, or to Israel as a nation, or to the pious remnant, or to the prophetical order, have signally failed. It still stands as the most remarkable prediction in the Old Testament, receiving its accomplishment in the Messiah, and in Him alone.¹

5. The celebrated prophecy of Daniel’s seventy weeks is also a direct prediction of the Messiah; for, as has been well observed, ‘a prophecy in which a period of its accomplishment is determined is incapable of a twofold application.’ ‘Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and the prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy. Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times. And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for Himself: and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city

¹ See Lecture VI., where Isa. liii. is fully discussed.
and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined' (Dan. ix. 24-26). We do not here dwell upon the intricacies of this prophecy, or the various calculations of the seventy weeks to which it has given rise. All classes of commentators are in general agreed that seventy weeks of years are meant, corresponding to the seventy years of Jeremiah; but there is not the same agreement as to the point from which these years are to be calculated, and consequently as to their termination. It is of the Messiah, or the Anointed Prince, that the passage treats; for it is unreasonable to suppose with some that two or even three Messiahs are meant. And, in all probability, it was this passage chiefly that gave rise to the general expectation among the Jews of the advent of the Messiah at the time of our Lord. According to their calculation, the seventy weeks of Daniel were accomplished.

6. 'But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah,' says the prophet Micah, 'though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall He come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting' (Micah v. 2). Here it is announced that a great Prince shall be born in Bethlehem, the birth-

1 For a full discussion of Daniel's seventy weeks, see Supplement I. to Lecture VI.
place of David; consequently a Prince of the Davidic line. This prediction has been supposed by several critics, who deny its Messianic application, to refer to Zerubbabel, a prince of the Davidic line, whom Cyrus appointed as the leader of the Jews on their return from Babylon. But a difficulty lies in the fact that Zerubbabel was not born in Bethlehem, but in Babylon. To remove this, these critics assert that Bethlehem is here mentioned as the birth-place of David, and that all that is intended is that the future Prince should be a descendant of David. The phrase, 'whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting,' is modified to denote from ancient times, and is supposed to allude to the long line of ancestry of Zerubbabel. But such an interpretation is utterly erroneous. Zerubbabel was no such mighty and distinguished prince. Indeed, it is doubtful whether he was even the Persian governor of the Jews. His birth in Babylon is an insurmountable obstacle to his being the subject of this prophecy; for there can be little doubt that the reason of the mention of Bethlehem is that it was to be the birth-place of the Prince who should come out of it. All the ancient Jewish interpreters adhere to the Messianic meaning. This was evidently the view taken by the Jews in the days of our Lord (Matt. ii. 5; John viii. 41, 42). So also the testimony of the Targums is in favour of the Messianic interpretation of the prophecy.
Thus the Targum of Jonathan says: 'And thou, Bethlehem of Ephratah, little art thou to be reckoned among the thousands of the house of Judah; out of thee shall proceed in my presence the Messiah to exercise sovereignty over Israel; whose name has been called from eternity, from the days of the everlasting period.' 'Thou art little,' observes Rabbi Jarchi, 'but out of thee shall come forth to me King Messiah.'

7. 'Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion,' writes Zechariah; 'shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy King cometh to thee: He is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass' (Zech. ix. 9). This prophecy cannot possibly be referred to Zerubbabel, or to any Jewish monarch or ruler after the time of Zechariah; but can only have a reference to the Anointed King, or the Messiah. This the Jews themselves are constrained to admit. 'It is impossible,' observes Rabbi Jarchi, 'to expound this text of any other than the Messiah.' And they get over the difficulty of its application to Jesus by supposing that He designedly acted for the purpose of applying the prophecy to Himself. 'Knowing well,' observes Dr. Adler, 'this prophecy of Zechariah, he acted in such a way as to fulfil it.'

1 Supplement I.
2 Quoted in Chandler's Defence of Christianity, p. 87.
3 Adler's Course of Sermons, p. 151.
8. In the book of the same prophet, we have the following Messianic prediction: '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' (Zech. xii. 10). The great difficulty in this passage is occasioned by the change in the pronouns; it is said, 'They shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for Him,' as if two persons were spoken of—the one, the Lord, whom the inhabitants of Jerusalem have pierced; and the other, some unknown person, whose death the inhabitants of Jerusalem lament. Many manuscripts read, 'They shall look upon Him,' and the passage is so cited in St. John's Gospel. 'Another scripture saith, They shall look on Him whom they pierced' (John xix. 37). If this be the true meaning, the difficulty is removed. This, however, is probably not the case, as such a reading is not confirmed by the Septuagint. Others render the clause, 'They shall mourn on account of it;' the lamentation being for the crime of having pierced the Lord. But even if the words are retained, it is not necessary to
suppose that two persons are meant, as a similar change in the numbers of the pronouns is not uncommon in the prophetical writings. Some endeavour to escape the Messianic application of the prediction by supposing that the word 'pierced' is to be taken in a metaphorical sense, 'vexed,' and that the meaning is that the Jews would be brought to repentance, and would mourn because they have grieved God by their sins. But it is doubtful if the word can be taken in this metaphorical sense; it denotes 'to thrust through,' 'to pierce as with a spear.' Besides, the mourning here expressed is the mourning for the dead: one 'mourning for his only son, and in bitterness for his first-born.' Other Jewish interpreters have recourse to two Messiahs, and represent this prophecy as a prediction of the death of Messiah the son of Joseph, thus acknowledging its Messianic character. Other Jewish writers suppose that by the 'pierced one' is meant an Israelite who has fallen in the great last struggle with Gog and Magog; they will lament for the death of one, as if the whole army had been defeated and slain. They translate the passage thus: 'They shall look up to me for him whom they (the enemy) have pierced, and they (the Jews) shall mourn for him.' 'The prophet,' observes Dr. Adler, 'having spoken of the protection and immunity that the

1 Ps. lxxxii. 16; Isa. xxxiii. 2, xlii. 22
children of Israel would enjoy, says that so great would this immunity be, that if it should happen that but one of them be pierced in this war, they would be surprised and dismayed—they would look upon it as a humiliation, as a sign that they had forfeited the favour of heaven.'

A similar view of the passage is adopted by Kimchi and Jarchi. But the passage will not admit of the above rendering; it is evident that the persons who pierced the Lord and those who mourn on account of it, are the same, namely the inhabitants of Jerusalem, not different as this interpretation requires. A change of subject is unnecessary and unnatural.

9. 'Behold,' says Malachi, 'I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, He shall come, saith the Lord of hosts' (Mal. iii. 1). The Messianic character of this verse is generally allowed by Jewish and Christian writers, however they may attempt to explain it. There is a somewhat similar prediction of a forerunner in the prophecies of Isaiah: 'The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God' (Isa. xl. 3). In Malachi, however, the prediction is more definite, for we are expressly in-

1 Adler's *Course of Sermons*, p. 56.
formed that the Lord's messenger will be Elijah: 'Behold, I send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the dreadful day of the Lord' (Mal. iv. 5). The Jews take this passage literally, and suppose that Elijah will actually appear in person before the advent of the Messiah; and hence they argue that the Messiah has not yet come, because Elijah has not appeared. It is not, however, at all necessary, considering the figurative nature of the prophetic language, to interpret the words literally, and to suppose that Elijah shall come in person: if one came in the spirit and power of Elijah, the prophecy would be fulfilled. By the Lord Himself, or the messenger (angel) of the covenant, can only be intended the Messiah, the Anointed King, of whose advent Elijah was to be the harbinger.¹

These are only a few out of many primary prophecies regarding the Messiah. So far as we can determine, these prophecies refer to the Messiah only, and cannot be predicated of another. The ancient Jews admit the Messianic character of most of them; although the modern Jews, in consequence of their controversy with the Christians, have attempted to explain them away by applications which must appear to every candid reader to be unnatural. That these and other predictions have received their accomplishment in Jesus of Nazareth, it will be our endeavour afterwards to

¹ Supplement I.
Messianic Prophecies.

prove: all that we now maintain is that there are Messianic prophecies in the books of the Old Testament. But here, again, we have to make the same remark which we made when adverting to the obscurity of prophecy, that the question is not whether some of the prophecies are only applicable to the Messiah in a secondary sense, but whether the combination of prophecies is sufficient to prove that Jesus is the Messiah; and most certain it is, that although there are many secondary prophecies, there are also many primary ones; and that although some prophecies are obscure, others are clear.

We can also trace the development of the Messianic idea in the Old Testament. Its obscurest prophecies are the most remote, the clearest are nearest the advent. The first stage is prior to the time of David. At first there is the general indefinite intimation, that the seed of the woman would bruise the serpent's head. This is the germ from which Messianic prophecy was afterwards developed. It does not appear whether this seed of the woman is an individual or the human race in general: it is a general promise of deliverance. Afterwards, this seed of the woman is limited to the family of Abraham: in his seed were all the families of the earth to be blessed; but here there is the same indefiniteness as to whether a person or a race be meant. Then occurs the
more precise prediction of the advent of Shiloh made by Jacob; but even on this, considerable obscurity rests: the very meaning of the term is doubtful. To Moses a revelation is made of the advent of a Prophet like to himself; but the connection between that Prophet and the promised seed was not revealed to him.—The second stage in Messianic development is the promises made to David, of a son to sit upon his throne, of a great King proceeding from his royal line who should rule in righteousness, and establish His dominion over all the kingdoms of the earth. Here a considerable advance was made: the seed of the woman was particularized; he was to be an individual—the Anointed King. In the Messianic Psalms this King is held forth as the object of the nation's hopes—as the ideal theocratic monarch who should sit on the throne of David.—The third stage is the era of the prophets. The prophets cast further light upon the nature of this Messianic King; they describe His divine origin; they enumerate His royal titles. They depict Him also as a mysterious sufferer, who by dying should atone for the sins of his people. Especially in the prophecies of Isaiah there is a vividness, a directness, a pointedness which reveal to us the great Messiah, at one time taken from prison and from judgment, and at another time travelling in the greatness of His strength, mighty to save. But perhaps
nowhere are there more plain Messianic prophecies—prophecies that cannot possibly apply to any other but to the Messiah—than in the book of Zechariah, the second last of the prophets. Here the Messiah is predicted under various aspects, as the Branch who should build the temple of the Lord, the Priest who should sit upon his throne, the peaceful Monarch who should enter Jerusalem in lowly triumph, the pierced Saviour whose death the inhabitants of Jerusalem should bewail, the Shepherd who should be smitten by the sword of the Lord.¹ Thus Messianic prophecy becomes more distinct as it advances, until about the time of our Lord a universal expectation prevailed throughout the East of the advent of this distinguished personage—the great and mysterious Messiah.² Messianic prophecy arose in Eden, and like the rising sun it first cast faint rays through the moral atmosphere; but the light gradually increased,—obscurities were removed; what was indefinite became more precise; what was hardly visible became clear,—until at length the full blaze of light burst upon this world, and He came whom we believe to be the Messiah, in whose sufferings and glory all these prophecies have received their accomplishment. This is the glorious salvation which prophets have predicted, apostles preached, and angels desired to look into

¹ See Liddon’s Bampton Lectures, Lecture II.
² Supplement II.
—the advent of Him who is the Saviour of the world, the Anointed King of the souls of men, at once David's Son and David's Lord.

SUPPLEMENT I.

ADDITIONAL REMARKS ON THE PRIMARY MESSIANIC PROPHECIES.

Shiloh.

'The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto Him shall the gathering of the people be' (Gen. xlix. 10).

This is a passage of acknowledged difficulty, which has given rise to much discussion. Its obscurity is not a matter of surprise, considering that it is one of the earliest of the Messianic predictions, delivered at an early stage of Messianic development. The chief difficulty lies in the meaning of Shiloh. Numerous interpretations have been given to it, and of these six may be noticed, either on account of the authorities by which they have been supported, or on account of their intrinsic probability.

1. The Vulgate renders Shiloh by qui mittendus est, 'He who is to be sent.' Such a meaning is
highly appropriate, considered as a title of the Messiah, who is elsewhere denominated as the 'Sent of God' (ὁ ἀπεσταλμένος). It must, however, be rejected as linguistically incorrect. It arose either from an erroneous reading of the original, or from a conjectural emendation of a difficult passage, or from accidentally confounding the two similar Hebrew letters נ and נ, as if the word were נלך instead of נלך, and derived from נלך, to send.

2. Some suppose that נלך is a compound of נלך, a son, and the pronominal suffix י, his, and hence they translate the clause: 'Until his son come.' This meaning is apparently countenanced by the Targum of pseudo-Jonathan: 'Until the time that King Messiah, the youngest of his children, shall come.' It was adopted by Kimchi and Abarbanel among Jewish writers, and receives importance from a preference having been given to it by Luther and Calvin. So also Junius and Tremellius rendered the word Shiloh by filius ejus. Such an interpretation naturally imparts to the passage a purely Messianic sense. Like the former meaning, it must, however, be rejected on linguistic considerations. No such word as נלך is found in Hebrew, and its possible occurrence, on account of the Arabic word shaltl, of similar import, is too fanciful a conjecture.

3. A common meaning is to consider Shiloh as the name of the well-known town in Ephraim,
where the ark was deposited after the settlement in Canaan, until it was captured by the Philistines. Accordingly, the passage is rendered: 'Until he (Judah) come to Shiloh.' The word Shiloh, elsewhere in the Old Testament, denotes the town of that name; and it is argued that this is the only meaning that can be assigned to it in this passage. This meaning is decidedly anti-Messianic. It has been adopted by most modern Jewish writers, and among Christian writers by Eichhorn, Bleek, Hitzig, Delitzsch, Ewald, Rödiger, Bunsen, G. Baur, Davidson, Williams, and the writer of the article 'Shiloh' in Smith's Dictionary. It is undoubtedly true that the verse admits of the above translation; and if any intelligible meaning could be assigned to it, it might be entertained. But those who adopt it find great difficulty in giving to it any plausible sense. The most general view is that the allusion is to the precedence which the tribe of Judah had during the journeys of the Israelites in the wilderness. Dr. Adler supposes that the reference is to the revolt of Jeroboam and the ten tribes, which took place at Shechem, not far from Shiloh, when Judah lost the sovereignty over Israel.

1 'The famous Shiloh,' observes Dr. Williams, 'is taken (by Bunsen) in its local sense, as the sanctuary where the young Samuel was trained; which, if doctrinal perversions did not interfere, hardly any one would doubt to be the true sense' (Essays and Reviews, 8th ed. p. 62).

2 Adler's Course of Sermons, p. 11.
think that the words ר theological, rendered until, should be translated as long as, and that the passage does not allude to any departure of the sceptre from Judah, but is a declaration of the perpetuity of Judah's sovereignty. They suppose that the prediction was uttered when the ark was at Shiloh, and that, in the author's opinion, it was to continue there for ever. All these explanations are mere idle suppositions. There was no historical connection between Judah's supremacy and the town of Shiloh; indeed, it was only after the desolation of Shiloh that Judah obtained the dominion over all Israel.

4. Others resolve the word Shiloh into He whose it is, and render the clause: 'Until he comes, unto whom it (that is, the sceptre or dominion) belongs.' This rendering supposes that the correct reading is יִשְׂלוֹ, and that this word is compounded of יִשְׂלֹ הַיִּשְׂרָאֵל, which, and יִשְׂלֹ עַל הַיָּד, to him. This is the most ancient interpretation, and is adopted by most of the versions, Targums, and Fathers. Thus the Peshito renders it: 'Until he comes, to whom it belongs;' the Septuagint: 'Until the things reserved for him (τὰ ἀξονομημένα αὐτῷ) come;' and the Targum of Onkelos: 'Until that Messiah shall come, whose is the kingdom.' Similarly, also, the Jerusalem Targum. And it is supposed that there is an allusion to this meaning of Shiloh in the prophecies of Ezekiel:
'It shall be no more, until he comes, whose right it is' (Ezek. xxi. 27: the Hebrew, xxi. 32). This meaning is decidedly Messianic; the person to whom the government belongs, whose right it is, is the Messiah. 'The government shall be upon his shoulder' (Isa. ix. 6). The meaning, however, depends on the correctness of the peculiar reading חֵלֶב, a reading which is found in several valuable Hebrew manuscripts, in all the Samaritan, and was most probably the reading of those manuscripts from which the versions are taken. But even admitting that חֵלֶב is the correct reading, yet this does not settle the question, as the town Shiloh is found sometimes so written, and as the contracted form of the relative does not occur in the Pentateuch, though it occurs as early as the song of Deborah (Judg. v. 7).

5. Others derive Shiloh from the Hebrew verb חֵלֶב, to be safe, to be at rest, to be at peace, and render it rest or tranquillity; and certainly this is the most natural derivation. This is the meaning adopted by such learned Hebraists as Vater, Gesenius, De Wette, Knobel, Kurtz, and Hofmann. Thus Gesenius, in his Dictionary, renders the passage: 'The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, until tranquillity shall come.' Though, of course, such an interpretation admits of an anti-Messianic sense, and has been considered as a prediction of or reference to the peaceful reign of
Solomon;¹ yet it also fitly represents the peace to be enjoyed in Messianic times. Indeed, the term peace is itself one of the titles of the Messiah given by the prophets. 'And this man shall be the peace, when the Assyrian shall come into our land' (Micah v. 5).

6. The meaning which we have adopted, as being upon the whole the most probable, is that which considers Shiloh to be a proper name of the Messiah, denoting a Peace-maker or the Prince of Peace. 'Until Shiloh, that is, the Messiah or Prince of Peace, comes.' The derivation is the same as the last, from שִׁלוֹחַ. This opinion was adopted by Castalio, Rosenmüller, and Hengstenberg. Of course if this view be correct, then the prediction is a primary prophecy of the Messiah, and contains the earliest intimation of His personality. It not only imparts a good sense to the passage, but is a beautiful description of the Messiah, as the founder of the kingdom of peace, and is in accordance with the other descriptions of His person and reign in the prophets.

It has, however, been objected to the Messianic character of this prophecy, that it could not receive its fulfilment in Jesus, inasmuch as the sceptre had departed from Judah at the overthrow of that kingdom by Nebuchadnezzar. 'The sovereignty of Judah,' observes Dr. Adler, 'did not cease at the

¹ Knobel refers it to the reign of David (Die Gensis, p. 365).
advent of the so-called Shiloh; it ceased 588 years before the birth of the Nazarene, when Nebuchadnezzar carried Zedekiah, king of Judah, into captivity. During the entire period of the second temple, not one king of the tribe of Judah ruled over the nation. The Jewish kings, during this period, were the Maccabees (who, being high priests, were members of the tribe of Levi), and Herod the Great, with his descendants, who were foreigners. How, then, can it be maintained that “the sceptre did not depart from Judah, nor the lawgiver from between his feet,” until the coming of the Nazarene? Hence, the Emperor Julian asserted that Nebuchadnezzar was the Shiloh of ancient prophecy;^ and in this opinion he has been followed by several Jewish writers. But, in answer to this objection, it is to be observed that by sceptre is not here meant the regal government, the sceptre of a king: the reference is not to the kingdom, but to the tribe of Judah; and although the kingdom was overthrown by Nebuchadnezzar, yet the tribe remained. The Jews were transported as a colony to Babylon, and doubtless had rulers of their own; and on their return to their own country, Zerubbabel, a prince of the family of David and of the tribe of Judah, was appointed their leader.

Nor was the subsequent government of the

1 Adler’s Discourses, p. II.
Maccabean and Herodian princes any contradiction to the fulfilment of this prediction in the person of Jesus. It is true that these princes did not belong to the tribe of Judah: the former were Levites by descent, and the latter foreigners; but still both wielded the sceptre of Judah. As is well remarked by Michaelis: 'Till the time of Jesus of Nazareth, the tribe of Judah had not entirely lost the sceptre and the legislative authority; for, though Herod the Great was not of that tribe, yet the kingdom over which he presided belonged to it; and one might with the same right and propriety of speech say, "Judah still holds a sceptre," as we now ascribe a sceptre to Russia and Great Britain, notwithstanding the reigning sovereigns of those countries are by descent not Russians nor Englishmen, but Germans.' It was not until the deposition of Archelaus by the Romans, or rather not until the final destruction of Jerusalem, that the sceptre departed from Judah. After the capture of their city by Titus, the Jews were scattered abroad, the tribe was dispersed, and their government was completely extinguished.

As we have stated, the ancient Jews were

---

1 Quoted by Dr. Pye Smith in his *Scripture Testimony to the Messiah*, vol. i. p. 164.

2 This is admitted and asserted by Renan in the following: 'As to Archelaus, ethnarch of Jerusalem, Jesus could not have him, for he was about ten years old when this man was deposed.' "Judah," says Augustus. *The last trace of self-government was thus broken up* (Life of Jesus).
unanimous in referring this prophecy to the Messiah. Modern Jewish writers have, in their controversies with Christians, had recourse to other interpretations. Thus Lipmann refers Shiloh to Saul, and Kimchi to Jeroboam, and Hiskia to Abijah, under whose reign Israel finally revolted. Another common opinion among the Jews is that the prophecy is not yet fulfilled. They assert that the sceptre has not departed from Judah, because the Jews still possess rulers and legislators, and that this is a proof that the Messiah or Shiloh has not yet come. Those who adopt this latter opinion regard the prediction as Messianic.

The Prophet like to Moses.

'The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me' (Deut. xviii. 15).

This prediction has seldom been applied to any particular prophet before the time of our Lord. Abenezra and Bechai suppose that Joshua, the successor of Moses, is meant, chiefly because it is

1 Baur's *Geschichte d. alt. Weissagungen*, p. 281.
2 The fullest discussion of this remarkable prediction is contained in Baur's *Alttest. Weissagung*, pp. 216–290. See also Pye Smith's *Testimony to the Messiah*, vol. i. pp. 160–166; Hengstenberg's *Christology*, vol. i. pp. 47–90; Basset's *Search and See*, pp. 1–22; Davidson's *Introduction to the Old Testament*, vol. i. pp. 199–210; Wright's *Genesis*, pp. 121–124; and M'Caul's *Messiahship of Jesus*, pp. 142–145.
asserted that the children of Israel hearkened unto him as they did unto Moses (Deut. xxxiv. 9). But there is no resemblance between Joshua and Moses; indeed, it is nowhere asserted that Joshua was a prophet at all, and there is no trace of his exercising the prophetical office. Abarbanel supposes that the prophet meant was Jeremiah, and he adduces fourteen points of resemblance between him and Moses. But most of these resemblances are fanciful, or such as might be applied to other prophets as well as to Jeremiah. Jeremiah, instead of being, like Moses, the deliverer of his nation, bewailed its ruin and desolation. Of no individual Jewish prophet can it be said that he resembled Moses, in such a peculiar sense as could not be predicated of some other prophet.

The application to an individual prophet is now in general relinquished. The common opinion of those who adopt the anti-Messianic meaning, both among Jewish and Christian writers, is that the term prophet is here used in a collective sense to denote the prophetical order. 'Moses,' observes Dr. Adler, 'evidently alludes to a line of prophets who after him should exhort, teach, and admonish in the name of the Lord. He speaks of Joshua, the God-fearing warrior; of Samuel, the high-minded, unselfish judge; of Elijah, inspired with fiery zeal in the service of his Master; of Elisha, the mild and placid; of Isaiah, eminent for his burning
eloquence and fervid piety; of the ardent Jeremiah, "the man of sorrows," who witnessed that desolation of the holy city, which Moses had foretold; and of Malachi, the last of the prophets, who in his concluding message exhorted the people to remain steadfast to the law of Moses.1 This opinion was adopted by Kimchi and Lipmann among Jewish writers, and by Rosenmüller, Vater, G. Baur, and Dr. Williams among Christian writers.

As observed in the lecture, two considerations prevent us adopting this view—the one is that the word 'prophet' is in the singular, and the other that the prophet in question is particularized; he was to be 'a Prophet like to Moses.' Such a resemblance can only be predicated of Jesus of Nazareth, who, like Moses, was the founder of a new dispensation of religion, a legislator as well as a prophet, and (though in a much higher sense) a mediator between God and man. As the law was given by Moses, and ordained in the hands of a mediator (Gal. iii. 19), so was it with the gospel, whose author and mediator is Jesus of Nazareth.

There are some who take a middle course, and suppose that although the prophecy does not refer exclusively to the Messiah, but includes also the prophetical order, yet it was so framed as to

1 Adler's Discourse, p. 53.
announce the Messiah to be the ideal prophet, in whom prophecy culminated. Primarily the prediction referred to the Messiah, but in a secondary sense to the prophetic order. This opinion was adopted by Calvin, Grotius, Keil, and Hävernick. This appears also to be substantially the view which Hengstenberg takes, although there is some vagueness in his expressions. 'The prophet here,' he observes, 'is an ideal person, comprehending all the true prophets who had appeared from Moses to Christ, including the latter. But Moses does not here speak of the prophets as a collective body, to which, at the close, Christ also belonged as it were incidentally, and as one among the many; but rather, the plurality of prophets is, for this reason, comprehended by Moses in an ideal unity; only, that on the authority of Gen. xlix. 10, and by the illumination of the Holy Spirit, he knew that the prophetic order would, at some future time, centre in a real person—in Christ. But there is so much the more of truth in thus viewing the prophetic order as a whole, since, according to 1 Pet. i. 11, the Spirit of Christ spoke in the prophets. Thus, in a certain sense, Christ is the only Prophet.'

1 Hengstenberg's Christology, vol. i. p. 107, Clark's translation. Unschl. prophecy is discussed in G. Baur's Altest. Weissagung. pp. in the g3; Hengstenberg's Christology, vol. i. pp. 95-107; and Messiahship of Jesus, p. 145 ff. and plac
The Mighty God.

'For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace' (Isa. ix. 6).

We have said that these words have been applied both by Jewish and Christian writers to Hezekiah. 'When,' observes Dr. Adler, 'Isaiah declared this prophecy, at the commencement of the reign of the wicked Ahaz, his son and heir-apparent, Hezekiah, was twelve years of age, and had already given promise of a God-fearing life. To him the verses in question refer.'¹ 'We should delude ourselves,' observes Dr. Williams, 'if, because Isaiah paints in glowing terms the good time coming under an heir of David's throne, while he had a definite prince in his eye, we were to intrude upon him the notion of a formal Messiah, which arose gradually out of applications of the words of ancient presentiment to each new object of homage, or creation of desire, of generations yet unborn.'²

'Prejudice and mystical interpretation apart,' says the author of Ecce Messias, 'there can be no hesitation as to the meaning of this passage. It points to prince Hezekiah, twelve or fourteen years

¹ Adler's Discourses, p. 22.
² Williams' Hebrew Prophets, p. 274.
old. On him the best hopes of the nation, sorely tried by the idolatrous practices of Ahaz, earnestly rested; and to his young promise Isaiah turns with patriotic and religious confidence. It is not surprising that uncritical Bible readers should have found a readier interpretation by applying to Jesus Christ whatever seems appropriate to Him, and neglecting all that is evidently inappropriate; but more reasonable and consistent interpretations must now be sought.¹ This opinion is also adopted, with some variations, by Rashi, Kimchi, Ebenezra, and Abarbanel, among Jewish writers, and by Grotius, Henderwerk, and Gesenius among Christian writers. These authors would find a reason for this prediction in the circumstances of the times, and suppose that Isaiah here encourages his countrymen to expect better days on the accession of Hezekiah to the throne. In order to adapt the prophecy to Hezekiah, several of the epithets are modified and softened—‘the mighty God’ is rendered ‘the mighty Hero,’ ‘the everlasting Father,’ ‘the Father of the age;’ and ‘the Prince of Peace’ is supposed to be peculiarly applicable to Hezekiah on account of his miraculous deliverance from the host of Sennacherib, and the peace and tranquillity that Judah enjoyed during his reign. Others give a different rendering to the passage, and read as follows: ‘He who is Wonder-

¹ Higgenson’s Ecce Messias, p. 63.
ful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, shall call his (Hezekiah's) name the Prince of Peace.'

If Hezekiah was the person intended by the prophet, the prediction received a melancholy refutation. Hezekiah, though a great and magnanimous monarch, yet could in no sense be called 'the Prince of Peace.' His reign was upon the whole disastrous, and although delivered from the Assyrians, yet it was not before his country had been desolated. And in no sense, literal or figurative, could it be affirmed of him, nor of any other earthly monarch: 'Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order and establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever' (Isa. ix. 7).

**Bethlehem Ephratah.**

'But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting' (Micah v. 2).

Ephratah appears to have been another name for Bethlehem of Judah. Thus we read: 'And Rachel died, and was buried in the way to Ephrath, which is Bethlehem' (Gen. xxxv. 19).
It is here so called to distinguish it from another Bethlehem, in the tribe of Zebulon. Although Bethlehem was the birth-place of David, yet it never appears to have been a town of any importance; it was 'little among the thousands of Judah.' Its littleness is seen in its omission in the catalogues of the towns of the tribe of Judah, in the books of Joshua and of Nehemiah. Yet, although it was thus obscure, it was to receive great dignity, from its being the birth-place of some mighty prince: 'Out of it shall He come forth, who is to be ruler of Israel.' The words, 'whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting,' refer to the origin of this prince,—that he was to spring from everlasting ages,—and can hardly admit of any other interpretation than that the origin of this prince was to be from eternity. Thus, then, the plain import of this prediction is that Bethlehem of Judah was to be the birth-place of the great future king.

Dr. Adler, however, objects that even allowing that Bethlehem is here foretold to be the birth-place of the Messiah, and admitting that Jesus was born in Bethlehem, yet this is no proof that Jesus is the Messiah. 'Inasmuch,' he observes, 'as Bethlehem has been the birth-place of many hundreds and thousands of persons, the mere accident of having been born there is not sufficient to justify any one in claiming the rank of the Messiah.'

1 Adler's Course of Sermons, p. 147.
admitted; but nothing is gained thereby. This single prophecy, taken by itself, does not prove the Messiahship of Jesus; but, taken in conjunction with other particulars predicted in other prophecies,—as, for example, regarding the time and family of the Messiah,—the proof may be irresistible: it is not a solitary prediction, but forms one of a series.

Jewish writers in general, and among them Dr. Adler, have adopted the Messianic application of this passage. They, however, avoid the reference to Jesus by supposing that Bethlehem is mentioned here as the birth-place of the Messiah only indirectly, denoting merely that he was to be descended from David; and that the eternal duration here mentioned alludes not to the person, but to the name of the Messiah. According to the rabbinical fancies, there were seven things created before the world existed; and one of these is the name of the Messiah. Other Jewish writers grant that Bethlehem is to be the birth-place of the Messiah, but they regard the prophecy as still unfulfilled, and look forward to its accomplishment in the future.

1 'The prophet, here speaking of the Redeemer, whose advent we await, apostrophises the little village of Bethlehem, the birth-place of David, from whom the Messiah was to spring' (Adler's Course of Sermons, p. 148).
Messianic Prophecies.

The Advent of Elijah.

'Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord' (Mal. iv. 5).

The allusions of the Jews, in their religious books, to the coming of Elijah as the forerunner of the Messiah, are very numerous and interesting. Such allusions frequently occur in their prayer-books. Thus in their Sabbath morning service the following prayer occurs: 'O Lord our God, cause us to rejoice in thy servant Elijah, the prophet, and in the kingdom of the house of David, thine Anointed.' In another prayer, the hope is expressed that 'Elijah the prophet shall come speedily with Messiah the son of David.' In their grace after meals, we have the following petition: 'May He who is most merciful send us Elijah the prophet of blessed memory, to bring us the good tidings of salvation and consolation.' Trypho the Jew, in his controversy with Justin, says: 'But Messiah—if He has indeed been born and exists anywhere—is unknown, and does not even know Himself, and has no power, until Elijah come to anoint Him, and make Him manifest to all.' 'We all expect that Messiah will be born a man of men, and that Elijah when he comes will anoint Him.'

'Oh that it were the will of God,' says Elias the

1 Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho, chaps. viii. xlix.
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Levite, 'to send us Elijah in his time, and to confirm to us this verse, "Behold, I send you Elijah, the prophet."' 'It is well known to the nation of Israel,' says Rabbi Isaac, 'that the Messiah would not be manifested till Elijah the prophet had come.' And Abenezra concludes his commentary on Malachi with these words: 'May God in His mercy fulfil His prophecy, and accelerate the time of his (Elijah's) advent.'

SUPPLEMENT II.

THE EXPECTATION OF A MESSIAH.

The idea of a Messiah cannot possibly be considered as either the discovery or the invention of our Lord and His apostles. On the contrary, it is certain not only that this Messianic idea previously existed among the Jews, but that about the time of our Lord there was a general expectation among them, and even among other nations, of the advent of the Messiah. We find traces of such an expectation throughout the Gospels. Thus when John the Baptist appeared, preaching the advent of the kingdom of God, we are informed that the people were in expectation, and all men mused in their hearts of John, whether he were the K
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Messiah or not (Luke iii. 15); and in order to ascertain the point, a deputation was sent to him from the Sanhedrim in Jerusalem: 'The Jews sent priests and Levites to him from Jerusalem to ask him, Who art thou?' (John i. 19). And so also when Jesus Himself appeared, a similar demand was made of Him, whether He were the expected Messiah. 'Then came the Jews and said unto Him, How long dost thou make us to doubt? If thou be the Messiah, tell us plainly' (John x. 24). And they had long disputations among themselves whether or not He was the Messiah, whose coming they all expected. 'Do the rulers indeed know that this is the very Messiah? Howbeit we know this man whence He is: but when the Messiah cometh, no man knoweth whence He is. And many of the people believed on Him, and said, When the Messiah cometh, will He do more miracles than these which this man hath done? Many of the people said, Of a truth this is the Prophet. Others said, This is the Messiah. But some said, Shall the Messiah come out of Galilee? Hath not the Scripture said, That the Messiah cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem, where David was?' (John vii. 26, 27, 31, 40–43). And St. Paul, in his address before Agrippa, mentions this expectation of the Messiah as the prevalent hope and the subject of the constant prayer of his countrymen (Acts xxvi. 6, 7).
But, independently of our Gospels, we learn that there was such a general expectation among the Jews. As a nation, they waited for the consolation of Israel: the belief was prevalent among them that the days of the Messiah were at hand, that the Anointed King predicted by the prophets was to make His appearance. We find traces of this belief in the apocryphal books—writings which are generally admitted to have been composed by Jews, though in some places altered by Christian hands. The most remarkable of these for our purpose is the Second Book of Esdras, generally cited as Fourth Ezra, which is now admitted to be a Jewish composition written about the close of the first century. Among other Messianic statements, we have a very remarkable one in chap. vii. 28, 29, which in our translation, taken from the Latin version, is as follows: 'For my Son, Jesus, shall be revealed with those that be with Him, and they that remain shall rejoice within four hundred years. After these years shall my Son Christ die, and all men that have life.' The word Jesus, however, is peculiar to the Latin: all the other versions have Messiah, which is now regarded by critics as the true reading; so that we have in all probability

1 Drummond fixes as the date the last quarter of the first century after Christ (Jewish Messiah, p. 117). Colani fixes on A.D. 97, in the reign of Nerva (Croyances Messianiques, p. 52). So also Wieseler and Davidson fix on A.D. 90–98.
here a Jewish Messianic statement, especially as the words which follow are opposed to Christian doctrine. There are also other extant Jewish books, such as the Book of Enoch and the Assumption of Moses, written about the commencement of the Christian era, in which the Messianic idea is contained. So also the Targums, being Chaldee paraphrases of the Old Testament books, especially that of Onkelos on the Pentateuch, and that of Jonathan on the Prophets, are full of Messianic allusions.

And the same expectation was entertained by the Samaritans, although they disagreed with the Jews on most other points. Thus the woman of Sychar asserted her belief in a coming Messiah: 'I know that Messias cometh: when He is come, He will tell us all things' (John iv. 25). And the inhabitants of that Samaritan city expressed their convictions from what they heard and saw.

1 The Fourth Book of Ezra was probably written in Greek; but the original is lost, and we have it only in five different versions—the Latin, the Syriac, the Arabic, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic.

2 For the Messianic statements in the book of Enoch, see Westcott’s Study of the Gospels, pp. 99-109, 5th ed. See also The Translation of the Book of Enoch, by Archbishop Laurence, 3d ed. 1838; Row, The Jesus of the Evangelists, pp. 167-191; Dillmann’s Henoch, 1853; and Ewald’s Abhandlung über des Aethiopischen Buches Henokh, 1854. ‘The predictions in Enoch,’ observes Row, ‘bear no doubtful reference. They are applicable to one person, and to one person only, the Messiah.’

3 For a full statement of the Messianic statements in these ancient Jewish books, see Drummond’s Jewish Messiah.
that Jesus was the Messiah: 'This is indeed the Messiah, the Saviour of the world' (John iv. 42). The Samaritans rejected all the books of the Old Testament, except the Pentateuch; but still they were at one with the Jews in their expectation of the Messiah. They probably founded their belief on the words of Moses, that Jehovah would raise up a prophet like to himself; and hence they regarded the Messiah as a great prophet—one that should tell them all things, rather than as a great King—one who should subdue their enemies; they do not appear to have entertained so decidedly as the Jews the notion of a conquering Messiah. And it is to be observed that the remnant of this interesting people still cherish their Messianic expectation, and look forward to the advent of a prophet who shall either be Moses restored to life, or who shall come in the spirit and power of their great Lawgiver. 'You would know,' say they in answer to inquiries as to their Messianic belief, 'whether the Messias be come, and whether it be He who is promised in our law as the Shiloh. Know that the Messias is not yet risen; but He shall rise, and His name shall be Hathab.'

1 Quoted from Hill's *Divinity Lectures*, vol. i. p. 153. According to Meyer, the Samaritan name Hathab (בָּכָהַב) is by some rendered the *converter*, and by others the *returning one* (Moses). For the Christology of the Samaritans, see Westcott on *The Study of the Gospels*, pp. 159, 160.
Nor was this Messianic expectation confined to the Jews and Samaritans; it was diffused throughout the East. Wherever the Jews went, they circulated their Messianic hopes. We read that wise men came from the East to Jerusalem, inquiring, 'Where is He that is born King of the Jews?' (Matt. ii. 2). And not only do we learn this from our scriptural books, but we have the remarkable testimony of several independent writers. There is frequent reference in Latin authors to the predictions in the Sibylline oracles of a great king who was about to appear. These oracles, which, so far as they are extant, consist of twelve books in Greek hexameters, have of late been carefully examined. They have been ascertained to be from various sources, and some of them to be of Jewish origin; so that many of the oracles contained in them are borrowed from the Old Testament prophets. We have, in the third book, supposed to be written by an Egyptian Jew in the second century before Christ, the following remarkable passage: 'When Rome shall rule Egypt, then shall appear upon men the supremely great king-

1 For interesting statements concerning these Sibylline oracles, the reader is referred to Drummond's *Jewish Messiah*, Book i. chap. i. section iii.

2 According to Pusey, this third book was written about B.C. 170. Bleek places it between B.C. 170-168. The passage quoted, however, is from an interpolation considered to be written between B.C. 40-31, as there is in it a supposed allusion to the second triumviri. All critics admit that it was written before the Christian era.
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dom of the immortal King. And a pure sovereign will come to conquer the sceptres of the whole earth unto all ages.'¹ When it was proposed that Julius Cæsar should be crowned king, we are informed that Lucius Cotta, one of those who were appointed to examine the Sibylline books, reported that in them there was a prophecy that the Parthians would never be subdued but by a king.² Cicero informs us that Lentulus, one of the Catiline conspirators, applied this oracle to himself, as if he were the designated king.³ Virgil, in his address to Pollio on the expected birth of a mysterious child, is justly supposed to give expression to these Messianic hopes: the resemblance between that poem and the prophecies of Isaiah is too striking to be accidental; he probably derived his knowledge from these Sibylline oracles. He proclaims the end of all war, the reign of universal peace, the harmony between the most ferocious and the most defenceless creatures; the herds of cattle shall not fear the terrible lions, serpents shall be extirpated, and poisonous herbs shall cease at the advent of this mysterious child, the offspring of the gods.⁴

¹ Drummond's *Jewish Messiah*, p. 276, Book iii. 46-50.
² Suetonius' *Julius Cæsar*, 79.
³ Cicero, *Or. Cat.* iii.
⁴ 'There is no difficulty,' observes Merivale, the distinguished historian of the Romans under the Empire, 'in supposing Virgil to have been acquainted with the prophetic portions of the Jewish scriptures, if not directly, at least through the medium of the so-called Sibylline oracles' (vol. iii. p. 247, note).
The words of the historians Tacitus and Suetonius are still more plain, and leave no doubt of such a Messianic expectation. 'Many,' says Tacitus, 'were persuaded that it was contained in the old records of the priests, that at that very time the East should prevail, and some coming out of Judea should obtain the rule; which prophecies foretold Vespasian and Titus.'

'An old and constant opinion,' says Suetonius, 'had grown throughout the whole East, that it was foretold that at that time some coming out of Judea should obtain the rule. This was predicted of the Roman emperor, as the event afterwards declared; but the Jews, applying it to themselves, rebelled.' And the testimony of Josephus is precisely similar, although he was prevented by the peculiarities of his situation from stating fully the Jewish Messianic notions. 'What did most elevate the Jews in undertaking this war, was an ambiguous oracle, that was also found in their sacred books, how about that time one from their country should become governor of the habit-

1 'Pluribus persuasio inerat, antiquis sacerdotum libris contineri, eo ipso tempore fore, "ut valesceret Oriens, profectisque Judæa rerum potirentur." Quae ambages Vespasianum ac Titum prædixerant' (Hist. v. 13).

2 'Percrebuerat oriente toto vetus et constans opinio esse in fatis, ut eo tempore Judææ profecti rerum potirentur. Id de imperatore Romano quantum postea eventu patuit, prædictum, Judæi ad se trahentes rebellarunt' (Vesp. 4). The sameness of the prediction in Tacitus and Suetonius proves that these historians must have taken it from the same source, probably the Sibylline oracles.
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able earth. The Jews took this prediction to belong to themselves in particular, and many of the wise men were thereby deceived in their determination. Now this oracle certainly denoted the government of Vespasian, who was appointed emperor in Judea.¹ We have nothing to do with the unnatural application of the prophecy by these historians to Vespasian; but they undoubtedly bear testimony to the existence and prevalence of such a prophecy, and to the expectation founded upon it. According to them, this was an ancient prophecy; it was contained in the sacred books of the Jews. The expectation was not confined to Judea, but was general throughout the East; and it was the hope of its fulfilment which chiefly incited the Jews to war.

It is thus a matter beyond controversy that there existed about the time of our Lord the expectation of the advent of some mighty prince, to whom the Jews gave the name of Messiah. The Jews grounded this expectation on certain prophecies contained in their sacred books. In the Gospels they are represented as quoting their scriptures, and applying them as predictions of their Messiah. 'Hath not the Scripture said, That the Messiah cometh out of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem?' (John vii. 42). And the chief priests and scribes answered Herod, when he asked

¹ Joseph. Jud. Bell. vi. 5. 4.
them where the Messiah should be born: 'In
Bethlehem of Judea; for thus it is written by the
prophet, And thou Bethlehem, in the land of
Judah, art not the least among the princes of
Judah: for out of thee shall come a Governor, that
shall rule my people Israel' (Matt. ii. 5, 6). Cicero
and Virgil quote from the Sibylline oracles, which
are in a great measure derived from the Jewish
prophecies. Tacitus, Suetonius, and Josephus unite
in asserting that the expectation of this ruler was
derived from the prophetic records. And, indeed,
this must evidently have been the case. No one
can read the books of the prophets with an impar-
tial eye without discerning the Messianic element—
the predictions of the advent of a great King who
was to rule over the house of Israel and to intro-
duce a happier and more glorious era; of One who
was to sit on the throne of David for ever, and of
whose dominion there was to be no end.
LECTURE IV.

THE SECONDARY MESSIANIC PROPHECIES.

In my last lecture I directed your attention to the primary prophecies concerning the Messiah—prophecies which refer to the Messiah only, and cannot be predicated of another. Those nine passages, which I then adduced, were merely given as examples; for it must by no means be understood that they embrace all the primary Messianic prophecies found in the Old Testament. None of the quotations were taken from the Psalms, although in that wonderful manual of Hebrew devotion there are many primary prophecies; but I purposely abstained from adducing them, and reserved my remarks on them for this lecture, as by many biblical scholars the application of them to the Messiah is regarded as indirect.

But besides primary or direct, there are also what have been denominated secondary or indirect Messianic prophecies—prophecies which we cannot, with the same degree of assurance, refer exclusively to the Messiah. To these secondary Messianic
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Prophecies objections have been made. It has been asserted that the meaning attached to them is fanatical and absurd. Such a view, it has been affirmed, introduces into Scripture the superstitious and unintelligible notion of a double sense; as if, over and above the plain meaning of a prophetical passage ascertained by the ordinary rules of criticism, there were a mystical or allegorical sense. On such a mode of interpretation, the meaning of a prediction would be left to individual caprice, and a wide door would be opened for all extravagant assertions. But this objection, so far as it goes, does not materially affect the great argument from prophecy. Even were it admitted that no argument could be drawn from these so-called secondary prophecies in favour of the Messiahship of Jesus, yet the primary prophecies remain untouched. It has been proved that there are Messianic prophecies in Scripture, and if these have been fulfilled in the life and character of Jesus of Nazareth, we have a sufficient proof that He is the Person referred to in them. We are, however, far from relinquishing the secondary prophecies; we trust to be able to prove, in the sequel of this lecture, that it is neither absurd nor fanatical to maintain them, but that they rest upon a solid foundation of truth, and that we may reasonably infer that in such secondary prop-

1 Collins' *Grounds and Reasons.*
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phecies a reference to the Messiah was divinely intended.

At the same time, it is admitted that the subject is involved in difficulty, and that at first sight there appears to be some truth in the above objection. And especially the abuse which has been made of the idea of a prophecy of a secondary sense, and the many extravagant instances of types, and analogies, and double senses, and forced interpretations which have been maintained, have created a prejudice against such predictions. The question which here meets us is, What prophecies are Messianic? On what grounds, it is asked, can it be asserted that a prediction or a statement which is plainly applicable to David or Solomon, is also applicable to the Messiah, and receives its fulfilment in Him? What criterion have we to distinguish such prophecies, and to judge between their primary and their secondary sense? What right have we to attach a double sense to the words of the prophet? These and such like questions are difficult to answer. Besides, the phrase secondary prophecy is unfortunate, and is calculated to convey a wrong impression. When it is asserted that the primary sense of a particular Psalm refers to David, and its secondary sense to the Messiah, the words suggest that the Messianic meaning is the inferior or subordinate sense; whereas what is meant is precisely the reverse: that the Psalm
receives its partial fulfilment in David, and its complete fulfilment in the Messiah; so that what we call the *primary* sense is the inferior and subordinate meaning, and what we call the *secondary* sense is the higher and more important meaning. It is accordingly carefully to be borne in mind, that in this lecture by the term *primary* we do not mean chief, but only *first* in order of time; and by the term *secondary* we do not mean inferior or subordinate, but only *second* in order of time. Perhaps some other words, such as typical and antitypical, or direct and indirect, would have been more appropriate and less liable to misconception.

In adverting to the secondary Messianic prophecies, I shall first consider *their nature*, and secondly, *their validity*.

### I. The Nature of the Secondary Messianic Prophecies.

By a secondary Messianic prophecy we mean a prediction which is capable of a twofold application, and which has received a first but incomplete fulfilment in some particular person or event in Jewish history, and a second but more complete fulfilment in the Messiah. It is maintained that such secondary prophecies do exist in the Old Testament—prophecies which, for example, in
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their first sense are applicable to David, and in their second and higher sense to the Son of David, or the Messiah. There is here a twofold prophecy, somewhat of the same nature as type and antitype; and there is a twofold fulfilment. The same is the case, if what is called the primary sense be not so much a prediction as the declaration of a fact or a prayer; as is the case in several of the so-called Messianic Psalms. For example, there may be a glowing description of the glories of Solomon's reign, expressed in terms which can only receive their realization in the kingdom of the Messiah. And it is further maintained that the application of such prophecies or declarations to the Messiah is not accidental or by way of accommodation, but was intended by the Holy Spirit, the true Author of these prophecies. Whether the prophets themselves understood this further and wider application of their predictions, may be questioned; but, as we have already had occasion to observe, what we have to do with is not the intention of the prophets, but of the Spirit of God, who inspired these prophets.

But the great objection to the idea of secondary Messianic prophecies is that it is apparently founded on an alleged double sense in Scripture. The words of the prophets are made to bear a twofold meaning. We would hardly apply such a theory to the interpretation of any other writing, unless
it professed to have a twofold meaning, as in the case of a satire, an allegory, or a parable. Accordingly, Bishop Warburton applies the allegorical principle of interpretation to prophecy. And yet a secondary prophecy is entirely distinct from an allegory. In an allegory the primary sense refers merely to the words, and the facts stated may be fictitious, or at least are wholly unimportant; whilst the secondary sense refers to the events, and is alone of importance. Whereas in a secondary prophecy both the primary and secondary applications are real and important.—Others, again, endeavour to evade the difficulty of a 'double sense,' by affirming that a secondary prophecy is not to be considered as a prophecy of a double sense, but rather as a twofold prophecy, having its real and complete fulfilment in the Messiah; it is so partially fulfilled in another as hardly to be applicable to him. Thus, for example, David in one of the Psalms says: 'Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt Thou suffer Thine Holy One to see corruption' (Ps. xvi. 10). No doubt David is here speaking of himself, and expressing his confidence in God; and yet in no sense were these prophetical words fulfilled in him; for, as St. Peter argues, David died, and saw corruption: there is here what may be called a secondary prophecy, but there is no double sense. The words have only one sense, and are only applicable to the
Messiah: 'David, seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of the Messiah, that His soul was not left in hell, neither His flesh did see corruption' (Acts ii. 31). This distinction, however, between a twofold prophecy and a prophecy of a double sense, is vague and ambiguous, and is in many instances not applicable. We are rather disposed to affirm that prophecy may receive a variety of fulfilments, until its complete fulfilment culminates in the Messiah. Certainly the sense of any book is the meaning which the author designed to attach to it; but we must not forget that the true Author of the prophetical writings is God; and if this be admitted, there is nothing to prevent us from admitting that the words have a higher meaning than that which lies on the surface, or which the writers themselves intended, supposing that they did not understand the full meaning of their prophecies.

'In sorting the prophecies of Scripture with their events,' observes Lord Bacon, in the second book of the Advancement of Learning, 'we must allow for that latitude which is agreeable and familiar unto divine prophecies, being of the nature of the Author, with whom a thousand years are as one day; and therefore they are not fulfilled punctually at once, but have springing and germinant accomplishment throughout many ages, though the height or fulness of them may refer to some one age.'
As an example of what is meant by a secondary prophecy, let us take that remarkable prediction of Immanuel, in the prophecies of Isaiah: ‘The Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil, and choose the good. For before the child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings’ (Isa. vii. 14–16). The evident intention of these words was to encourage Ahaz, or if not him, at least the house of David, with the assurance that the kings of Israel and Syria, by whom the country was invaded, would not finally prevail. Now, the primary meaning of this prophecy, and that probably which would only suggest itself to the wicked monarch, was a promise of deliverance from the formidable attacks of those two hostile kingdoms; that before a child to be born should attain to its moral consciousness, both of these kingdoms would be deprived of their kings. Such an interpretation, we consider, is absolutely necessary, because to refer it exclusively to the miraculous birth of the Messiah, which was to happen hundreds of years afterwards, could not possibly be any sign of deliverance to Ahaz. And, besides, there is a note of time appended which can only refer to a child then to be born: ‘Before the
child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings.' All attempts to give another explanation of these words, as if the child here spoken of was a different child from Immanuel, or as if the land mentioned was not the kingdoms of Israel and Syria, but the land of Canaan—the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, are futile, and give rise to forced interpretations. Nor is the august title 'Immanuel,' 'God with us,' any objection; for it is not necessarily the distinctive title of a person, but may be intended to denote that God was on the side of Judah, that He was with them as their Helper; and, indeed, the word is so used in this prophecy a few verses further on: 'Take counsel together, and it shall come to nought; speak the word, and it shall not stand: for (Immanuel) God is with us' (Isa. viii. 10).

But, besides this primary meaning, the words have a secondary and far higher sense. The prophecy is directly applied by the Evangelist to the miraculous birth of the Lord Jesus Christ: 'Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us' (Matt. i. 22, 23). In the Messiah the prophecy was to receive its complete realization: He was to
be virgin-born; to Him the name Immanuel belonged in its fullest sense, and the sign given had respect to a much greater deliverance than from the attacks of any earthly enemies. And this secondary and higher sense is evident from the prophecy itself, and is no mere fanciful or mistaken accommodation of the words by the Evangelist to Jesus. This mysterious child may be traced throughout the whole of this prediction. To Him the land of Judah belonged as His peculiar right; it is termed, 'Thy land, O Immanuel' (Isa. viii. 8); He is to diffuse the light of truth among those who walk in darkness, and dwell in the land of the shadow of death (Isa. ix. 2); He is to be a mighty King, who is to subdue all the enemies of His people (Isa. ix. 3–5); and He it is who is denominated in the same prophecy as 'The Wonderful, The Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace,' and who is to sit upon the throne of David for ever (Isa. ix. 6, 7). And, in all probability, there is a reference to this prophecy by the contemporary prophet Micah, who often borrowed from Isaiah. After announcing the birth of the Messiah in Bethlehem Ephratah, Micah adds, 'Therefore will he give them up,'—that is, God will give up the Jews to their enemies, —'until the time that she which travaileth hath brought forth' (Micah v. 3). 'Both prophecies,' observes Rosenmüller, 'illustrate one another:
Micah designates the divine origin of the Promised One; Isaiah, the miraculous circumstances of His birth.\textsuperscript{1}

We have another example of a secondary prophecy in the Seventy-second Psalm. In its primary sense, this Psalm applies to Solomon; it is entitled, 'A Psalm for Solomon.' It describes the glories of his distinguished reign. It represents the large extent of his dominion, the equity of his government, the benevolence of his administration, and the peace and prosperity of his reign. And yet there are expressions employed in this Psalm which are far too exalted to apply to Solomon, and which transcend the limits even of oriental exaggeration—expressions which can only apply to the ideal King, that greater Son of David who was to rule as the Prince of Peace, and of whose kingdom there was to be no end. For instance, the following expressions cannot in any sense be applicable to Solomon, and can only refer to the Messiah: 'They shall fear thee as long as the sun and moon endure, throughout all generations. In his days shall the righteous flourish; and abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth. He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth. All kings shall fall down before him, and all nations shall serve him.

\textsuperscript{1} Quoted in Hengstenberg's Christology, vol. ii. p. 50; Supplement I.
His name shall endure for ever: his name shall be continued as long as the sun: and men shall be blessed in him: all nations shall call him blessed’ (Ps. lxxii. 5–8, 11, 17). Indeed, such expressions are so inapplicable to Solomon as to convert the Psalm into a primary prophecy of the Messiah.

The same notion of an ideal King—of one who is the Anointed of the Lord, whose reign was to be universal and perpetual, embracing all nations and extending over all times—pervades all those Psalms which have been, happily termed ‘Messianic.’ Indeed, in several of them the Messianic element is so evident, and the expressions employed are so inapplicable either to David the warrior monarch, or to Solomon the peaceful sovereign, that we can hardly regard them as secondary prophecies, but must view them as primary predictions of the Messiah: David and Solomon sink into insignificance before the ideal King whose advent is foretold; what are most extravagant assertions with regard to them, receive their full accomplishment in Him. Among these Psalms there is a considerable diversity. Some may be considered as objectively Messianic, describing the life and actions of the Messiah; others as subjectively Messianic, delineating His inner life, His feelings and emotions. Some have reference to His divine nature, as the Son of God who sits at the Father’s right hand,
and whom all nations are commanded to worship; others have reference to His human nature as Son of man, whom the Lord has made strong for Himself (Ps. lxxx. 17). Some testify of the sufferings of the Messiah, but the greater number proclaim His eternal glory.

Thus, in the Second Psalm, we have a description of a mighty King. He is the Lord's Anointed, or Messiah; the strong confederacy formed against Him is the object of His derision; He sits as King on the holy hill of Zion; He is declared to be the Son of God; His inheritance embraces all nations: all His enemies are subdued under His feet and punished for their rebellion, and the kings and judges of the earth are warned to submit to His authority. 'Be wise now, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son, lest He be angry, and ye perish from the way, when His wrath is kindled but a little' (Ps. ii. 10-12). In the Forty-fifth Psalm, He is described as fairer than all the children of men; as combining majesty with grace; as everywhere victorious: His arrows are sharp in the hearts of the King's enemies, whereby the people fall under Him; as ruling in righteousness, and anointed as the Messianic monarch; and as dignified with the incommunicable name of God: 'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: the sceptre of Thy
kingdom is a right sceptre' (Ps. xlv. 6). In the Hundred and tenth Psalm, He is represented not as David's Son, but as David's Lord; as sitting at the right hand of God until His enemies are made His footstool; as ruling in the midst of His foes; as surrounded by a willing people; as a Priest upon His throne, after another order than that of Aaron; as striking through kings in the day of His wrath; and as judging among the heathen. In the Twenty-second Psalm there is a change in the description; the sufferings of the Messiah are delineated; He is forsaken of God; He is a worm, and no man, a reproach of men and despised among the people; the wicked compass Him about; they pierce His hands and His feet; they part His garments among them, and cast lots for His vesture. And yet, as is evident from this same Psalm, this is the great Messianic King who is so used; His glory follows His humiliation; all the kingdoms of the world are converted into His subjects; all the kindreds of the nations worship before Him; a seed shall serve Him, and it shall be counted to the Lord for a generation. Such descriptions, as are contained in these Psalms, are so entirely inapplicable to David or Solomon, the greatest of the Jewish monarchs,—they so evidently point to the ideal King, the Anointed of the Lord,—that we cannot regard them as secondary prophecies at all, but as primary predictions of that Son of David who was to sit
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upon his throne, and whom both Jews and Christians regard as the Messiah.¹

Nor do we think that the writers of these Psalms were altogether unconscious of the fact that they were celebrating the glories of King Messiah. The promise had been made to David by the prophet Nathan of a Son who was to sit upon his throne; of a great King proceeding from his royal line who should establish the throne of his kingdom for ever (2 Sam. vii.). He was to be the Anointed King, the ideal theocratic monarch. On this King, this Son of David, the nation's hopes were fixed. The Psalmists sung His praises, and looked forward to His advent and glory; they spoke of the glory of His kingdom, and discoursed upon His greatness. The references in the Psalms to this promise made to David are numerous and direct. Thus, in one of those 'songs of degrees,' supposed to be composed on the return of the Jews from Babylon, and thus long after David was dead, the Psalmist prays: 'For thy servant David's sake, turn not away the face of Thy Messiah. The Lord hath sworn in truth to David; He will not turn from it; Of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy throne' (Ps. cxxxii. 10, 11); and in another Psalm we read: 'I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn unto David my servant, Thy seed will I establish for ever, and build up thy throne to

¹ Supplement II.
all generations. Also I will make Him my first-born, higher than the kings of the earth' (Ps. lxxxix. 3, 4, 27). The Messiah was thus revealed as an Anointed King, as the descendant of David; and hence it is not unreasonable to suppose that the Psalmists, although necessarily ignorant of the full meaning of their predictions, yet were conscious that He whose kingly glories they were describing was the great ideal King, the seed who was promised to sit on the throne of David: the Spirit of God which was in them testified of the glories of Messiah's reign.

The observations which have been made regarding the alleged secondary prophecies are also applicable, to a considerable extent, to those prophecies which are of a typical nature; both are to be regarded as Messianic in their full meaning and application. Indeed, there is not much difference between a type and a secondary prophecy; and, at one time, I thought of substituting the word typical for secondary, as a more appropriate term and less liable to misconception. A secondary prophecy foretells the distant future under the veil of an event which has happened, or which is soon to happen. A type, again, is divinely appointed to foretell the same future by representative acts or symbols. The one addresses itself more to the mind; the other more, in the form of signs, to the bodily senses. And yet, in another point of view,
especially in the case of typical persons, the difference between them is evanescent. Thus many of the secondary Messianic prophecies may be considered as truly typical; David and Solomon, to whom these prophecies refer, being considered as types of the Messiah. The existence of such types or typical prophecies is clearly recognised in the New Testament.

There are typical rites. The ceremonies under the law are typical of the blessings conferred by the gospel. Indeed, we cannot see any meaning in many of the ceremonies of the Jewish ritual, unless they were typical of gospel times. 'These things,' says St. Paul, 'are a shadow of good things to come; but the body is of Christ' (Col. ii. 17). But especially is the rite of sacrifice—the chief rite of Jewish worship, and that which occupies the greatest space in the Jewish laws—typical of the sacrifice of Christ. The legal sacrifices were but faint shadows and images of that greater and better sacrifice which in the fulness of time was to be offered, and which alone could remove guilt. What was merely ceremonial and prefigurative under the law, was real and efficacious under the gospel.

And as there are typical rites, so also there are typical persons. David, for example, is held forth as a type of the Messiah not only in the Psalms, which may have been composed by him, but in the books of the prophets which were written long after
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his death. It is not only predicted of the Messiah that He shall be the Son of David, a Prince of the Davidic line, and that He shall sit on the throne of David, but He is expressly called David. ‘They shall serve the Lord, and David their King,’ says Jeremiah, ‘whom I will raise up unto them’ (Jer. xxx. 9). ‘I shall set up one Shepherd over them,’ says Ezekiel, ‘and He shall feed them, even my servant David, a Prince among them’ (Ezek. xxxiv. 23, 24). ‘In the latter days,’ says Hosea, ‘Israel shall return, and seek David their King’ (Hosea iii. 5). These prophetic utterances can by no possibility refer to David personally, for he had been for ages dead and buried; they are, in truth, primary prophecies of the Messiah. But the Messiah is here called by the name of David; because David, the man according to God’s own heart, was the constituted type of the Messiah: he was in an inferior sense what the Messiah was in a complete sense—the Anointed of the Lord. Among the Jews, David has been always considered as a type of the Messiah. ‘The whole life of David,’ says the Jalkut chadash, ‘was a type or parable of the Messiah.’ And in the prayers which they still offer up in the synagogues, the Messiah is frequently mentioned by the name of David. Thus in the preparatory service for the Sabbath we have the following prayer: ‘Shake off the dust; arise, O my

1 Wünsche’s *Die Leiden des Messias*, p. 87.
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people, and adorn thyself with thy beautiful attire; for by the hand of Jesse the Bethlehemite, redemption draweth nigh to my soul;’ in the prayer for the new moon we have the following declaration: ‘David, King of Israel, liveth and existeth;’ and in the order of prayers for the New Year, we have the following comprehensive petition: ‘O Lord, grant honour unto Thy people; applause unto those who fear Thee; a pleasing hope unto those who seek Thee; and confidence unto those that wait for Thee; joy unto Thy land, gladness unto Thy city, a revival of the kingdom of Thy servant David, and an ordination of renewed splendour to the Son of Jesse Thine Anointed, speedily in our days.’

In considering typical rites and persons, the greatest caution must be exercised. We must carefully guard against fanciful resemblances, nor must we unwarrantably multiply the points of similarity between type and antitype. The Messiah, we are informed, was to be a prophet like unto Moses. It is evident that this refers to a resemblance in those characteristics which distinguished Moses from all other prophets, as being a legislator and a mediator; but to give twenty or forty points of resemblance between Christ and Moses is certainly a very useless exercise of ingenuity, and tends to expose the subject to ridicule. So, also, we must guard against the unnecessary multiplication of types, which are unauthorized by Scripture, as
opening a wide door to extravagant interpretation. Joseph, sold by his brethren, in a state of slavery and afterwards in a state of exaltation, nourishing all his father's house, may possibly be a type of Jesus Christ; but I for one would not venture to assert, as has been frequently done, that Samson also was a type of our Lord.

II. The Validity of the Secondary Messianic Prophecies.

It is a disputed question, how far the secondary Messianic prophecies can be used as valid arguments in proof of the Messiahship of Jesus. It is supposed by many that they are unavailing for this purpose; that, being secondary, their existence as Messianic prophecies must be proved; that we can only be sure of this from the testimony of Christ and His apostles; and that consequently to use them as evidences of the Messiahship of Jesus, would be to reason in a circle. After we have established the Messiahship of Jesus from primary prophecies, then secondary prophecies serve other and most important purposes.

This is the view which has been taken of the matter by Bishop Marsh, who may be regarded as its best exponent. He will not admit of any secondary prophecies, except those which are recognised in the New Testament as such; and
consequently such prophecies cannot be logically and fairly used as proofs, except when the truth of the New Testament is admitted. He argues that our only ground of belief in the existence of secondary prophecies is the assertion of Scripture; that the question of secondary senses resolves itself into a question of authority; and that we must restrict the secondary prophecies to those passages which are referred to in the New Testament. 'Since,' he observes, 'in every instance, where a passage of the Old Testament has a secondary sense, the existence of that secondary sense depends entirely on the divine authority, which has ascribed it to the passage, we must wholly confine the application of a secondary sense to those particular passages, to which a secondary sense has been ascribed by divine authority. There is no supposed logical propriety, no supposed moral fitness, which can either establish the existence or lead to the discovery of such senses. It is authority, and authority alone; though we may fairly presume from the very exercise of such authority, that in every instance, where a secondary sense is applied by such authority, there is a moral fitness for the application.' And he makes a similar observation with regard to typical prophecies: 'There is no other rule by which we can distinguish a real from a pretended type, than

1 Marsh's Lectures on Criticism, pp. 453, 454.
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that of Scripture itself. There are no other possible means by which we can know that a previous design and a pre-ordained connection existed. Whatever persons or things therefore, recorded in the Old Testament, were expressly declared by Christ or by His apostles, to have been designed as prefigurations of persons or things relating to the New Testament, such persons or things, so recorded in the former, are types of the persons or things with which they are compared in the latter. But if we assert that a person or thing was designed to prefigure another person or thing, where no such prefiguration has been declared by divine authority, we make an assertion for which we neither have nor can have the slightest foundation. 1

According to this view, the criterion for ascertaining secondary Messianic prophecies and Messianic types, is the authority of Christ and His apostles. Only those are to be received as secondary prophecies and types which Christ or His apostles declare to be so. In this matter, we must submit our judgment to authority. There is certainly a simplicity in this view of the subject: a plain rule of interpretation is prescribed, and a strong barrier erected against all those allegorical and fanciful interpretations which some insert into the sacred text. But still we cannot argue against

1 Marsh's Lectures on Criticism, p. 373.
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the reality of any principle, merely because it has been abused. There are several passages in the Old Testament which seem to relate to certain passing events in the Jewish history, and to have received a partial fulfilment in them, but which, when applied to events in the life of Jesus, evidently receive a much more complete fulfilment, and have a truer application; which, however, are not directly applied by any of the sacred writers to Christ. Thus the Seventy-second Psalm, which is so evidently Messianic, is never applied in the New Testament to Christ; and the same is the case with several of those Psalms which have been termed Messianic. Now, to say that these are not applicable to Christ, would be an unwarrantable abstraction of the Evangelical element from the Old Testament. Christianity and Judaism are inseparably connected: the same truths which are clearly taught in the one are shadowed forth in the other. We would rather affirm that the example of Christ and His apostles in the application of the secondary prophecies and types, gives us authority to consider and apply them in a similar manner, than believe that there is a restriction of the Evangelical element to those particular passages in the Old Testament which are quoted in the New.

But, further, the above opinion unnecessarily weakens the argument in favour of the Messiah-
ship of Jesus drawn from the secondary Messianic prophecies. According to this view, we must first prove the Messiahship and divine authority of Jesus before we can believe in the Messianic application of these prophecies. But many of these so-called secondary prophecies are, as we have already observed, so evidently Messianic that we cannot doubt that they were intended to be so by the Spirit of God. Expressions are used wholly inapplicable to any but the Messiah; so much so that they almost cease to be secondary, and become primary prophecies. This, we have seen, is peculiarly the case with several of the Messianic Psalms. As, for example, that declaration of universal and perpetual dominion in the Seventy-second Psalm, 'His name shall endure for ever: his name shall continue as long as the sun: men shall be blessed in him, and all nations shall call him blessed,' would be converted into impious extravagance were we to restrict it to the glories of Solomon's reign.1 And I cannot possibly conceive in what sense, figurative or real, those words of the Twenty-second Psalm can apply to David: 'They pierced my hands and my feet. I may tell all my bones: they look and stare upon me. They part my garments among them, and

1 'In any other than the Christian sense,' observes Coleridge, 'it would be a specimen of more than Persian or Mogul hyperbole and bombast, of which there is no other instance in Scripture.'
The Secondary Messianic Prophecies. 179

cast lots upon my vesture.' The mere fact that these and similar prophecies may in some vague and limited and indefinite sense be capable of being applied to other persons and events than to the Messiah and His Kingdom, does not destroy or weaken the force of the argument from prophecy, seeing that in the Messiah alone they receive their definite and full accomplishment. Whatever meaning the writers assigned to their predictions, they are evidently real Messianic prophecies, proceeding from the Spirit of God; and events have occurred which, by their exact correspondence, are proved to be the fulfilment of those prophecies.¹

There is considerable difficulty in laying down rules for the interpretation of the secondary Messianic prophecies; it is hard to say what is the precise nature of those criteria by which the secondary sense of a prophecy may be ascertained. Many of the Psalms are so plainly Messianic, so descriptive of the future ideal King, that their secondary sense can hardly be overlooked or denied. The Messianic idea pervades the Old Testament, and its existence is frequently too obvious not to be detected. The great principle

¹ See some profound remarks on the nature of secondary prophecies and the validity of the arguments derived from them, in Butler's Analogy, Part ii. chap. vii. See also Bishop Alexander's Bampton Lectures, 'Witness of the Psalms to Christ and Christianity,' p. 66.
undoubtedly is to interpret Scripture by Scripture; to seek for the meaning of the Spirit of God, not from our own fancies, but from other parts of the sacred volume. 'No prophecy of the Scripture,' says St. Peter, 'is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost' (2 Pet. i. 20, 21). The following rule of interpretation laid down by Döderlein, is probably as cautious and judicious as any that can be given: 'If a prophetic description of the greatness of an illustrious person, and the blessings conferred by him, be more exalted than can belong to any king, or prophet, or any circumstances of the Jews; and if it be clearly foreign to anything in the situation of the prophet; then it is proper, and even necessary, to consider it as belonging to the nobler dispensation of the Messiah. If it be manifest that the expressions employed by the prophet cannot, with any propriety, be applied to himself or to his situation, we are authorized to regard them as declaring the dignity, character, and history of the Messiah.'

It is admitted, however, that whilst some secondary prophecies are in themselves evidently

1 Quoted by Dr. Pye Smith in his Testimony to the Messiah, vol. i. p. 146.
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Messianic, as seen both in the terms in which they are expressed and in the correspondence between them and the events said to be their fulfilment, there are others whose application is not so evident. The reality of these must rest on divine authority, and consequently cannot be employed as an argument with unbelievers in the inspiration of Christ. We consequently do not intend to apply such prophecies in the first place, because their existence as Messianic prophecies is a matter of dispute. But after the Messiahship of Jesus has been established, and after His authority and that of His apostles have been recognised, then secondary prophecies serve many important purposes. They serve to connect more closely Judaism with Christianity; to prove that the same spirit of Christ pervades both dispensations—that, in fact, the one is wholly a prediction of the other. And they open up to us new and enlarged views of the extent and grandeur of the dispensations of God: that, from the first promise down to the advent of Christ, there has been a constant preparation going on by prophecy, by type, by history, by all the dispensations of Providence, and by all the communications of revelation, for the erection of that great spiritual kingdom of which Christ is the King, and whose subjects are redeemed men; thus proving and declaring the truth of the assertion of St. John, that 'the
We have thus considered the secondary Messianic prophecies—prophecies which, although they may, when delivered, have applied to some other persons or events, yet receive their complete fulfilment in the person of the Messiah. Several of these prophecies, especially those contained in the Messianic Psalms, are so evidently Messianic that they can hardly be regarded as secondary, and are as strong and convincing as the primary prophecies, and therefore may well be employed in considering the application of the Messianic prophecies to Jesus. Other secondary prophecies are not so evidently Messianic, and therefore no argument can be derived from them. But still there is sufficient evidence to prove that the Messianic element pervades the Old Testament; that the prophets foretold the coming of the great Deliverer; and that it may be affirmed generally of the Old Testament prophecy, that its spirit consisted in the testimony borne to the Messiah. And thus we are now prepared to apply the test of prophecy to the claims of Jesus—to inquire whether or not His life and character corresponded to the predictions of the Messiah in the Old Testament; and I trust to be able, in our next lecture, to demonstrate the full truth of the declaration, that the testimony not merely
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of Christ or the Messiah, but 'the testimony of Jesus'—the testimony borne to Him as an individual—'is the spirit of prophecy' (Rev. xix. 10).

SUPPLEMENT I.

IMMANUEL.

'THEREFORE the Lord Himself will give you a sign: Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel' (Isa. vii. 14).

There are few Messianic predictions more difficult of interpretation, or which have given rise to a greater number of expositions, than this interesting and important prophecy. There are questions connected with it which admit only of a partial solution; and there are objections to its being a primary prophecy of the Messiah which are difficult to answer; and yet it is evidently quoted by the Evangelist, not in the way of accommodation, but as a Messianic prediction; whilst its connection with the incarnation of our blessed Lord invests it with a high degree of importance.

The occasion of the prophecy is briefly as follows. An important crisis in the history of the

1 Supplement III.
kingdom of Judah had occurred. A powerful coalition had been formed between the neighbouring kings of Syria and Israel to overthrow the family of David, and to set up another dynasty in its place. 'Let us go up against Judah, and vex it, and let us make a breach therein for us, and set up a king in the midst of it, even the son of Tabeal' (Isa. vii. 6). This caused great consternation in the court of Ahaz. And certainly they had good cause for alarm, for never was the family of David reduced to such a state of prostration. The invasion of the hostile kings was at first successful—the armies of Judah were twice defeated; the king's son and many of the nobles were slain; Jerusalem was surrounded by hostile armies; and Ahaz, who then sat on the throne, was a wicked prince who had provoked the Lord with his idolatries. But however wicked Ahaz might be, yet the threat of the hostile kings to destroy the house of David, from which the Messiah was to proceed, and to set up another king, was at variance with the purposes of God. Isaiah, accordingly, came forth to encourage Ahaz with the assurance of deliverance. He tells him to ask a sign of the Lord, either in the depth, or in the height above. Ahaz, relying, not upon the divine protection, but on the aid of Assyria, answers in a spirit of feigned humility: 'I will not ask, neither will I tempt the Lord.' Then said Isaiah: Not-
withstanding your refusal, the Lord Himself, of His own accord, will give you a token of speedy deliverance from the power of your enemies:

'Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil, and to choose the good. For before the child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings.'

The translation of the passage requires emendation. The following is a more correct version of the original Hebrew: 'Therefore gives the Lord Himself a sign: Behold, the virgin is pregnant, and bears a son, and she calls his name Immanuel. Butter and honey shall he eat, till he knows to reject evil and choose good. Because before the lad knows to reject evil and choose good, the land which thou fearest shall be forsaken of the two kings;' or, perhaps more correctly, 'forsaken shall the land be, before whose two kings thou art afraid.' There is not much difference in the translation of the Septuagint. The verbs are in the future, as in our Anglican version; and instead of 'she calls,' the reading is, 'thou shalt call.' It may be rendered as follows: 'Behold, the virgin shall conceive in the womb, and shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Immanuel.' The words in St. Matthew's Gospel do not precisely
agree either with the Hebrew or the Septuagint: 'Behold, the virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel' (Matt. i. 23).

There is some difficulty in the exegesis. The article before virgin points to some definite virgin—not 'a virgin,' but 'the virgin.' The correct meaning of the word Almah (נדה), here rendered virgin, has been much disputed. Some critics suppose that it denotes a maiden,—one who is of a marriageable age, but not married,—and that the proper word to designate the virgin state as such is Bethulah (زهرה). Others consider that our translation is perfectly correct. And certainly the versions favour it: the Septuagint has ἐν παρθένος; the Vulgate, virgo; and the Syriac, a word of similar import. The derivation of the word does not give us much assistance in determining its meaning. Some derive it from בִּבְשָׁה, to hide, to conceal, with reference to the customs of the East, as virgins were obliged to live in retirement; others, from the Chaldee בִּבְשָׁה, to grow up, to be strong; hence, also, בִּבְשָׁה, a youth, which certainly favours the meaning maiden. Besides the passage before us, it occurs six times (Gen. xxiv. 43; Ex. ii. 8; Ps. lxviii. 26; Prov. xxx. 19; Cant. i. 3, vi. 8) in the Old Testament; and in all these places the word denotes a young unmarried woman.—The

1 Thus Gesenius.
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word הַפּה, translated in our version shall conceive, is an adjective, being the feminine of the verbal adjective הַפוּה, and therefore, correctly rendered, means pregnant, or is with child. The verbs are best taken neither in the preterite nor in the future, but in the present, as the sign was actually realized by the prophet, being present before his prophetic vision; hence, 'Behold, the virgin is pregnant, and bears a son.' The name of the child is given by the virgin herself: 'She calls his name.' Immanuel denotes, 'God with us.' It does not necessarily denote the personal name of the child, but may be an appellation to denote that God was with the house of David to protect them from their enemies. Such compound appellatives, into which the sacred names of God enter, were not unfrequent among the Israelites.

Verse 15, 'Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil, and choose the good,' has been differently rendered. By some it is supposed to denote a state of desolation—that the land was converted from a rich luxuriant country into pasture ground supplying only milk and honey.¹ Others, with greater reason, suppose that a state of plenty is denoted, milk and honey being the special products of the land of Canaan (Josh. v. 6).² Judea, which was desolate and laid waste at the time of the prediction, will, in a few

¹ So Anger, Delitzsch. ² So Jarchi, Bishop Lowth.
years, produce milk and honey. And the reason of this returning plenty is assigned in verse 16: 'When the lad knows to reject evil and to choose good, the land shall be forsaken, before whose two kings thou art afraid.' By the land here is meant the land of Syria and Israel, viewed as one land, because they were united in their hostile attack against Judah; and by the two kings are meant Rezin the king of Syria, and Pekah the king of Israel. Hence the obvious meaning of the passage—that which lies on the surface, and which would commend itself to the common reader—is that in a short space of time, perhaps in two or three years, deliverance will arise to the house of David, and the two hostile monarchs will be overthrown.

The interpreters of this prediction may be divided into three classes—first, those who refer the prophecy entirely to the time of Ahaz; secondly, those who refer it entirely to the Messiah; and thirdly, those who adopt a middle course and consider it a double prophecy.

1. The first class of interpreters refer the prophecy entirely to the time of Ahaz. They suppose that the prediction was uttered by Isaiah to encourage Ahaz and his kingdom with the promise of deliverance: that before a child to be born would be able to know to refuse the evil and to choose the good, the kingdoms of Syria and Israel would be deprived of their kings; or, as it is ex-
The Secondary Messianic Prophecies. pressed in the following chapter, which they, in general, regard as having reference to the same child: 'Before the child shall have knowledge to cry, My father, and my mother, the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria shall be taken away before the king of Assyria' (Isa. viii. 4). This opinion is adopted by all recent Jewish writers, and by Gesenius, Hitzig, Knobel, Hendewerk, and Anger among Christian writers.¹ These Christian writers suppose that the passage is quoted by Matthew not as a prediction, but by way of accommodation or illustration. The reasons assigned for this opinion are twofold. (1) The prophecy is announced as a sign to Ahaz of deliverance from the hostile attacks of Syria and Israel: 'The Lord Himself will give you a sign;' and it is argued that if it referred to the miraculous birth of the Messiah which was to happen hundreds of years afterwards, there could be in it no possible sign of deliverance to Ahaz; whereas, by referring it to the birth of a child at that time, the sign was direct and evident. (2) A note of time is annexed which proves that the sign must refer to a child then to be born: 'Before the lad knows to reject evil and to choose good, the land shall be forsaken, before whose two kings thou art afraid.' The name Immanuel does not express the divine nature of the child, but is merely an indication that God

¹ See Anger's Vorlesungen über die Messianische Idee, p. 48.
was with the kingdom of Judah to help it, and the word is so employed in the next chapter (Isa. viii. 10).

There is a great diversity of opinion, both among those writers and among those who adopt the idea of a double prophecy, concerning the persons of the virgin and her child. (1) Some suppose that the Almah was the wife of Ahaz, and Immanuel was her son. This was the opinion of Trypho in his controversy with Justin Martyr. 'The whole prophecy,' he observes, 'refers to Hezekiah, and is fulfilled in him.'¹ So also Dr. Pye Smith, who advocates the idea of a double prophecy, supposes that the child primarily referred to Hezekiah;² and Delitzsch also, although he considers the prophecy as primarily Messianic, admits the plausibility of this view.³ It is objected that according to the historical books Hezekiah must at that time have been nine years old, and therefore not a child about to be born. But to this it is answered, that there is evidently some error in the numbers; for, according to the computation in the historical books, Ahaz would only be eleven when Hezekiah was born, and hence the period of his birth must be deferred.⁴ Kimchi and

¹ Justin Martyr, Dialogue with Trypho, chap. lxvii.
² Smith's Scripture Testimony to the Messiah, vol. i. p. 244.
³ Delitzsch On Isaiah, vol. i. p. 218, Clark's translation.
⁴ Bishop Chandler and Mansel, in the Speaker's Commentary, with much plausibility suppose that Hezekiah was only the adopted
Abarbanel evade the difficulty by the hypothesis of a second wife to Ahaz. (2) Others suppose that the Almah was the wife of the prophet Isaiah, and Immanuel was his son. This opinion is now the most prevalent; it is adopted by Abenezra, Jarchi, and Adler among Jewish, and by Gesenius, Knobel, Hitzig, Hendewerk, Davidson, and Williams among Christian writers. According to some, she is the prophetess mentioned in the next chapter, and Immanuel is the same as Maher-shalal-hash-baz (Isa. viii. 2-4). But a difference in the name would seem to denote a difference in the children. Besides, the prophet's wife would have been more definitely designated the prophetess (Isa. viii. 3). And Isaiah had already a son Shear-jashub, so that his wife could not have been denoted by the title Almah. Some try to remove the difficulty by supposing the Almah to be the prophet's second wife, to whom he was then only betrothed; but this is evidently a mere evasion. (3) A third opinion, adopted by Michaelis, Eichhorn, Koppe, and Paulus, is that no definite child is alluded to; but that what the prophet means is that before any child to be born of a maiden shall attain to the years of discernment, the land shall be forsaken of son of Ahaz, being the heir to the throne. The king's own son Maaseiah was slain by the Syrians and Israelites, and the house of David was threatened with extirpation.

1 See Adler's Discourses, pp. 18, 19.
2 So Gesenius.
both its kings. The definite article before virgin, designating her as some particular virgin, is an objection to this opinion, as according to it no force is assigned to the article.¹

2. The second class of interpreters refer the prophecy entirely to the Messiah, and deny any reference to the time of Ahaz. The sign given is the miraculous birth of the Messiah of a virgin, and the deliverance promised is from spiritual enemies. Of course, according to this interpretation, the Almah is the Virgin Mary, and the child is the Lord Jesus Christ. This opinion is adopted by Calvin, Vitringa, Hengstenberg, Delitzsch, Fairbairn, M'Caul, and the great majority of Christian writers, although they differ greatly in their exposition of the prophecy. The reasons assigned for this view are chiefly two. (1) The words of the prediction can only admit of a Messianic application. It is a virgin who conceives and bears a son; and the name of that son is Immanuel, 'God with us,' expressing at once His divine and human natures. (2) The authority of inspiration supports the primary Messianic character of the prophecy. St. Matthew quotes these words as a direct prophecy of the Messiah: 'Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child,

¹ See Hengstenberg's Christology, vol. ii. pp. 63, 64.
and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel' (Matt. i. 22, 23). These words are too strong to be explained away, as if the Evangelist Matthew merely used them for the sake of illustration. (3) To these two reasons, others add a third; they suppose that this prophecy is referred to by the prophet Micah in his direct Messianic prophecy. 'But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall He come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting. Therefore will He give them up, until the time that she which travaileth hath brought forth' (Micah v. 2, 3). It is supposed that in the words 'she which travaileth,' or 'she which beareth,' denoting the mother of the Messiah, there is a direct allusion to the virgin mother of Immanuel in Isaiah.

To this view, it is objected that the prediction of the miraculous birth of the Messiah, which happened centuries afterwards, could not be a sign of deliverance to Ahaz. But to this it is answered, that the sign was not given to Ahaz at all, who refused it, but to the house of David, or to the Lord's people in the nation of Judah.¹ Ahaz had already refused a sign, and the prophet turns from him to the house of David. 'Therefore the Lord

¹ So Calvin. See his *Commentary on Isaiah, in loco.*

N
Himself will give you a sign.' And the sign was at once striking and convincing: that all attempts against the house of David were in vain; that that house would never be extinguished, because out of it was to proceed the Messiah—He who was to be virgin-born, the Immanuel.

A still stronger objection, and one not so easy of solution, is adduced from the fact that the age of the child and the period of its birth are mentioned: the words appear to affirm that the child was to be born within a year after the prediction, for we read in the sixteenth verse: 'Before the lad shall know to reject the evil, and to choose the good, the land shall be forsaken of whose two kings thou art afraid.' This is indeed the main difficulty in the passage to its being a direct prediction of the Messiah.

Some (Chandler, Kennicott, Maclaurin) suppose that the lad mentioned in verse 16, called "Nahar", the lad, is different from Immanuel, and is the prophet's own son Shear-jashub, who accompanied him (Isa. vii. 3). They suppose that Isaiah, in saying, 'Before the lad knows,' or, as they render it, 'Before this lad knows,' pointed to his own son. There is a plausibility in this view, as it assigns a reason for Shear-jashub accompanying the prophet, and for the difference

---

1 Chandler's *Defence of Christianity*, p. 246; Kennicott's *Sermon on Isaiah* vii. 13-16; Maclaurin's *Works*, vol. ii. p. 197.
in the words יִבְצָא and יְשִׁיטָה. It has, however, too much the appearance of an evasion to escape a difficulty. There is no indication in the text of a change of subject; on the contrary, the same quality of rejecting the evil and choosing the good assigned to Immanuel in verse 15, is assigned to the lad in verse 16, indicating that they are one and the same. Calvin supposes that the reference in verse 16 is not to any particular child, but to children in general. 'The meaning,' he observes, 'is before the children, who shall be born hereafter, can distinguish between good and evil, the land which thou hatest shall be forsaken,'¹—a meaning which is forced, unnatural, and wholly inadmissible.

Others (M'Caul, Basset ²) admit that the lad mentioned in verse 16 is the same as Immanuel, but they suppose that the land to be forsaken of both her kings is not the kingdom of Syria and Israel, but the land of Canaan, Immanuel's land (Isa. viii. 8), and that the kings consequently are those of Israel and Judah. According to this view, the prediction received its fulfilment not in the days of Ahaz, but in the days of our Lord on the death of Herod the Great: 'Before the virgin's son shall arrive at the age when children

¹ Calvin, in loco.
² M'Caul's Messiahship of Jesus, p. 181; Basset's Search and See, p. 106.
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distinguish between good and evil, the land of Israel shall cease to have any independent king or kingdom. But such an exposition cannot be maintained; the two kings mentioned are evidently Rezin and Pekah, and the land is the land of which they are kings,—namely, Syria and Israel,—the singular being used because they formed one coalition.

Hengstenberg's view deserves special mention. He supposes that the prophet realizes and anticipates the birth of the Messiah, and asserts that in the time that would elapse between the birth of the Messiah and His knowledge to discern good and evil, the overthrow of the hostile kingdoms would already have taken place. He maintains not an actual, but an ideal birth and an ideal growth of the child Immanuel. 'In verse 14,' he observes, 'the prophet has seen the birth of the Messiah as present. Holding fast this idea and expanding it, the prophet makes him who has been born accompany the people through all stages of its existence. We have here an ideal anticipation of the real incarnation. . . . What the prophet means and intends to say here is this, that in the space of about a twelvemonth the overthrow of the hostile kingdoms would already have taken place. As the representative of the contemporaries, the prophet brings forward the wonderful child who, as it were,

1 M'Caul's Messiahship of Jesus, p. 182.
formed the soul of the popular life. At the time when this child knows to distinguish between good and bad food, hence, after the space of about a twelvemonth, the land of the two hostile kings shall be desolate. In the subsequent prophecy, the same wonderful child, grown up into a warlike hero, brings the deliverance from Ashur, and the world's power represented by it.¹ But such a meaning, however ingenious, is vague and obscure, and fails to cast light on the text which it professes to explain.

Other writers (Rosenmüller, Bruno Bauer) refer, indeed, the whole prophecy to the Messiah; but suppose that, according to the prophet's view, the advent of the Messiah was to be immediate,—a rationalistic explanation which entirely destroys the supernatural element in the prediction, and converts it into a mere enthusiastic utterance. So far as we understand it, this is also the opinion of Ewald. That distinguished scholar asserts, in the strongest terms, the direct Messianic character of the prediction. 'False,' he observes, 'is every interpretation which does not see that the prophet is here speaking of the Messiah to be born, and hence of Him to whom the land really belongs, and in thinking of whom the prophet's heart beats with joyful hope.' And again: 'Nothing can be more preposterous than to imagine that the prophet intended by the

maiden a wife of the king, or even his own.' But then he appears to think that the prophet imagined that the birth of the Messiah would take place at once. He speaks of 'the young Messiah in the first age of His development,' and supposes that verse 16 means that 'before the boy enters upon his riper age, therefore a few years from the present time, the allied kingdoms of Syria and Israel would be desolate.' Nor is the explanation of Delitzsch free from the above rationalistic tendency; whilst he maintains the direct Messianic interpretation, he still appears to intimate that the prophet considered that the birth of the Messiah was to be immediate. 'The birth of Immanuel,' he observes, 'apparently falls between the time then present and the Assyrian calamities, and His earliest childhood appears to run parallel to the Assyrian oppression.'

3. The third class of interpreters consider the prediction as a double prophecy, having reference both to the time of Ahaz and to the time of the Messiah. According to them, the immediate design of the prophecy was to encourage Ahaz, or if not him, yet the house of David, with the prospect of speedy deliverance. But, along with this primary design, there was another design, if not

2 Delitzsch *On Isaiah*, vol. i. p. 223.
of the prophet, yet of God, who was the true author of the prophecy, to foreshadow the birth of the Messiah and the deliverance procured by Him, and thus to comfort and support His believing people. The deliverance of the house of David from Syria and Egypt was a prefiguration of the deliverance of the Lord's people from all their enemies, and pointed to Him who in future ages was to bring redemption to Israel. We have already in the lecture assigned the reasons for the adoption of this view, and need not repeat them. It has been adopted by Kidder, Lewth, Pye Smith, Row,\(^1\) Wordsworth, Barnes,\(^2\) and the writer of the article 'Emmanuel' in Smith's Dictionary. According to this opinion, this prophecy belongs to the class of secondary Messianic prophecies which receive partial fulfilment in some particular person or event in Jewish history, and a complete fulfilment in the Messiah. 'The prophecy,' observes Bishop Lowth, 'is introduced in so solemn a manner; the sign is so marked, as a sign selected and given by God Himself, after Ahaz had rejected the offer of any sign of his own choosing out of the whole


\(^2\) Barnes, in his Commentary on Isaiah, has a long and exhaustive note on Immanuel, which I only saw after this supplementary note was written.
compass of nature; the terms of the prophecy are so peculiar, and the name of the child so expressive, containing in them much more than the circumstances of the birth of a common child required, or even admitted, that we may easily suppose that, in minds prepared by the general expectation of a great Deliverer to spring from the house of David, they raised hopes far beyond what the present occasion suggested; especially when it was found that in the subsequent prophecy, declared immediately afterwards, this child, called Immanuel, is treated as the Lord and Prince of the land of Judah. Who could this be, other than the heir of the throne of David, under which character a great and even a divine Person had been promised? ¹ 'This passage,' says Dr. Pye Smith, 'comes under the class of prophetic testimonies, which had a primary, but inferior and partial, reference to some proximate person or event; but had another and a designed reference to some remote circumstance, which, when it occurred, would be the real fulfilment, answering every feature, and filling up the entire extent of the original delineation.' ² 'This passage,' observes Dr. Arnold, 'has a manifest historical meaning as applied to Isaiah's wife; the sign being one of time, that within the youth of an infant presently

¹ Lowth On Isaiah, note to chap. vii. 14.
² Smith's Testimony to the Messiah, vol. i. p. 239.
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to be born, Syria and Israel should be overthrown. Emmanuel might improperly be the name of a common child, just as Jesus or Joshua was; but both apply to our Lord, and to Him only in unexaggerated strictness.¹

SUPPLEMENT II.

THE MESSIANIC PSALMS.

We do not here give any dissertation on the Messianic Psalms. Their number has been very differently estimated, according to the peculiar views of different writers. Some trace the Messianic idea in every Psalm; others fail to discern it in any. About twenty-one Psalms are referred to as Messianic in the New Testament.² But the Messianic element is by no means confined to them; critics have enumerated forty-three Psalms which treat of Messiah and His kingdom.³

Three different views have been taken of these Psalms. According to the first, they are devotional compositions of Jewish writers, having entire refer-

¹ Arnold's Life and Correspondence, p. 509, 6th ed.
³ See, for a variety of opinions concerning the number of the Messianic Psalms, Baur's Geschichte der alttest. Weissagung, p. 412.
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ence to their own time, which have by the writers of the New Testament been accommodated to express Christian doctrines and feelings. According to the second, they are secondary prophecies: primarily, they refer to some actual Jewish king; but they idealize his government, and thus receive their full accomplishment only in the Messiah, the great ideal King. According to the third, the Psalmists, filled with the idea of the theocratic King, that Seed promised to David who was to sit upon his throne, and influenced by the Spirit of inspiration, describe the glories of the kingdom, and the character of the great King. Certainly, in some Psalms, the Messianic element is more evident than in others; and in the Psalms which we have commented on in our lecture, we consider that the sufferings, but especially the glory, of the Messiah are foretold.

The Messianic Psalms have been variously classified. Bishop Alexander arranges them in four divisions—the subjectively Messianic, descriptive of the character and moral consciousness of the Messiah; the typically Messianic, wherein David, Zion, and Jerusalem are employed as types of Messiah and His kingdom; the mystically Messianic, where the Messianic element is felt rather than demonstrated; and the objectively Messianic, descriptive of the actions of the Messiah.¹ Such a

¹ Alexander's Bampton Lectures, Lecture II.
division, however, cannot be always maintained, as some of the Psalms partake of several of these qualities. A better division is that of St. Peter, when he observes that the prophets 'testified beforehand of the sufferings of Christ and of the glory that should follow.' There are a few Psalms, such as xvi. and xxii., which treat of the sufferings of the Messiah—the passion Psalms; but by far the greater number proclaim His kingly glory and power.

In our lecture we adverted to five Psalms, —namely, ii., xxii., xlv., lxxii., and cx. These may be regarded as primary Messianic Psalms. They are so considered not only by most Christian writers, but, with perhaps the exception of Ps. xxii., by the ancient Jewish commentators.

The Second Psalm is repeatedly referred by Jewish writers to the Messiah. The Targum of Jonathan has: 'The kings of the earth stand up, and the rulers are united together to rebel before the Lord, and to contend against His Messiah.' Trypho, in Justin Martyr, refers the Psalm to the Messiah, though he denies its applicability to a suffering Messiah. The ancient book, Zohar, has the following passage: 'Of the Messiah it is said, Kiss the Son. Thou art my Son.' Abenezra explains the whole Psalm of David and of his Son Messiah. 'If the words,' he observes, 'be
applied to the Messiah, the matter is clear.’ Kimchi observes: ‘Some interpret this Psalm of Gog and Magog, and the Anointed as King Messiah; but it is more natural to suppose that David spoke of himself.’ And Rashi makes the following candid avowal: ‘Our masters understood this Psalm of King Messiah; but for replying to the heretics (that is, the Christians), it is better to understand it of King David.’ There is, it is admitted, a difficulty in the translation of verse 12, ‘Kiss ye the Son.’ The word here rendered son is not the common word הַעַד, as in verse 7, but the unusual Chaldee word הָעַד, occurring elsewhere in this sense only in Prov. xxxi. 2. In other parts of the Old Testament הָעַד signifies clean, pure, chosen. The Septuagint has δραχοω ταιδειας, receive instruction; and the Vulgate, apprehendite disciplinam. Adler renders it, ‘Arm yourselves with purity,’ as the verb הָעַד sometimes signifies to arm oneself. But if we retain the meaning pure, we must consider it as an adjective, and render it, ‘Kiss ye the pure or the chosen One.’ The great lexicographers Gesenius and Fürst give the preference to the rendering, ‘Kiss ye the Son.’

The Twenty-second Psalm, so evidently Mes-
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sianic, and so descriptive of the sufferings of the Messiah, was probably not so regarded by the ancient Jewish writers, because in general they overlooked the idea of a suffering Messiah. We are well aware that in the sixteenth verse of this Psalm, quoted in the lecture as applicable only to the Messiah, there is a diversity in the reading of the Hebrew manuscripts, and a great difference of opinion. The word pierced—‘they pierced my hands and my feet’—is replaced in most of the Hebrew manuscripts by another word, differing only in one letter, namely נא instead of וֹא. This has been rendered by some critics, like a lion; though, according to others, it admits of the meaning piercing. On the other hand, all the versions retain the reading, they pierced. Thus the Septuagint has ἐγαίνω καταβαίνω μου καὶ πόδας μου, they pierced my hands and my feet. The Vulgate translates the word by foderunt, ‘they dug or pierced.’ And the Syriac has a word of similar import. The rendering, as a lion, hardly makes sense: The assembly of the wicked have enclosed me: as a lion, my hands and my feet; whereas they pierced, or piercing, gives an easy and obvious meaning. The distinguished Jewish lexicographer Fürst, decides in favour of the meaning pierced or piercing. Thus, in his Dictionary he observes: הָלַךְ, to shut around, enclose, fetter: better בָּן, to bore through (Ps. xxii.
The Forty-fifth Psalm is regarded by the ancient Jewish Church as undoubtedly Messianic. The Targum of Jonathan has: ‘Thy beauty, O King Messiah, is superior to that of the sons of men; the Spirit of prophecy is given into Thy lips, therefore God hath blessed Thee for ever.’ Kimchi, in quoting the words, ‘God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows,’ says, ‘The Psalmist spoke these words in the person of the Messiah;’ and he thinks that this is implied in the title to the Psalm, Jedidith, which he considers to be a name of the Messiah. ‘This Psalm,’ observes Abenezra, ‘treats of David, or rather of his Son, the Messiah; for that is His name, My servant David shall be a Prince in the midst of you.’

The Seventy-second Psalm is clearly Messianic. Indeed, those who deny the Messianic element in the Psalms, find a difficulty in eliminating it from this Psalm. Thus Higginson observes: ‘This noble Psalm is the most Messianic, so to speak, in

---

1 See this verse discussed at great length in Basset’s Search and See, pp. 59-79; M’Caul’s Messiahship of Jesus, pp. 158-161. See also Gesenius’ Dictionary on the word יִתְנָה; Perowne On the Psalms, vol. i. pp. 246, 247. His conclusion is: ‘It is probable that the Masoretic interpretation ought to be given up, especially as like a lion is not very forcible, and leaves the structure of the sentence incomplete.’
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the collection, and is applied by Bible readers in
general, without hesitation or conscious difficulty,
to the Messiah of Nazareth, as beautifully describ-
ing the spirit of His reign.'¹ The ancient Jews
acknowledge its Messianic character. Thus the
Targum of Jonathan: 'O God, give King Messiah
the ways of Thy judgment!' Jarchi confesses
that the ancient Rabbis refer this Psalm to the
Messiah. Kimchi observes there were that ex-
plained this Psalm of the Messiah, who is other-
wise in Scripture called Solomon; and he adds
that the expressions in it are great exaggerations
if applied only to Solomon. And the Rabbis thus
translate verse 17: 'His name shall endure for
ever: his name Yinnon, before the sun;' and
hence they infer that the name Yinnon is one of
the names of the Messiah, and preceded the
creation of the sun.²

The Hundred and tenth Psalm was regarded
as Messianic by the Jews in the days of our
Lord. Jesus refers to it in His reasoning with
the Jews, without any explanation, as being dis-
tinctly acknowledged by them to be attributable
to the Messiah: 'And He said unto them,
How say they that Messiah is David's son? And
David himself saith in the book of Psalms, The

¹ Higginson's Ecce Messias, p. 30.
² Chandler's Defence, p. 214; Leathes' Witness of Old Testament
to Christ, p. 116.
Lord said unto my Lord, Sit Thou on my right hand, till I make Thine enemies Thy footstool’ (Luke xx. 41–43). It is also asserted by the Rabbis to be Messianic. Thus in the Talmud it is said: 'God placed King Messiah at His right hand, according to Ps. cx. 2, and Abraham at His left.'

Thus, then, according to the Jews themselves, the Messianic element pervades the Book of Psalms. The writers foresaw in spirit the advent of the Messiah, of that great ideal King who was to be descended from David, and to sit upon His throne.

SUPPLEMENT III.

QUOTATIONS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT.

It has been objected by Collins and others, that the quotations made by the sacred writers from the Old Testament are often misapplied, and have no reference, either direct or indirect, to the Messiah. Now it is admitted that there are four or five quotations which do not clearly appear to be prophecies at all. In these instances, it has

1 For Talmudic references to this Psalm, see Perowne On the Psalms, vol. ii. pp. 297–299.
been supposed that there is merely an accommodation of words, just as we employ some phrase, or maxim, or appropriate words to illustrate the subject we have on hand. Great caution, however, must be exercised in applying this solution, as the prophetic element may be present in a quotation without our discerning it. 'We should,' observes Dr. Pye Smith, 'be slow and cautious to admit this solution, and well consider the probability that, in such cases, there may be a ground of appropriation, the want of observing which is owing to our ignorance of some circumstance connected with the original intent of the passage; and the more we study the Old Testament and compare it with the New, the more we discover the system of designed predisposal and correspondence running through the whole: and which forms organic ligaments between the two, often in minute circumstances.'

The two most remarkable instances of such quotations are both found in the Second chapter of the Gospel of St. Matthew—the one having reference to our Lord's flight to Egypt; the other, to the massacre of the infants at Bethlehem.

In relating the flight to Egypt, the Evangelist adds that this was done, 'that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Out of Egypt have I called my Son'

1 Testimony to the Messiah, vol. i. p. 145.
(Matt. ii. 15). These words are found in the prophecy of Hosea, and it was doubtless from that prophecy that the quotation was made: 'When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt' (Hos. xi. 1). It is admitted that in these words of the prophet there is no prediction, but the assertion of a historical fact. Some suppose that the phrase, 'being called out of Egypt,' became a proverbial expression for any deliverance from impending danger; and that Matthew uses it here with great propriety, as it was actually to Egypt that our Lord fled, and from it that He was afterwards divinely called. Others, again, explain the quotation on the principle of the typology of Scripture; and think that what happened to Israel, the type, occurred also in the person of the Antitype. The Scripture was fulfilled prophetically, because the circumstance recorded was typical.1

The prophetic element in the other quotation is still more difficult to be discerned. In relating the slaughter of the infants of Bethlehem, the Evangelist says: 'Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying, In Rama was there a voice heard, lamentation, and weeping, and great mourning, Rachel weeping for her children, and would not be comforted, because they are not' (Matt. ii. 17, 18). The passage

1 See Fairbairn's Typology of Scripture, vol. i. p. 104.
referred to in Jeremiah is as follows: 'Thus saith the Lord; A voice was heard in Rama, lamentation, and bitter weeping; Rachel weeping for her children, refused to be comforted for her children, because they were not' (Jer. xxxi. 15). It is difficult to see how these words of Jeremiah can, in any sense, be a prediction of the massacre of the infants at Bethlehem by Herod. Rama is a different city from Bethlehem; it is situated in the tribe of Benjamin, and is as far to the north of Jerusalem as Bethlehem is to the south. The reference in Jeremiah is to the slaughter of the principal Jews in Rama by Nebuchadnezzar; and also to the fact that here the Jews were collected who were to be led captive to Babylon. Rachel, the mother of Benjamin, is personified as lamenting the fate of her children. So that it would seem that nothing more is meant by the expression, 'Then was fulfilled,' than that the Evangelist employs the words, by which the prophet describes the ruin and devastation of his country by the Babylonians, to illustrate the slaughter of the children at Bethlehem. The sorrow felt in the one case is used to represent the sorrow felt in the other.

One or two quotations, the suitableness of which is not to us apparent, are not sufficient to counterbalance those many quotations which are at once obvious and applicable. The question under dis-
cussion is not whether all the quotations made by the sacred writers from the Old Testament are suitable or unsuitable, applicable or inapplicable, but whether there is a sufficient number of real Messianic prophecies to prove that the Messiah was foretold, and whether there are corresponding particulars in the life and character of Jesus to justify the sacred writers and us, in applying these prophecies to Him. The obscurity of some of the prophecies, the secondary nature of others, and the apparent inconclusiveness or even misapplication of some of the quotations, although they may weaken the force of the argument in these particular predictions, yet do not affect those prophecies which are primary and evident, or those quotations which are pertinent and applicable.
LECTURE V.

PROOF OF THE MESSIAHSHIP OF JESUS.

In applying the argument from prophecy to the proof of the Messiahship of Jesus, there are two propositions to be established,—the first, that there are in the Old Testament prophecies concerning the Messiah; the second, that there is a correspondence between these prophecies and the life of Jesus,—and from these two propositions the conclusion is drawn, that 'Jesus was the Christ,' or the Messiah. This is precisely the method which St. Paul adopted in his reasoning with the Jews in the synagogue of Thessalonica: he first proved from the Scriptures that the Messiah 'must needs have suffered and risen again from the dead;' and, secondly, he inferred, from the occurrence of these events in the history of Jesus, 'that this Jesus whom he preached is the Messiah' (Acts xvii. 2, 3).

In our two last lectures we considered the first of these propositions. We proved that there are undoubtedly Messianic prophecies in the Old Testament: some of them of such a primary
nature that, in their strict and literal sense, they relate to the Messiah, and do not apply to any other person or event; and others, though of a secondary nature, yet so decidedly Messianic that they can only apply to some other person or event in Jewish history in a very subordinate sense, and can only receive their full accomplishment in the Messiah. We now proceed in this lecture to compare these prophecies with the facts of the life of Jesus as recorded by the evangelists, and shall thus consider the second of these propositions—

the fulfilment of the Messianic prophecies in the person of Jesus of Nazareth.

The question, then, to be discussed in this lecture is: Whether there be a sufficient correspondence between the Messianic prophecies and the life of Jesus to prove that he was the Deliverer foretold in the Old Testament? In order that our argument may be free from all objections, we restrict ourselves in our proof to those prophecies which in our opinion are either primary, or, if of a secondary nature, are so decidedly Messianic as to be admitted by the ancient Jews to apply to the Messiah. Several of these prophecies, both of a primary and secondary nature, we have already enumerated in our two last lectures, and on these chiefly we base our argument. There are several secondary Messianic prophecies which we do not, in the first instance, employ; because their
character as Messianic prophecies must first be established, and this, with regard to many of them, depends chiefly on the authority of our Lord and His apostles; and, therefore, to employ them in an argument designed to prove our Lord's authority as the Messiah, would be to reason in a circle. For a somewhat similar reason, we also omit, for the present, all those prophecies, though of a primary nature, which relate to the miraculous works and the resurrection of the Messiah. We wish to consider prophecy as an independent evidence of the divine mission of our Lord; and, for this reason, we do not assume the reality of His miracles, and do not argue from them. Miracles constitute one evidence in favour of Christianity, and prophecy another; each rests on its own foundation: the one chiefly on testimony, and the other on the accomplishment of the prophecies; and although they mutually support each other, yet each is independent and distinct, and both combined afford the most undoubted proof that Christianity is from God.

The Messianic prophecies extend over a thousand years. They are interspersed throughout all the books of the Old Testament. They are found in the books of Moses, the oldest writer, and in the prophecy of Malachi, the last of the prophets. They are numerous; if all were to be collected from the sacred writings, and if the secondary and
typical prophecies were to be included, it would be found to be no exaggeration to affirm that the Old Testament was pervaded with the Messianic idea. They are varied; they relate to minute particulars as well as to great events; some of them are seemingly contradictory; some represent the Messiah as a mighty king, and others speak of Him as a man of sorrows. They differ widely in clearness; some are primary, direct, and unmistakeable, and others are secondary, obscure, and hardly discernible. But all these prophecies, when examined, will be found to have received their fulfilment in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, and not one will be discovered that is inconsistent with the history of His life.

But let us now proceed to an actual comparison between the prophecies of the Old Testament concerning the Messiah and the events recorded in the life of Jesus.

I. *The Family from which the Messiah was to arise.*

There is in the Old Testament a gradual limitation in the description of the family from which the Messiah should arise. At first, the prophecy is general, so that the whole human race is included; but afterwards it is limited more and more, until it rests with a single family of the Jews. The first
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prophecy which occurs in Scripture, is likewise the first promise. It is contained in part of the sentence pronounced on the serpent: 'I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel' (Gen. iii. 15). Taken by itself, apart from other predictions, this prophecy is vague and obscure: it is impossible to tell whether the seed of the woman denotes an individual, or the human race in general; but the prediction denotes this at least, that the victory which the serpent had obtained over our first parents was not final, but that in the end the human race would come off victorious. This promised seed of the woman is afterwards alluded to in various prophecies. It is first expressly limited to the family of Abraham (Gen. xxii. 18). The promise is then renewed to Isaac, one of the sons of Abraham (Gen. xxvi. 4), and to Jacob, one of the sons of Isaac (Gen. xxviii. 14). Still there is an indefiniteness and a generality about the prediction. It is rendered more particular and definite in the blessing pronounced by Jacob on Judah, one of his twelve sons: 'The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be' (Gen. xlix. 10). The promised seed of the woman is now restricted to one person,

1 See Supplement IV. to Lecture I.
to Shiloh or the Peace-maker, belonging to a particular tribe of Israel, namely Judah. The promise is still further limited, until it is concentrated in the regal line of David, of the tribe of Judah. There are several primary prophecies which predict this. 'There shall,' says Isaiah, 'come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots: and the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon Him' (Isa. xi. 1, 2). And the same prediction is contained in the prophecies of Jeremiah: 'Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice on the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is his name whereby he shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness' (Jer. xxiii. 5, 6). And it is to be observed that the Jews uniformly believe that their Messiah shall belong to the house of David. 'The Son of David' is one of the most common of the Messianic titles. Hence, when the Lord asked the Pharisees, 'What think ye of the Messiah? whose Son is He?' they were ready with their reply, 'The Son of David' (Matt. xxii. 42).

Now, this class of predictions was fulfilled in the person of Jesus. It is admitted by all that He was a Jew by birth, and thus belonged to the tribe of Judah. 'It is evident,' says the author of the
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Epistle to the Hebrews, 'that our Lord sprang out of Judah' (Heb. vii. 14). And we are expressly informed in the Gospels that He was descended from David. Two of the Evangelists, most probably from public records, trace back His descent to David; and although there are undoubtedly difficulties connected with these genealogies, yet both coincide in the fact of His Davidic descent. Matthew begins his Gospel with these words: 'The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham' (Matt. i. 1). And St. Paul states it as an acknowledged fact that Jesus Christ was of the seed of David (Rom. i. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 8). Hence, then, the prophecies were fulfilled in respect of the family from which the Messiah was to arise. And it is further to be observed, that if these prophecies are not already fulfilled in the person of Jesus, they never can be fulfilled; for all distinctions of families among the Jews were lost, and all public documents destroyed, at the destruction of Jerusalem.

II. The Time of the Appearance of the Messiah.

It may be said that the prediction regarding the family may apply to any other illustrious person

1 This is not the place for discussing the difficulties connected with the genealogies. We rest the Davidic descent of Jesus more on the statement of St. Paul than on the genealogies of Matthew and Luke.
of the house of David. But not to mention that from the time of Jeremiah, with the exception of Zerubbabel, no illustrious person descended from David has appeared, the time marked out for the appearance of the Messiah is sufficiently definite to enable us to restrict the prophecy to the Lord Jesus. The time is limited by the prophets to a very short period, as may be seen from the following predictions. In the prophecy of Jacob, already frequently adverted to, it was foretold that the Messiah would appear before Judah ceased to be a tribe and to have governors of its own (Gen. xlix. 10). Now this did not happen until the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans; for before that event the Jews, though subject to the Romans, had rulers of their own; but after that event, they ceased to be a nation. The same time is specified in other prophecies, wherein it is predicted that the Messiah would appear whilst the second temple was still in existence. 'The Lord, whom ye seek,' says Malachi, 'shall suddenly come to His temple, even the Messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, He shall come, saith the Lord of hosts' (Mal. iii. 1). On the other hand, it was foretold that the Messiah would not appear until after the fourth prophetical kingdom had obtained the mastery of the world. Thus Daniel says: 'In the days of these kings' (that is, of the fourth kingdom) 'shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never
be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever' (Dan. ii. 44). It is evident that the allusion here is to the kingdom of the Messiah. The four prophetical kingdoms are almost universally admitted to correspond in their descriptions with the Babylonian, Persian, Macedonian, and Roman Empires.¹ Now it has been observed, that the Roman Empire was not universally established until after the battle of Actium, when Egypt, the last of the branches of the Macedonian Empire, was subjugated. And probably, as an inference from this prediction of Daniel, there is the following singular statement or prediction in the third book of the Sibylline oracles, supposed to be written about the very time of the conquest of Egypt: ‘When Rome shall rule Egypt, then shall appear the great kingdom of the immortal King.’² Thus, then, there are two limits marked out by prophecy—the establishment of the Roman Empire, and the destruction of Jerusalem: the Messiah was to be born after the first event, but before the second. Now the battle of Actium was fought about thirty years before the Christian era,

¹ Rationalistic critics suppose that by them are meant the Babylonian, the Medean, the Persian, and the Macedonian Empires; but there was no distinct empire of the Medes after the Babylonian. Ewald and Bunsen with still greater improbability suppose that the four empires are the Ninevite, Babylonian, Persian, and Macedonian.
² Drummond's *Jewish Messiah*, p. 276.
and the destruction of Jerusalem occurred seventy years after; so that there is only the space of a century within which the Messiah was to appear.¹

But the most remarkable prophecy concerning the time of the appearance of the Messiah, is that of Daniel's seventy weeks, referred to in a former lecture, but on which it is requisite to dwell for a little: 'Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy. Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times. And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for Himself: and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined. And He shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week He shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations He shall make it
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desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate' (Dan. ix. 24–27).

Neither your time nor the nature of this lecture will permit me to enter upon any critical examination of this remarkable and undoubtedly in many respects obscure prophecy. It is to be observed that the time of the Messiah's advent appears here to be specified. It was to occur a certain number of weeks after a certain event, namely, 'the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem.' It is in general admitted that the weeks are to be understood, according to the prophetical mode of computation, as weeks of years (Ezek. iv. 6). There is a wonderful agreement on this point among almost all biblical scholars. Jewish Rabbis as well as Christian commentators, those who give to the passage an anti-Messianic interpretation as well as those who regard it as Messianic, agree in considering the weeks as weeks of years, and hence in asserting that by the seventy weeks in the prediction are meant four hundred and ninety years. Thus, Dr. Adler writes: 'The angel tells Daniel that by these seventy years mentioned in Jeremiah's prophecy, ordinary years were not to be understood, but years of release, or weeks of years, that is, periods of seven years each.'

1 Adler's Course of Sermons, p. 106.
translated *weeks* denotes merely 'periods of sevens,' without reference to their nature, whether they are days, weeks, months, years, or millenniums; the duration of the period must be decided from the context. So that the translation 'seventy weeks' is more definite than the original warrants. Now, from the context it is evident that the term cannot be understood as weeks of natural days, because the seventy days would be only a year and a half, a period far too short for the accomplishment of all the particulars mentioned in the prophecy. Jerusalem was not only to be restored and built, but to be destroyed, and the sacrificial worship of the Jews was to cease. On the other hand, it is evident also from the context, that the reference is to the prophecy of Jeremiah concerning the seventy years that should elapse between the Babylonish captivity and the restoration of the Jews to their city and nation (Dan. ix. 2): the seventy septenary periods of Daniel answer to the seventy years of Jeremiah; and hence it is inferred that the septenary periods here mentioned are not periods of seven days, but of seven years. According to this calculation, the seventy weeks of Daniel amount to 490 years. These weeks or septenary periods are again subdivided into three parts—seven weeks, threescore and two weeks, and one week \((7 + 62 + 1)\); and events are stated as happening at the end of each. After seven
weeks, Jerusalem was to be rebuilt; after threescore and two weeks, Messiah was to be cut off; and during one week, the covenant was to be confirmed with many. Each of these periods is to be considered as consecutive,—the one following the other, and each is calculated from the close of the preceding; this is necessary to make up the whole number of the seventy weeks. From this it follows that sixty-nine septenary periods—that is, considering the sevens to be not weeks of days, but weeks of years, 483 years—were to elapse between the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem and the coming of the Messiah. Now we learn that such a commandment was given in the twentieth year of the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus to Nehemiah (Neh. ii.), which, according to the most approved chronology, occurred B.C. 454. Adding to this the thirty years which elapsed before Jesus commenced His public ministry \((454 + 30 = 484)\), then the period of our Lord's appearance will, as nearly as possible, coincide with the prophetical weeks of Daniel.¹

We are the more confirmed in the correctness of this calculation by the knowledge of the remarkable fact, that about the time when our Lord was upon the earth, there was a general expectation of the advent of the Messiah not only among the Jews, but throughout the East, as we learn from

¹ Supplement I.
the writings of Virgil, Tacitus, Suetonius, and the Sibylline oracles.\(^1\) We cannot account for such an expectation, except on the supposition that, according to the most approved calculation, the weeks of Daniel were then approaching their termination. Josephus observes that Daniel, whom he calls one of the greatest of the prophets, ‘did not only prophesy of future events, as did other prophets, but he also determined the time of their accomplishment.’\(^2\) In the Talmud we are informed that ‘in Daniel is delivered to us the end of the Messiah;’ that is, as Rabbi Jarchi explains it, ‘the time of His appearance.’ There is also in the Talmud the statement, that about the time of Titus the Messiah was considered as having already come, although concealed until the Jews were rendered more worthy for his appearance.\(^3\) And Rabbi Nehumias, said to have lived about fifty years before our Lord, is cited by Grotius as affirming that the time fixed by Daniel for the Messiah could not go beyond fifty years.\(^4\)

Now this class of prophecy, relating to the time

\(^1\) See on this, Supplement II. to Lecture III.

\(^2\) Joseph. Ant. x. II. 7.

\(^3\) Referred to in Anger’s Geschichte der Messianischen Idee, p. 86.

\(^4\) Grotius, De Veritate Religionis Christianae, v. 14: ‘In Jesum autem tam bene convenit, ut magister Hebraeus Nehumias, qui annis quinquaginta eum praecessit, aperte jam tum dixerit, non posse ultra eos quinquaginta annos protrahi tempus Messiae a Daniele significatum.’ For talmudic references to the time of the birth of the Messiah, see M‘Caul’s Old Paths, pp. 387–398.
of the Messiah's advent, does also undoubtedly apply to the Lord Jesus. He appeared after the Romans had conquered Egypt, and so obtained the mastery of the world, and before the destruction of Jerusalem, whilst the Jewish nation had rulers of their own, and when the second temple was still standing. He also came, as near as can be calculated, towards the close of Daniel's prophetical weeks. Thus, then, our Lord lived at the time when it was predicted by the prophets that the Messiah should appear. It is also to be observed, that this predicted period of the Messiah's advent has long passed away; Judah has for ages ceased to be a nation: the temple of Jerusalem has been so completely destroyed that not one stone has been left upon another; the Roman Empire has crumbled into pieces; and the seventy weeks of Daniel have long since been completed. If the Messiah was to come, He has already come; and although the Jews still expect a Messiah, yet, in cherishing such an expectation, they do so in direct contradiction to the prophecies contained in their sacred books.

III. The Place where the Messiah was to be born.

'Time and place,' observes Dr. Hill, 'are two circumstances which every false prophet is careful
to avoid, or at least to express in ambiguous terms, but which were precisely marked and literally accomplished with regard to the Messiah.'

The time predicted, we have found, corresponds with our Lord's appearance; and so also, we shall find, does the place. This place is clearly stated by the prophet Micah, in a remarkable prophecy adverted to in a former lecture: 'Thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall He come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting' (Micah v. 2). This prophecy has been generally acknowledged by the Jews to signify that the Messiah should be born in Bethlehem. The Jews, in the time of our Lord, so understood it. This is evident from the reply to Herod, when he demanded of them where the Messiah should be born: 'They said unto him, In Bethlehem of Judea' (Matt. ii. 5). And so also the supposition that Jesus was born in Galilee, His usual place of residence, was urged as an objection to His Messianic claims. 'Shall the Messiah come out of Galilee? Hath not the Scripture said, That the Messiah cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem, where David was?' (John vii. 41, 42).

Now this prediction was fulfilled in the birth of

1 Hill's *Lectures in Divinity*, vol. i. p. 158.
our Lord. Two of the Evangelists inform us that He was born in Bethlehem. 'Jesus,' writes St. Matthew, 'was born in Bethlehem of Judea in the days of Herod the king' (Matt. ii. 1). The occasion of His birth in Bethlehem was remarkable. The residence of Mary, His mother, was Nazareth in Galilee, not Bethlehem; so that, had nothing unusual occurred, He would have been born in Nazareth. But the Emperor Augustus had issued an order that all the inhabitants of Herod's kingdom should be enrolled; and this was done, according to the Jewish custom, by each repairing to the city to which his family originally belonged. Accordingly we are informed by St. Luke, that in consequence of this decree, 'Joseph went up from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth, into Judea, unto the city of David, which is called Bethlehem, because he was of the house and lineage of David' (Luke ii. 4). Mary, his espoused wife, accompanied him, and it was then that Jesus was born. Thus this prophecy was remarkably fulfilled: the hand of Providence in bringing it about is clearly discernible; so that, in consequence of a series of unforeseen events, it happened that our Lord was born in Bethlehem, the very place foretold by the prophet, seven hundred years before, as the birthplace of the Messiah.
IV. The Life and Character of the Messiah.

The predictions concerning the Messiah's life and character are very numerous and varied; we can only make a selection. It was foretold that the Messiah should have, as a forerunner, an illustrious prophet, coming in the spirit of Elijah. 'The voice of him,' says Isaiah, 'that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God' (Isa. xl. 3). And the prophecy of Malachi is still more definite: 'Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me' (Mal. iii. 1); 'Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord' (Mal. iv. 5). It was foretold that the Messiah Himself should be an illustrious prophet, that He should be the author of a new and better dispensation of religion, that He should be a preacher of righteousness, and that His doctrines should not be confined to the Jews, but extend to the Gentiles. 'The Lord thy God,' says Moses, 'will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto Him ye shall hearken' (Deut. xviii. 15). 'Behold,' says Isaiah, 'my Servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my Spirit upon Him: He shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles, and
the isles shall wait for His law' (Isa. xlii. 1, 4). And again: 'The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; He hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound' (Isa. lxi. 1). It was foretold that the Messiah, although He should be born in Bethlehem, yet would reside chiefly in Galilee: 'Nevertheless the dimness shall not be such as was in her vexation, when at the first He lightly afflicted the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, and afterward did more grievously afflict her by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, in Galilee of the nations. The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light: they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined' (Isa. ix. 1, 2). It was foretold that the Messiah should live an afflicted life, and that He should be rejected by the generality of His countrymen: 'He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief: and we hid as it were our faces from him; He was despised, and we esteemed Him not' (Isa. liii. 3). It was foretold that, nevertheless, He should enter Jerusalem in lowly triumph: 'Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy King cometh unto thee: He is just, and having salvation;
lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass' (Zech. ix. 9).

Now all these prophecies were fulfilled in the life and character of the Lord Jesus. John the Baptist appeared, and announced himself to be the forerunner of the Messiah, as 'the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord' (John i. 23). Our Lord was a Prophet like unto Moses: like him, He was a lawgiver, the author of a new dispensation of religion, and a mediator between God and man. He was Himself a great preacher: He preached the gospel to the poor, and commanded His disciples to preach His religion to the Gentiles as well as to the Jews: 'Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature' (Mark xvi. 15). The sphere of His ministry was chiefly confined to Galilee; He left Nazareth and dwelt in Capernaum, which is upon the sea coast, on the borders of Zabulon and Naphthali, and hence His disciples were at first called Galileans. He lived a life of persecution, poverty, and sorrow; He was rejected by the generality of His countrymen: 'He came unto His own, and His own received Him not' (John i. 11). And a few days before His death, He entered Jerusalem in lowly triumph. Thus, then, the prophecies which described the life and character of the Messiah were fulfilled in the Lord Jesus.
V. The Sufferings, Death, and Burial of the Messiah.

Now it is admitted that the predictions of the sufferings of the Messiah are not so numerous as those which proclaim His kingdom and glory. Still there are some remarkable and explicit predictions. The Twenty-second Psalm and the Fifty-third chapter of Isaiah must ever be regarded as the most explicit of the Messianic prophecies: here a suffering Messiah, rather than a Messianic King, is portrayed, although, according to both predictions, the sufferer passes from extreme anguish to glory. And so also in the prophecies of Zechariah there are some remarkable predictions of a suffering Messiah. Thus it was foretold that the Messiah should be sold and valued at thirty pieces of silver—the price of a slave: 'If ye think good, give me my price; and if not, forbear. So they weighed for my price thirty pieces of silver. And the Lord said unto me, Cast it unto the potter: a goodly price that I was prized at of them' (Zech. xi. 12, 13). It was foretold that the Messiah, though innocent, should be dealt with as guilty and treated as a criminal: 'He was numbered with the transgressors; and He bare the sin of many' (Isa. liii. 12). It was foretold that the Messiah should be derided and upbraided with
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His confidence in God: 'All they that see me laugh me to scorn: they shoot out the lip, they shake the head, saying, He trusted on the Lord that He would deliver Him: let Him deliver Him, seeing He delighted in Him' (Ps. xxii. 7, 8). It was foretold that the Messiah should be wounded and pierced: 'He was wounded for our transgressions' (Isa. liii. 5); 'They shall look upon me whom they have pierced' (Zech. xii. 10). It was foretold that the hands and feet of the Messiah should be bored, and His garments divided among His enemies: 'They pierced my hands and my feet. I may tell all my bones: they look and stare upon me. They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture' (Ps. xxii. 16–18). It was foretold that the Messiah should at length be put to death: 'He was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people was He stricken. He hath poured out His soul unto death' (Isa. liii. 8, 12). And it was foretold that although He should suffer the death of a malefactor, yet He should be buried in a rich man's grave: 'He made His grave with the wicked, and with the rich in His death' (Isa. liii. 9); or, as Bishop Lowth renders the passage: 'And His grave was appointed with the wicked: but with the rich man was His tomb.'

Now it is clear from the narratives of the Evangelists that these predictions were minutely fulfilled.
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in the person of the Lord Jesus. He was betrayed by Judas Iscariot, and sold by him for thirty pieces of silver, the price at which the priests and Pharisees had valued Him. He was treated as a criminal, being condemned by the Sanhedrim on the charge of blasphemy, and by Pilate on the charge of sedition. He was wounded and pierced; His hands and feet were nailed to the cross, and His side was pierced with a spear. His enemies parted His garments among them, and cast lots for His vesture; and the very words of the Psalmist were employed by them when they derided Him on the cross. He was put to an ignominious death, being crucified between two thieves. But although He died a malefactor's death, yet He was buried in a rich man's tomb; for Joseph, who, we are informed, was a rich man of Arimathea, and a member of the Sanhedrim, obtained on application the body of Jesus, and buried Him in his own sepulchre. Thus, then, the prophecies which described the sufferings, death, and burial of the Messiah were fulfilled in the Lord Jesus.

VI. The Success of the Religion of the Messiah.

The prophets not only predicted the sufferings of the Messiah, but still more fully the glory that should follow these sufferings: the establishment
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and the success of the Messianic kingdom. The Messiah was foretold as the Author of a better and more glorious dispensation of religion than that of Moses. A new covenant was to be entered into with the house of Israel, and all nations were to be admitted to share in its blessings. The Gentiles were to be received into the number of God's people, and the religion of the Messiah was to become the religion of the world. 'In that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek' (Isa. xi. 10). 'The Gentiles shall come to Thy light, and kings to the brightness of Thy rising' (Isa. lx. 3). It was foretold that the kingdom of the Messiah would embrace all nations, and all men would do homage to Him as the great Anointed King. 'Ask of me, and I will give Thee the heathen for Thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for Thy possession' (Ps. ii. 8). 'He shall have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth. All kings shall fall down before Him, and all nations shall serve Him' (Ps. lxxii. 8, 11). Daniel, in an evident prediction of the Messiah, says: 'I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought Him near before Him. And there was given Him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all
people, nations, and languages should serve Him: His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and His kingdom that which shall not be destroyed' (Dan. vii. 13, 14). And the same success of the religion of the Messiah is foretold by the contemporary prophets Isaiah and Micah in terms almost precisely similar: 'In the last days it shall come to pass, that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established in the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it' (Isa. ii. 2; Micah iv. 1).

Now this class of predictions also finds its realization and fulfilment only in the Lord Jesus. He is the Founder of a better and more glorious dispensation of religion than Judaism. It is not, like the religion of Moses, confined to one particular nation, but designed to embrace the world. And the history of the early Church is just the history of the rapid diffusion of Christianity. Within a few years after the death of its Founder, it was propagated over the whole Roman Empire, and penetrated into countries which the Roman legions never visited; persecutions availed not to stop its progress, and it is now professed by the most enlightened and civilized nations of the world. It is true that the complete fulfilment is yet future: the greater part of this world is still unchristianized; but there are tendencies at work
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which point to Christianity being the destined religion of the world, and certainly enough has already been accomplished to prove that the above prophecies evidently point to Jesus of Nazareth as the great Messianic King.

We have compared the prophecies regarding the family, the time of appearance, the birth-place, the life and character, the sufferings, death, and burial, and the success of the religion of the Messiah, with the facts recorded in the Gospels of the life of Jesus, and we have found an exact correspondence between them; so that we can have no dubiety in drawing the conclusion that 'Jesus is the Christ.'

As has been well observed, 'the fact of a complicated lock being opened by a key, shows that the lock and key were meant for each other.'

In order to perceive the full force of the argument, we must take a conjunct view of the whole. Not one, but numerous prophecies were fulfilled in Jesus—prophecies all of them uttered hundreds of years before Jesus was born—prophecies varied and complicated—prophecies referring to time and place, and to many minute events in history—all of them point to Jesus, and receive their fulfilment in Him. He was born of the same family and in the same place which the prophets foretold of the birth of the Messiah; He was in the world at the time when the Messiah was to appear; His character and life bore a minute resemblance to the
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character and life of the Messiah; He suffered all those indignities which the Messiah was to suffer; He was wounded, He was pierced, He was killed, He was buried, as it was foretold that the Messiah should be wounded, pierced, killed, and buried; and His religion was received by the Gentiles, as it was foretold of the religion of the Messiah. So many prophecies fulfilled, and not a single one disproved, clearly demonstrate that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah predicted by the prophets. It matters not whether some of the prophecies are secondary; it matters not whether some of them are obscure and their application doubtful; it is the whole combination of prophecies which must be disproved; it is the entire Messianic spirit of the Old Testament which must be denied; it is the evidence not of one, but the united testimony of a hundred witnesses which must be refuted.¹

SUPPLEMENT I.

DANIEL'S SEVENTY WEEKS (DAN. IX. 24–27).

This passage has given rise to more discussion than any other Messianic prediction. The meanings assigned to it are nearly as various as the

¹ Supplement II.
interpreters of it are numerous. Christian commentators of all shades of opinion, as well as numerous Jewish writers, have expended on it a vast amount of learning and ingenuity. And it must be admitted that there is hardly any other Messianic prediction involved in so much obscurity. There are many particulars contained in it which have given rise to a great variety of opinion. What is the nature of the weeks? Are they weeks of days or weeks of years? What is the reason of their subdivision into three parts? Are the parts consecutive, or are they to be calculated from the same point of commencement? What is the special commandment, 'to restore and build Jerusalem,' from which the seventy weeks are to be calculated? Is it the decree of Cyrus, or of Darius, or of Artaxerxes to Ezra, or of Artaxerxes to Nehemiah? Or is it the 'word of the Lord to Jeremiah,' in his prophecy of the seventy years of the captivity? Are there two Messiahs—the Messiah and the Prince, and the Messiah who shall be cut off—or are these one and the same? Who is the Prince that shall come to destroy Jerusalem? These are questions which have been very differently answered by biblical scholars. No doubt a large portion of this obscurity arises from the want of historical data. Our information concerning the restoration of Jerusalem is small, and the chronology of the Persian Empire somewhat confused. Could we
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certainly fix the date of a commandment to restore
and build Jerusalem, we would be better able to
calculate the seventy weeks; but so long as there
is a difference of opinion about this commandment,
there must also be a corresponding difference in
the calculation. Besides, the passage is extremely
difficult to translate: the construction is intricate,
and the meaning of several of the words doubtful;
so that eminent Hebrew scholars have given a
different sense to several of the phrases; and if
there be a dubiety in the translation, there must
also be a dubiety in the interpretation. But even
had we accurate historical data, and could arrive
at a true translation of the passage, all obscurity
would not be removed; the questions concerning
the nature of the weeks and the reason of their
subdivision would still remain to be answered.

The translation of the passage is difficult; but
the following is as accurate and literal a translation
as I can give:—

24. Seventy septonaries are decreed upon thy
people and upon thy holy city, to finish the
transgression, and to seal up sins, and to make
atonement for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting
righteousness, and to seal the vision and the pro-
phet, and to anoint a holy of holies. 25. Know
therefore and understand, that from the going
forth of the word to restore and to build Jerusalem
unto Messiah a Prince shall be seven septonaries,
and sixty and two septenaries; and the street shall be restored and built, and the trench, even in troublous times. 26. And after sixty and two septenaries Messiah shall be cut off, and the people shall not be to Him; and the people of the Prince, the coming One, shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be in a flood, and until the end of the war desolations are determined. 27. And He shall confirm the covenant with many for one septenary: and in the half of the septenary He shall cause the sacrifice and the offering to cease, and on the summit (wing) of abomination shall be the destroyer, even unto the completion, and that decreed shall be poured upon the destroyer.

The Septuagint affords no assistance in the translation of the passage. Its version of the Book of Daniel was so corrupt and faulty, that at an early period, so far back as the time of Jerome, it was superseded, and the version of Theodotion was substituted in its place. This version differs from the Hebrew in several particulars, but these are not of much consequence, and do not throw much light upon the passage. The principal variations will be noticed as we proceed with the exposition.

Ver. 24. Here a great difficulty meets us at the outset. What is the nature of the weeks here

1The true Septuagint translation of Daniel was supposed to be lost, but was discovered at Rome, and published in 1772.
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mentioned? We have in the lecture assigned reasons why these weeks should be considered not as weeks of days, but as weeks of years; and hence in our translation we have substituted the word *septenaries* for weeks. The word שֵׁנִים is the plural of שָׁנִים. It does not necessarily signify *weeks of days*, but may denote *periods of sevens*. To denote *weeks of days*, שָׁנִים is sometimes added in apposition (Dan. x. 2). The special nature of the septenary periods is to be determined from the context. Now the context favours the idea of year-weeks. The reference is undoubtedly to Jeremiah's seventy years, previously alluded to in this prophecy (Dan. ix. 2); and hence, when it is said that seventy septenary periods are determined 'on Thy people and on Thy holy city,' it is natural to suppose that septenary periods of years are intended. Besides, as remarked in the lecture, if the term is to be understood of natural weeks, it would be far too short a period for the accomplishment of all the particulars mentioned in the prophecy.

Six particulars are mentioned as occurring during or at the termination of these seventy weeks or septenaries. 'Seventy septenaries are decreed upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to seal up sins, and to make atonement for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal the vision and the prophet, and to anoint a holy of holies.'
Of these only the last particular requires comment. In our version it is, 'to anoint the Most Holy;' but literally translated it is, 'to anoint a holy of holies.' Those who give the prediction an anti-Messianic interpretation, suppose that by 'a holy of holies' is to be understood the temple or the altar; and accordingly some refer it to the dedication of the temple in the time of Zerubbabel, and others to the consecration of the altar of burnt-offerings by Judas Maccabeus, after its desecration by Antiochus Epiphanes. It is, however, to be observed that when the words are applied to 'the holy of holies' in the temple, they are always—both in the Hebrew and in the Greek version—accompanied with the article; nor is there any mention of an anointing either of the temple in the time of Zerubbabel, or of the altar in the time of Judas Maccabeus. On the other hand, the words naturally admit of a Messianic interpretation. The five previous particulars are all of a Messianic character, and therefore so must be the sixth. The phrase 'a holy of holies,' though usually applied to things, admits of a personal application, as it is applied to Aaron and his sons (1 Chron. xxiii. 13). And so also our Lord Himself is called τὸ ἅγιον, the holy thing (Luke i. 35). Hence, then,

1 In our version it is rendered: 'And Aaron was separated, that he should sanctify the most holy things;' but the correct translation is: 'And Aaron was separated to sanctify him as a holy of holies,' ἀφῆται καθά τὸν ἅγιον τῶν αἵματος.
we consider that our version, when it renders the words by ‘the Most Holy,’ gives the true import of the phrase, though not the literal translation. And this is also the meaning assigned to it in the various versions: the personal sense is there maintained. The Septuagint has εὑρεθήσεται ἁγιὸν ἅγιον, which can only apply to a person. The version of Theodotion has ἁγιὸς ἅγιον ἅγιον, which, though an exact rendering of the Hebrew, was understood by the Fathers to refer to the Person of the Messiah. The Syriac version directly refers it to the Messiah: till the Messiah, the Most Holy; and the Vulgate has Sanctus sanctorum.

Ver. 25. A difference in the punctuation of this verse gives rise to a difference in its interpretation. In the Masoretic punctuation, an athnach, which is in general equivalent to our colon, is placed after ‘seven weeks;’ and accordingly the Jews read the passage as follows: ‘Know therefore and understand that from the going forth of the word to restore and build Jerusalem unto Messiah a Prince shall be seven septenaries; and during sixty and two septenaries, the street shall be restored and built, and the trench, even in troublous times.’ This reading and punctuation have been adopted by those who assign to the passage an anti-Messianic interpretation. It must also be admitted that this rendering gives a clearer meaning to the subdivision of the weeks than our translation; the seven
weeks extend to Messiah the Prince, and the sixty and two weeks are occupied in the restoration and building of Jerusalem. On the other hand, the authority of the Masoretic punctuation is not great; at the most, it gives only the opinion of those Jewish Rabbis who introduced such a punctuation into the sacred text; and, besides, the athnach is often employed by them when it has not the force of a colon. The context is against our adoption of such a punctuation. It assigns the long and incredible period of sixty-two weeks, that is, 434 years, to the building of Jerusalem; and in the following verse it is said that 'after sixty and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off,' so that it would assign the same extended period of 434 years to the life of the Messiah; unless, indeed, the difficulty be escaped by the assumption that two Messiahs are here intended—that Messiah the Prince in verse 25 is different from the Messiah who shall be cut off in verse 26.

We shall consider what commandment to restore and build Jerusalem is referred to, when we compare the Messianic and the anti-Messianic interpretations of the passage. This is evidently the period from which the seventy weeks are to be computed. These are in verse 25 subdivided into seven weeks and sixty-two weeks; and in verse 27 the last week is mentioned \((7 + 62 + 1)\). These periods are necessarily consecutive, in order to make
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up the whole number of seventy weeks. The seven weeks commenced at the beginning of the period 'from the going forth of the word to restore and to build Jerusalem;' the sixty-two weeks at the end of the seven weeks, and the one week at the end of the sixty-two weeks. Events are predicted as happening at the end of each of these periods. This is clearly stated regarding the last week (Dan. ix. 27), though not so clearly regarding the other two periods—the seven weeks and the sixty and two weeks; still, however, with sufficient clearness to assign the special events to each with some degree of certainty: 'Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the word to restore and to build Jerusalem unto Messiah a Prince shall be seven weeks and threescore and two weeks; the street shall be restored and built, and the trench, even in troublous times; and after threescore and two weeks Messiah shall be cut off.' Two periods are here given—seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks; and two events are stated as happening at these periods—the building of Jerusalem, and Messiah being cut off. Now we are told that the Messiah would be cut off after the threescore and two weeks; and it is therefore not unreasonable to suppose that the building of Jerusalem refers to the first period, the seven weeks. Thus, then, during seven weeks, that is, forty-nine years, Jerusalem was to be rebuilt; and after threescore
and two weeks, that is, 434 years, Messiah was to be cut off.

The last clause of the verse, rendered in our version, 'The street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times,' is difficult to translate. Hengstenberg renders it: 'Restored and built is the street, and firmly determined, but in narrow times.' Bleek gives the following translation: 'It (Jerusalem) shall be rebuilt with streets and ditches, but in troublous times.' The meaning, however, is not difficult. The reference is evidently to the commandment previously mentioned to restore and build Jerusalem; and the words assert that this restoration shall be carried on in troublous times.

Ver. 26. The first clause of this verse is, in our version, as follows: 'And after threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for Himself.' It is almost universally admitted that this translation is erroneous. The words יְהוָּ֣ה cannot be translated, 'but not for Himself.' The only meaning of which they are capable is: 'And it is not to Him;' or, 'And it shall not be to Him.' Almost all critics agree in this translation, yet various meanings have been attached to the words. There is evidently an ellipsis to be supplied, and this has been differently attempted. Bleek renders it, 'And He shall have no successor;' Hengstenberg, 'And there is no inheritance to Him;' Keil, 'He loses
His position as Messiah;' and Pusey, 'The city and the sanctuary shall be His no more.' The version of Theodotion translates the words, καὶ κρίμα σωτ ἐστιν ἐν αὐτῷ, 'And there is no judgment to Him.' Perhaps the most correct meaning is to supply the word people: 'Messiah shall be cut off, and the people shall not be to Him'—that is, the Jews shall reject Him, they shall renounce Him as their Messiah. 'He came unto His own,' says the Evangelist, 'and His own received Him not.' And this rejection culminated at the crucifixion, when the cry of the multitude was, 'Away with Him, away with Him! Crucify Him, crucify Him! We have no king but Cæsar!'

The last clause of the verse is extremely difficult to interpret. יspan means the people of the Prince. But who is meant by this has been much disputed. By the anti-Messianic interpreters it is supposed that the Prince here mentioned is Antiochus Epiphanes, who laid waste Jerusalem and desecrated the temple. By most Messianic interpreters it is thought that the reference is to the Jewish war, and that by the people are meant the Romans, and by the Prince, Titus. It would, however, seem more natural to understand by the Prince Him who was already mentioned, namely, Messiah the Prince; more especially as the phrase which follows in apposition, 'He that shall come,' or 'the coming One,' is one of the titles of the
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Messiah. 'Art Thou He that should come?' This, however, does not necessitate us to deny the application of the 'people of the Prince' to the Romans, who may well be called 'the people of the Messiah,' inasmuch as they were His instruments in the execution of His vengeance on the Jewish nation. The version of Theodotion read ὑ, with, instead of ὑ, people, the difference being in the pointing. It gives the following translation: 'And He,' that is, the Messiah, 'shall destroy the city and the sanctuary with the Prince that is coming.' The words that follow, 'and the end thereof,' have been variously interpreted. Some apply them to the end of the city and the sanctuary; others, to the end of the people of the Prince; and others, to the end of the whole series of events—'the end of the matter.'

Ver. 27. In this verse the particulars of the last or seventieth week are stated. There is a great variety of opinion regarding the person who shall confirm the covenant for one week. The anti-Messianic interpreters in general suppose that it is Antiochus Epiphanes who entered into league with the apostate or Hellenizing Jews, and whose persecution lasted for seven years. The Messianic interpreters suppose that it is the Messiah, and that the reference is to the preaching of the Gospel for seven years, either during the ministries of John the Baptist and Christ, or during the ministry of
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Christ, and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit after His ascension. By 'the summit, or wing, of abominations,' Hengstenberg understands the temple, so called on account of its desecration by the Jews. Bleek refers it to the altar of the temple. Theodotion renders it ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερὸν βδέλυγμα τῶν ἱερικῶν, on the temple shall be the abomination of desolations. And so also the Vulgate has et erit in templo abominatio desolationis. It is most probably to this passage that our Lord refers when He says: 'When ye shall see the abomination of desolation, τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἱερικῆς, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place' (Matt. xxiv. 15); and if so, the prophecy refers to the Jewish war.

Having given a translation and exposition of the prophecy, we now proceed to consider the two very different meanings which have been assigned to it—the Messianic and the anti-Messianic.

1. The Messianic interpretation has been adopted and defended at length by Prideaux, Faber, Pusey, Wordsworth, Hengstenberg, Hävernick, and Auberlein. We have dwelt upon it in the lecture. According to this view, there is only one Messiah: 'Messiah the Prince' and 'the Messiah who was to be cut off' are one and the same. This Messianic interpretation is justified by the Messianic character of ver. 24. The points mentioned in that verse—the finishing of transgression,
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the making an end of sin, the making atonement for iniquity, and the bringing in of everlasting righteousness—have all a reference to the age of the Messiah, as is evident from the prophetical language of the Old Testament in general. And so also there is a wonderful coincidence as regards the time; as shown in our lecture, the time of our Lord's advent as nearly as possible coincides with the seventy weeks of Daniel, calculated from the decree given to Nehemiah by Artaxerxes in the twentieth year of his reign.

Four different edicts of the Persian monarchs are mentioned in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah. The first was in the first year of Cyrus given to Zerubbabel, granting permission to return to Jerusalem and to rebuild the temple (Ezra i.). The second was in the second year of Darius Hystaspes, and was a renewal of the edict of Cyrus (Ezra vi.; Hag. i. 1). The third was in the seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, given to Ezra to establish the worship of God (Ezra vii.). And the fourth was in the twentieth year of the same monarch, given to Nehemiah to rebuild the wall of Jerusalem (Neh. i. 1, 2, ii. 5). Now the decree which certainly corresponds best with the indications given in the prediction of Daniel, is that of Artaxerxes Longimanus to Nehemiah. In the other decrees there is no mention of the building or fortifying of Jerusalem, but only of the temple; Jerusalem
still remained without walls until the time of Nehemiah. In all probability, the Jews were not until then permitted to fortify their city. As Hengstenberg remarks: 'Up to the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, what had once been the city of Jerusalem was an open village, thinly populated, and exposed to injury of every kind from those who dwelt around.' But now by this decree permission was given to Nehemiah to build and to restore Jerusalem. From this date, then, the seventy prophetical weeks of Daniel are to be calculated; after sixty-nine of these weeks, or 483 years after this decree, Messiah was to appear. According to Hengstenberg, who enters upon a long and minute dissertation on the chronology of these times, the twentieth year of Artaxerxes Longimanus coincided with B.C. 454. If we add to this the thirty years which elapsed before our Lord commenced His public ministry, we obtain a period of 484 years, which differs only by one year from the sixty-nine prophetical weeks of Daniel. And, as has been stated in our lecture, the correctness of this calculation is strongly confirmed by the expectation of the advent of the Messiah among the Jews at the time of our Lord;

2 Hengstenberg’s Christology, vol. iii. p. 223. Dr. Pusey disagrees with Hengstenberg as to the duration of the reign of Artaxerxes, and dates the commencement of the weeks from the commission to Ezra (Lectures on Daniel, pp. 168–170).
and which expectation, as Josephus admits, arose from their calculation of the numbers contained in the prophecy of Daniel.

A great objection to the Messianic interpretation is that it is admitted by those who adopt it, that there is in the prediction a manifest reference to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, which is represented as occurring in the seventieth week, but which in reality did not occur until nearly forty years after the crucifixion of our Lord. 'The people of the Prince, the coming One, shall destroy the city and the sanctuary.' 'In the half of the week He shall cause the sacrifice and offering to cease, and on the summit of abominations shall be the destroyer, even to the completion, and that decreed shall be poured upon the destroyer.' 'This clause,' observes Dr. Adler, 'is stated to refer to the entire destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, and to their having caused the sacrifices to cease for ever. But surely these events did not take place in the midst of that week (the seventieth) when the Nazarene is said to have died, but upwards of thirty years later.'

Now I candidly admit that this is a difficulty of which I am not prepared to offer any satisfactory solution. It will not do to affirm with Faber that 'this half week is not the half of the previously-mentioned week, but an entirely distinct portion of

1 Adler's *Course of Sermons*, p. 113.
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time,'¹ and thus to cut it off from Daniel's seventy weeks; for this is irreconcilable with the words of the prediction. The words denote not 'in half a week,' but 'in the half of the week.' Nor can it be denied that, according to the Messianic interpretation, there is here a reference to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. Our Lord's allusion to the prophecy confirms that reference. It may, however, be that the destruction of Jerusalem is here mentioned, because it virtually, though not actually, occurred during the seventy weeks. When the Jews rejected the Saviour, Jerusalem was virtually destroyed; its preservation was rendered an impossibility. And so it often happens in prophetic language that an event which is inevitable is said to have occurred. And, in this case, not only was the train laid, but by the rejection of Christ the match was applied, though the explosion occurred at a later period. At all events, the obscurity of one part of a prediction does not invalidate the conclusions drawn from the completion of those other parts which we understand.

It has been further objected, that the Messianic interpretation only accounts for sixty-nine weeks and a half; no meaning whatever is assigned to the last half of the seventieth week. According to the usual mode of calculation, Christ appeared

¹ Faber On Daniel, pp. 375, 376.
after sixty-nine weeks: His ministry lasted for half a week; so that there is still half a week unaccounted for. Dr. Pusey thinks 'the remaining three and a half years probably mark the time during which the gospel was preached to the Jews, before the preaching to the Samaritans showed that the special privileges of the Jews were at an end, and that the gospel embraced the world.'

Others carry down the seventy weeks to the death of the martyr Stephen. But the solution of Prideaux is perhaps to be preferred. He refers the whole of the seventieth week to the ministry of Christ—carried on during the first half indirectly by the ministry of John the Baptist, and during the second half directly by Himself; and that thus the words, 'He shall confirm the covenant with many for one week,' received their accomplishment; and during the second half of the week, by His own death, the one great sacrifice for sin, He 'caused the sacrifice and oblation to cease.'

So that, according to Dr. Prideaux, it was not at the close of sixty-nine and a half weeks, but at the close of the seventy weeks, that the death of Christ occurred. It is to be observed that Prideaux calculates the seventy weeks from the decree of Artaxerxes Longimanus in the seventh year of his reign to Ezra, and gives, according to another

---

1 See objections stated in Drummond's *Jewish Messiah*, p. 266.
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chronology, a different duration to the reign of that monarch.¹

Applying this prophecy to the Lord Jesus, it will be found to receive its full accomplishment. The first part of the prophecy—the period of seven weeks, or forty-nine years—refers to the restoration of the city: from it we learn, that it was foretold that forty-nine years would elapse from the decree of Artaxerxes to Nehemiah to rebuild Jerusalem until the work was completed. The want of historical data prevents us comparing this part of the prediction with the event, nor does it at present concern us. But the other parts of the prophecy all relate to the Messiah. We have found, taking the weeks as years, that Jesus appeared at the very time it was here predicted that the Messiah would appear. Jesus accomplished the work that it was here predicted the Messiah would accomplish: He 'finished transgression, made an end of sins, made reconciliation for iniquity, and brought in everlasting righteousness.' Jesus was put to death, as it was here predicted that the Messiah would be put to death: 'after sixty and two weeks, Messiah shall be cut off.' Jesus was rejected by the Jews, as it was here predicted that the Messiah should be rejected: 'the people were not to Him.' Jesus by the sacrifice of Himself put
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an end to the sacrifices under the law, as it was here predicted that the Messiah should cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease. In Jesus, then, this prophecy receives its accomplishment. He is 'Messiah the Prince,' that 'Messiah who was to be cut off.'

2. But to complete this dissertation, we must consider the anti-Messianic interpretation. This interpretation has been adopted and defended at length by Drummond, Davidson, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Rosenmüller, Kuenen, Ewald, Bleek, Wieseler, Hitzig, Hilgenfeld, Lücke, Anger, and partially by Hofmann, and by all recent Jewish writers. They refer the fulfilment of the prediction to the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, though with most of them it is regarded as vaticinium post eventum. The meaning which these critics give of course differs widely from that which we have advanced. They fix the commencement of the weeks, not from any decree given by a Persian monarch to restore Jerusalem, but either from the commencement of the Babylonish captivity, or from the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar: they are constrained to do this on account of the numbers given in the prophecy. They consider that there are two Messiahs mentioned—the first, 'Messiah the Prince,' who should appear after forty-nine years, and whom they all agree in considering to be Cyrus; and the other, the
'Messiah who was to be cut off,' but concerning whom there is a great difference of opinion. The prince whose people should come and destroy the city and the sanctuary, they consider to be Antiochus Epiphanes, the great persecutor of the Jews. To him they apply the words, 'And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week: and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease' (Dan. ix. 27). The persecution, they observe, lasted one week of years, and in the midst of the week, for three years and a half, the Jewish worship was prohibited. 'Most probably,' observes Dr. Adler, 'the prophecy refers to the persecutions and oppressions which Israel was destined to endure at the hands of the cruel and fanatic Antiochus Epiphanes. The purpose of this, as of some of the other visions that were vouchsafed to Daniel, seems to have been to strengthen and encourage the Jews to remain faithful to their God in those times of trial that awaited them. This vision announces to them that at the expiration of seventy weeks,—that is, 490 years after the destruction of their temple,—their sufferings would be at an end, their iniquity pardoned, the piety and righteousness of old re-established, and the Holy of Holies again anointed. The prophet here foretells events which were fulfilled in the renewed dedication of the temple by Judas Maccabeus,
and the re-establishment shortly afterwards of the independence of Israel, when kings of their own race and faith again sat on the throne of David, and a new era commenced, which was designated the era of the freedom of Israel.¹

But whilst these anti-Messianic writers agree in considering the first Messiah to be Cyrus, they differ widely in their views concerning the second Messiah. According to Collins, he is Judas Maccabeus. According to Eichhorn, Wieseler, Hitzig, Hilgenfeld, Kuenen, and Hofmann, he is Onias III., the high priest who was put to death at the instigation of Menelaus (2 Macc. iv. 34, 35)—an opinion which is also entertained by Dr. Adler. According to Bertholdt and Rosenmüller, he is Alexander the Great. According to Ewald, Bleek, and Anger, he is Seleucus IV. Philopater, the brother of Antiochus Epiphanes, who was poisoned. Thus Anger observes: 'This Messiah, who was to appear sixty-two weeks after the former, that is, on the sixty-ninth week, immediately before Antiochus Epiphanes, is either Seleucus Philopater, who died B.C. 175, from tears before the beginning of the last week, or nezzar: priest Onias III., who died B.C. 171, at of the nunciation of the last week; probably the consider that the in the description afterwards given the first, 'Messia... is indicated, but not Onias.'² after forty-nine years in considering to be *I, p. 114. Sermons, p. 81. Sungen, p. 81.
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In this interpretation of the seventy weeks there is a complete disregard and violation of chronology.¹ The commencement of the seventy weeks is affirmed to be the 'word of the Lord to Jeremiah,' in his prophecy of the seventy years of the captivity,² and is dated from B.C. 606, when Jehoiakim became tributary to Nebuchadnezzar. Now, according to their interpretation, seven weeks or forty-nine years would reach to the time of Cyrus, whereas the interval is seventy years; and hence there is an error of twenty-one years. Again, the end of seven weeks is placed at the time of Cyrus, B.C. 536, and the end of sixty-two weeks at the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, B.C. 164; consequently, according to this view, sixty-two weeks or 434 years ought to intervene between these periods; whereas the interval was not more than 372 years. There is thus here also an error of sixty-two years. The only way by which these critics try to avoid this difficulty, and in this they only partially succeed, is to consider the seven weeks and the sixty-two weeks not as consecutive, but as both commencing at the same period—namely, the commencement of Jeremiah's seventy years, B.C. 606. But such a mode of calculation is irreconcilable with the words of the prophecy, and cannot be admitted. Of

¹ This is admitted by Adler, Course of Sermons, p. 120.
² It is difficult to conceive how a prophecy of the desolation of Jerusalem can be construed into a command to restore and rebuild it.
course it is easy to cut the knot by saying, with Ewald, Hitzig, and Kuenen, that Daniel was mistaken in his calculations;¹ but such a method places the matter out of the sphere of argument. We consider, then, that there are insuperable difficulties to the adoption of the anti-Messianic interpretation.

Keil adopts a mode of interpretation peculiarly his own. Hofmann had indeed suggested that the prophecy might receive only a partial fulfilment in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, and that its full accomplishment might be reserved for the appearance of Antichrist, and the final completion of the kingdom of God at the second advent. Accordingly, Keil supposes that the prediction refers to the second advent of the Messiah. The weeks of Daniel are not to be considered as year-weeks, but as indefinite periods measured by sevens. The point of commencement is the edict of Cyrus, permitting the Jews to return from Babylon. The seven weeks are the period between that and the first advent of Christ. The sixty-two weeks which follow are the duration of the Christian Church—the period between the first advent of Christ and the advent of Antichrist. And the last week indicates 'the time of the supremacy and of the victory of the destroyer of the Church of God, the Antichrist, and the destruction of

¹ Kuenen's Prophets and Prophecy, p. 272.
this enemy by the irrevocably determined final judgment."

The prophecy of Daniel's seventy weeks has been discussed by numerous writers. Sir Isaac Newton, at the commencement of last century, wrote a treatise on it. The subject is treated at great length by Prideaux in his *Connection of the Old and New Testaments*, vol. i. pp. 207–332. The following are the principal modern works which treat of the subject:—Faber's *Dissertation on the Prophecy of Daniel*, contained in Dan. ix. 24–27; Drummond's *Jewish Messiah*, pp. 243–266; Hengstenberg's *Christology*, vol. iii. pp. 92–263; Keil *On Daniel*, pp. 336–400; a valuable dissertation on this prediction in the *Speaker's Commentary*; Kuenen's *Prophets and Prophecy of Israel*, pp. 263–273; Pusey's *Lectures on Daniel*, Lecture iv.; Hitzig *On Daniel*, pp. 153–175.

---

**SUPPLEMENT II.**

**THE FORCE OF THE ARGUMENT.**

The following extract from the work of Dr. Olinthus Gregory, *On the Evidences of Religion*, will give us

1 Keil's *Commentary*, p. 575. The same view is also stated by Leyrer in Herzog's *Encyclopedia*, article 'Zahlen bei den Hebräern.'
some idea of the accumulated force of the argument from prophecy, stated as it is with the precision of mathematics:—

'Suppose that, instead of the spirit of prophecy breathing more or less in every book of Scripture, predicting events relative to a great variety of general topics, and delivering besides almost innumerable characteristics of the Messiah, all meeting in the person of Jesus, there had been only ten men in ancient times who pretended to be prophets, each of whom exhibited only five independent criteria as to place, government, concomitant events, doctrine taught, effects of doctrine, character, sufferings, or death; the meeting of all which in one person, should prove the reality of their calling as prophets, and of his mission in the character they have assigned to him; suppose, moreover, that all the events were left to chance merely, and we were to compute, from the principles employed by mathematicians in the investigation of such subjects, the probability of these fifty independent circumstances happening at all. Assume that there is, according to the technical phrase, an equal chance for the happening or the failure of any one of the specified particulars; then the probability against the occurrence of all the particulars in any way is that of the 50th power of 2 to unity—that is, the probability is greater than eleven hundred and twenty-five millions of millions
to one, that all the circumstances do not turn up, even at distinct periods. This computation, however, is independent of the consideration of time. Let it then be recollected farther, that if any one of the specified circumstances happen, it may be the day after the delivery of the prophecy, or at any period from that time to the end of the world; this will so indefinitely augment the probability against the contemporaneous occurrence of merely these fifty circumstances, that it surpasses the power of numbers to express correctly the immense improbability of its taking place. Be it remembered, also, that in this calculation I have assumed the hypothesis most favourable to the adversaries of prophecy, and the most unfavourable possible to the well-being of the world and the happiness of its inhabitants,—namely, the hypothesis that everything is fortuitous,—and it will be seen that my argument is strengthened by restoring things to their proper state. If everything were left to blind chance, it appears that the probability against the fulfilment of only fifty independent predictions in the same time, place, and individual would be too great to be expressed numerically; how much greater, then, must it be in fact, when all events are under the control of a Being of matchless wisdom, power, and goodness, who hates fraud and deception, who must especially hate it when attempted under His name and authority, who
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knows all that occurs in all places, and who can dissipate "with the breath of His mouth," every deceiver and all his delusions?"¹

LECTURE VI.

EXAMINATION OF ISAIAH LIII.

'Of whom,' asks the Ethiopian eunuch, whilst perusing the Fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, 'does the prophet speak this? of himself, or of some other man?' The portrait is that of a sufferer: a Man of Sorrows, bowed down, crushed, despised, rejected; sufferings heavier than those which befall other men have befallen Him; His countenance is marred in consequence of these untold pains; all faces are turned from Him; He is unpitied; He is forsaken. The people regard His sufferings as well merited; He is justly stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But the people are mistaken: these sufferings were not for Himself, but for them; He was their representative, their substitute; it was their sins that He bore; it was their sorrows that He carried. And as He knew that He was the destined substitute of others, His sufferings are voluntary; He offers no complaint, He makes no resistance; He is led as a lamb to the slaughter; He openeth not His mouth; He submits to the stroke of divine justice; for the
transgression of His people is He smitten. But these sufferings terminate in victory and glory. He is finally delivered from them, and receives, as a reward for His voluntary endurance, a seed to serve Him, victory over His enemies, length of days, and the abiding favour and pleasure of the Lord. 'He shall see of the travail of His soul, and shall be satisfied.'

Such are the contents of the prophecy; such is the Sufferer. Now, of whom does the prophet speak? Is it of Jesus our Lord, or of some other man? Was Philip in the right when, from this passage of Scripture, he preached Jesus to the Ethiopian eunuch? Let us consider, first, the negative answer to the question—the opinions of those who consider this prophecy as non-Messianic; and, secondly, the positive answer—the opinions of those who see its fulfilment in the Lord Jesus.

I. The Negative or Non-Messianic Interpretation of the Prophecy.

It is undoubtedly the case that this prophecy was written and published ages before the days of Jesus—that is, before the occurrence of the events which Christians say are its fulfilment. This is undeniable and indisputable; it is a point on which

1 Supplement I.
there is and can be no difference of opinion. The prediction is contained in the Hebrew Scriptures as they are now in the hands of the Jews, and in the Septuagint translation which was made at least two centuries before the Christian era. It is utterly impossible that the passage can be an interpolation. The Jews who strenuously deny its Messianic application, yet unanimously admit its genuineness. It is also immaterial to our present argument who is the author of this prophecy, whether Isaiah or some other man; all that we require to prove is its publication previous to the event said to be its fulfilment. It cannot, then, be asserted that the prophecy was designedly made after the event, and that the supposed correspondence is the result of human intention or fraud. The passage is also, as Dr. Paley observes, 'taken from a writing declaredly prophetic.' It is not a history, or a moral discourse, or a poem, but professes to be a prophecy. Whatever may be its interpretation, or whether it has any, it is an oracle—a declaration of the future. 'Isaiah,' says the author of Ecclesiasticus, 'saw by an excellent spirit what should come to pass at the last, and he comforted them that mourned in Sion. He showed what

1 'Even if its author lived as late as the time of Cyrus, still the great prophecy respecting the Servant of Jehovah must have been in existence more than 500 years before the advent' (Row's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 209).

2 Paley's *Evidences*, Part ii. chap. i.
should come to pass for ever, and secret things or ever they came' (Ecclus. xlviii. 24, 25).

Further, if we take the prophecy not by itself, but in connection with what precedes,—viewing it not as a detached fragment, but as a part of a large prophecy,—we shall find that the Sufferer here portrayed is to be identified with the person called in the preceding chapters 'the Servant of the Lord.' This is evident from the last verses of the chapter immediately preceding: 'Behold, my Servant shall deal prudently, He shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high. As many were astonished at Thee; His visage was so marred more than any man, and His form more than the sons of men: so shall He sprinkle many nations; the kings shall shut their mouths at Him: for that which had not been told them shall they see; and that which they had not heard shall they consider' (Isa. lii. 13-15). And in this very prophecy he is called the righteous Servant of the Lord: 'By His knowledge shall my righteous Servant justify many' (Isa. liii. 11). Now, this phrase often occurs from the Fortieth chapter of Isaiah down to this Fifty-third.¹ The Servant of the Lord is there variously described. He is elected by God to this office, filled with the Spirit of the Lord, taught of God in order to become the Teacher of the Gentiles. He shall recover His people from captivity, and gather again the tribes of Jacob. He

¹ It does not occur after Isa. liii.
shall be a light to the Gentiles, and publish the glad tidings of salvation to the ends of the earth. Kings shall fall down before Him, princes shall worship at His feet, and the isles shall wait for His laws. 'Behold my Servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my Spirit upon Him, and He shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. I the Lord have called Thee in righteousness, and will hold Thine hand, and will keep Thee, and give Thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles' (Isa. xlili. 1, 6). And yet He is often represented as a sufferer, rejected of the people, enduring suffering with patience, meek and submissive, His visage marred more than any man, and His form more than the sons of men. The Servant of the Lord, then, and the Sufferer delineated in this Fifty-third chapter of Isaiah are identical. This is admitted by all, by Jewish as well as by Christian writers; and therefore the question resolves itself into this: Who is this Servant of the Lord? 'Of whom speaketh the prophet this? of himself, or of some other man?'

The modern Jews are unanimous in the assertion that whoever is meant by the 'Servant of the Lord,' he is at least not the Messiah. The doctrine of a suffering Messiah is rejected and repudiated by them; they assert that it is the product of early Christianity, and that the first impulse was given to it by
the apostles, in order to find a point of attachment between the prophecies and the sufferings of their Master. The only Messiah whom they expect is a victorious Prince, the ideal King who shall rule in righteousness, and bring about the golden age of Judaism. There are many reasons which have induced them to adopt this opinion. The idea of a glorified Messiah is more congenial to their feelings, more in accordance with their patriotic hopes; whereas the idea of a suffering Messiah has nothing attractive about it, and is opposed to their self-righteousness. Besides, rejecting the fulfilment proposed by Christianity, the Jews found it impossible to reconcile the prophecies concerning a glorified Messiah with the declarations of suffering; and hence they adopted the plan of entirely denying the idea of a suffering Messiah, and applying the passages which describe a sufferer to some other person. And they were the more induced to this course by reason of their controversies with the Christians. They could not deny the existence of their prophecies, but they denied their fulfilment in Jesus. As, however, suffering was the prominent feature in the life of Jesus, and as Christian controversialists referred to those passages which foretold a sufferer, the Jews felt constrained to deny the application of these passages to the Messiah, and to assert that the doctrine of a suffering Messiah was a mere Christian invention.
1. The prediction, however, must have some meaning. If not of Jesus, of whom speaketh the prophet? Now the most prevalent opinion, both among recent Jewish writers and those Christian divines who adopt the anti-Messianic view, is, that the Servant of the Lord is not to be understood of an individual, but of a collective body, that the idea involves plurality, and that by it the nation of Israel is meant. There are, however, different opinions as to the meaning of the term Israel. Some suppose that the whole nation of Israel is here personified; others restrict the prophecy to the pious portion of the Jewish people—the cream of the nation; whilst others imagine that an ideal Israel—'Israel, as it existed in the imagination of the prophet'—is here referred to. The only essential difference between these Jewish and Christian writers is, that the Jewish interpreters suppose that the whole sufferings of the Jewish nation are referred to, and that the prediction which also foretells its future glory is only partially fulfilled; whilst the Christian interpreters restrict the prophecy to the sufferings of the Jews in Babylon and their restoration to their own land, and regard it not as a prediction, but merely as a poetical description of these events.

The reason assigned for this opinion is, that the Servant of the Lord is expressly and repeatedly called by the name of Israel; and this these writers
regard as tantamount to an identification. 'Thou, Israel, art my Servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend. Thou whom I have taken from the ends of the earth, and called thee from the chief men thereof, and said unto thee, Thou art my Servant; I have chosen thee, and not cast thee away' (Isa. xli. 8, 9). And again, 'Thou art my Servant, O Israel, in whom I will be glorified' (Isa. xlix. 3).¹ But when they come to apply this notion to an explanation of the prophecy, they are constrained to have recourse to the most forced interpretations. Israel is the Servant of the Lord who is despised and rejected by the Gentiles; it is his sufferings which are here portrayed. The Gentiles, however, shall be brought to a sense of their injustice: they shall regard the sufferings which they have inflicted upon Israel not only as unmerited, but as, in a certain sense, vicarious—that Israel was punished for their sins, and not for his own; that they were permitted by God to afflict him, in order that by his stripes they might be healed; and hence the knowledge imparted by Israel shall be the means of the conversion of the Gentiles: they shall repent of their cruelties, become obedient to the law, and worship Jehovah, the God of Israel.

The following extract from Dr. Adler will show

¹ In six passages—viz., xli. 8, 9, xliv. 1, 2, xlv. 21, xlv. 4, xlviii. 20, xlix. 3—the Servant of the Lord is called Jacob or Israel.
what interpretation the modern Jews give to this remarkable prophecy:—

‘Our expositors agree in saying that the Servant here spoken of is the nation, Israel. All the preceding chapters have spoken of the glorious exaltation that awaits Israel. The prophet now proceeds to speak in more explicit terms of this future greatness: “Behold! my Servant shall prosper, he shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high.”

He shall be exalted in the same degree as he had been degraded during his exile. On beholding this, all the nations and the kings of the earth will be astonished; they will call to mind that state of abasement which had formerly been the lot of the Israelites. Then follows that wondrous record of our nation’s sufferings, depicted by a master hand, on which each page in our history during the Middle Ages is a life-breathing vivid commentary. “Israel was despised and rejected, acquainted with grief, and we (the nations of the earth) esteemed him not.”

Now, why was Israel dispersed to all quarters of the globe? Why had he to suffer all these afflictions? That he might fulfil his mission, and wean mankind from error and irreligion. When at last the nations of the earth shall reflect upon the martyrdom Israel endured for so many centuries, how he was cut off from the land of the living, how his grave was made with the wicked and his death compassed by the mighty of the
earth, and how he bore it all and refused to become unfaithful to his God,—then the nations of the earth will renounce their sinfulness, and acknowledge the God of Israel as the one true God. They will say, "Israel has been wounded for our transgressions, bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and through his stripes we are healed." They will say in effect, that instead of Israel being the victim of God's wrath, abandoned by the Lord as we deemed him, he was in truth wounded through our cruelty, he was bruised by our iniquitous treatment. We were permitted to afflict him thus, that by his chastisement our redemption and healing might be effected: redemption from error and sin, healing from false belief; for Israel was to be the teacher of mankind, the exemplar of unflinching obedience to the one God. The prophet continues, "Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; He has put him to grief; when his soul shall make an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand." Israel shall be gloriously rewarded for the sufferings he has borne. "Through his knowledge"—through practising and teaching the sacred lessons of his faith—"shall my righteous Servant justify many (that is, bring them to virtue); for he shall endure their iniquities. Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall
divide the spoil with the strong (in other words, he will be the equal of the mightiest of the earth in honour and glory); because he has poured out his soul unto death: and he was numbered with the transgressors; and he endured the sins of many, and made intercession with the transgressors.”

How sublime is this view of the prophet! He stands here, looking, as it were, from the summit of his prophetic intelligence upon the history of the world, and divines the future development and ultimate perfection of man—the golden age that awaits mankind, when they will acknowledge the errors of which they have been guilty, tender the hand of brotherhood to redeemed Israel, and acknowledge Israel’s God.’

In all error there is a germ of truth, of which it is the perversion. Israel is, in a certain sense, the Servant of the Lord, because he was the depositary of the true faith, the only nation who acknowledged the true God, the witness of Jehovah amid the darkness of heathenism. But the true Servant of the Lord is the Messiah, the great representative of the nation. The words of the prophecy are too particular and too personal to be applied to a collective idea; they refer to an individual. Nor can they, with any propriety, be regarded as fulfilled in Israel. In what sense can it be said of the nation of Israel, ‘Surely he hath borne our

1 Adler’s Course of Sermons, pp. 42-44.
griefs, and carried our sorrows: he was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was laid upon him? Surely it is a gross perversion of language to affirm that Israel was a substitute for the nations of the world. Israel suffered for his own sins, and not for the sins of others. Besides, so far from being a willing victim, as the sufferer in the prophecy, his sufferings were most involuntary. The statement that ‘he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death,’ is appropriate when applied to an individual, but is utterly incomprehensible when applied to a nation. And so, also, when it is said, ‘For the transgressions of my people was he stricken,’ no meaning whatever can be assigned to the words on the supposition that the nation of Israel is spoken of. The person stricken and the person (my people) for whose transgression he was stricken, are identical: the passage becomes wholly unintelligible. In short, the idea that the Servant of the Lord here, in this Fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, is a personification of Israel, is wholly inapplicable, and can only be forced to correspond with the prophecy by the most arbitrary assumptions.

2. This, however, is the general opinion of those who adopt the anti-Messianic interpretation. There are a few other suppositions which have been partially adopted. It has, for example, been sup-
posed that the Servant of the Lord is a personification of the prophetical order. 'The prophetical order,' observes Schenkel, 'was the great hidden blossom which early storms broke.' The prophets stood up as the great defenders of the worship of Jehovah; they denounced the idolatry and apostasy of their countrymen; they stood undaunted before wicked monarchs. Hence they were frequently persecuted; they were rejected by the wicked among the Jews; they were the scapegoats of the nation; they were often put to death; but yet they were recognised by God, they were the true Israel, the servant of the Lord. 'Thus saith the Lord, that confirmeth the word of His Servant, and performeth the counsel of His messengers' (Isa. xliv. 26). The prophet then here describes their sufferings, their courage and faithfulness in opposing idolatry, the self-sacrifice of themselves, and the final victory of their cause.

But it is evident that such a supposition is destitute of all foundation: the points of resemblance are few. The true prophets were certainly the servants of the Lord: they stood forward as His advocates, protesting against the wickedness of the nation, and seeking to re-establish among them the worship of God. They were also in general persecuted, as are all reformers and all preachers of righteousness to an ungodly nation. But they were not the substitutes of the nation. The volun-
tary and substitutionary nature of the sufferings here predicted can only by a forced interpretation correspond with the persecutions to which the prophets were subjected. So far also were the prophets from asserting their innocence,—that 'they had done no violence, neither was any deceit found in their mouth,'—they were ever ready to abase themselves under a feeling of personal sinfulness. Nor were the prophets as a body ever exalted; on the contrary, they were always treated with ignominy and hatred. And the individual traits of character stated are wholly inapplicable to such a collective body as the prophetical order. Even Hitzig observes: 'The supposition that by the Servant of the Lord the prophetical order is to be understood, is destitute of all foundation and probability.'

3. Others, again, and certainly with greater truth, consider the prophecy as applicable only to an individual. The description is too personal and too minute to be regarded as a mere personification. Accordingly, the prophecy has been referred to different persons, though, with the exception of Jeremiah, there are not two interpreters who agree upon the individual intended. Some refer the prophecy to one of the kings of Judah, as Uzziah, Hezekiah, or Josiah; one thinks that Isaiah here speaks of himself, and not of any other man; another supposes that the 'Servant of the

1 Quoted by Hengstenberg, *Christology*, vol. ii. p. 339.
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Lord is Cyrus, who granted permission to Israel to return to their own land; another, that He is Zerubbabel, the leader of the returning Israelites; another, that He is Judas Maccabeus; and another, that the subject of prophecy is the royal house of David, who were almost extirpated when Nebuchadnezzar slew the sons of Zedekiah. All these are hypotheses without any foundation to rest upon—mere guesses which require no refutation.

A few interpreters suppose that the prophet Jeremiah is here meant. No prophet was so highly esteemed by the Jews. He was invested with a peculiar sanctity: he is represented as appearing in vision, and interceding for the people (2 Macc. xv. 13, 14): his return was expected; and in the Gospels we learn that among the different conjectures entertained concerning Jesus, one was that He was Jeremiah (Matt. xvi. 13, 14). This opinion was favoured by the illustrious Grotius, and has recently been revived and defended by Bunsen, a man who must always be venerated for his deep piety and extensive erudition, whatever views may be entertained concerning his theological opinions. Of Jeremiah, it is asserted, does the prophet speak. He was the man of sorrows,—beaten, despised, rejected,—the weeping prophet. He was taken from prison and from judgment. He says of himself, ‘I was like a lamb or an ox that is brought to the slaughter’ (Jer. xi. 19), thus
verifying the words of the prophecy, 'He is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb.' But surely this is mere trifling. The mere general features of suffering, and the mere accidental coincidence of words, are not sufficient to establish an identity. In no sense whatever can it be affirmed that Jeremiah was a substitute for the sins of others. Nor have we any account of Jeremiah's death, whether 'he was cut off out of the land of the living.' And so far was he from making intercession for the transgressors, from praying for the forgiveness of his enemies, that he makes intercession against them: 'Pull them out like sheep for the slaughter, and prepare them for the day of slaughter.' 'Forgive not their iniquity, neither blot out their sin from Thy sight' (Jer. xii. 3, xviii. 23). ¹

4. One other anti-Messianic solution remains to be noticed,—a solution more dwelt upon in former times than in the present day, and yet a solution which appears to be more plausible than any; and that is the doctrine of a twofold Messiah. According to this view, there are two Messiahs who form the subject of Hebrew prophecy: there is a suffering Messiah, Messiah ben Joseph of the tribe of Ephraim; and there is a glorified Messiah, Messiah ben David of the tribe of Judah. All the predictions which refer to the sufferings of the Messiah

¹ Supplement II.
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are applicable to the former; and all the predictions which refer to His glory apply to the latter. Concerning the Messiah ben Joseph, it is asserted that He shall precede and prepare the way for the second Messiah; that He shall live a life of poverty and wretchedness, and shall at length perish in His contest with the powers of evil. It is to Him that this Fifty-third chapter of Isaiah refers; and it is to Him that these words of the prophet Zechariah apply: 'They shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and shall mourn' (Zech. xii. 10).

Concerning the Messiah ben David, it is asserted that He shall conquer all His enemies; that He shall sit upon the throne of David for ever; that He shall never see death, but shall rule in righteousness and glory. The one is the Man of Sorrows; the other is the great Anointed King.

Now, when not considered in the light of the fulfilment, the two opposite ideas of suffering and glory must appear an inexplicable problem; and therefore we do not wonder that the Jewish interpreters of prophecy should have recourse to this idea of a twofold Messiah. But, evidently, this is a mere hypothesis to escape a difficulty. There is no assertion of the distinction in Scripture; on the contrary, in various passages, suffering and glory are referred to the same person. There are not two Messiahs, but one: He who was to be the mighty God was also to be the Man of Sorrows; and
He who was to sit on the throne of David for ever, and of the increase of whose dominion there was to be no end, was also to be led as a lamb to the slaughter, and to be cut off out of the land of the living.\(^1\)

All the anti-Messianic interpretations, then, are wholly inadequate to explain the prediction. The assertion of substitution is the rock on which they all split. The sinless One is here substituted for the sins of others: 'For the transgression of my people was He smitten; the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all.' Surely the sins of the Gentiles were not laid on the Jews, according to one interpretation; neither was the prophetical order the substitute for Israel, according to another; nor did Jeremiah bear the iniquities of the nation, according to a third. All these are mere unfounded suppositions, which do not meet the necessities of the case.

II. The Positive or Messianic Interpretation of the Prophecy.

We have seen how inapplicable and forced are all the anti-Messianic interpretations of the prophecy—how unable they are to afford any plausible answer to the inquiry, 'Of whom speaketh the

\(^1\) Supplement III.
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prophet this? But when we apply the prediction to Jesus,—when we take into account not merely His sufferings, but the glory which followed; the success of His religion, the supreme exaltation of His name, the kingdom which He has erected through suffering,—the correspondence between the prophecy and the fulfilment must be obvious to every unprejudiced mind. He suffered as it was predicted that the Servant of the Lord should suffer. He was rejected and despised of men. His own nation did not believe on Him. He was a Man of Sorrows and acquainted with grief; during His whole life He was exposed to the persecutions and misrepresentations of His enemies. His sufferings were eminently substitutionary, inflicted on Him not for His own sake, but on account of others. Of Him, and of Him only, can it in the truest sense be said, 'He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities.' He endured all these sufferings with patience. He was silent before Pilate; He opened not His mouth in complaint, but submitted to the cruellest indignities without a murmur. He made intercession for the transgressors; on the cross He prayed for the forgiveness of His murderers. He was put to death, cut off out of the land of the living. But although He died the death of a criminal, yet He was buried in a rich man's grave. 'He made His grave with the wicked, and with the rich in His
death.’ He was exalted, as it was here predicted that the Servant of the Lord should be exalted. Notwithstanding His sufferings, His doctrine has succeeded, His reign is perpetual, His seed is numerous, and the pleasure of the Lord has prospered in His hand.

We do not see how any one can read this remarkable prophecy without being struck with its pointed resemblance to the character, sufferings, and death of the Lord Jesus. The portrait is complete: the resemblance is striking and unmistakeable. Indeed, it seems more like a history of the past than a prediction of the future: a statement of the doctrines of the Gospel made by some New Testament writer, as St. Paul or St. John, rather than a prediction of some Old Testament prophet. The seven centuries which intervened between Isaiah and Christ seem to be bridged over, and the future is painted in the characters of the present. In no portion of Scripture, even in the most Evangelical parts of the New Testament, is the doctrine of the atonement, that grand characteristic of Christianity, so clearly stated as in these words of the prophet: ‘Surely He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows: He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, and with His stripes we are healed. The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all.’
And yet nothing is more indisputable than that these words were uttered centuries before our Lord came into this world.

To this Messianic interpretation it is, however, objected that the Servant of the Lord is in many passages of these later chapters of Isaiah expressly called Israel. We have the prophet's own declaration of the meaning of the expression which he employs. But we have already sufficiently proved that in no sense of the term can the nation of Israel denote the sufferer in this prediction. Either the prophet employs the title 'Servant of the Lord' with various meanings throughout the prophecy, or the Messiah is called Israel because He is the representative and personification of the nation—because ideal Israel finds its realization in His person. Or it may be that the representation of the Servant of the Lord begins with a collective subject, but as the prophet proceeds the collective idea is dropped, and in this Fifty-third chapter an individual is represented. But whatever may be the solution, certainly the Servant of the Lord in this chapter is not the nation of Israel, but the great and mysterious Messiah—He on whom the hopes and faith of the nation were founded. 'The idea of the Servant of the Lord,' observes Delitzsch, 'to speak figuratively, assumes the form of a pyramid. The base was Israel as a whole; the central section

1 The view promulgated by Oehler.
was that Israel which was not merely Israel according to the flesh, but Israel according to the spirit; and the apex is the person of the Mediator of salvation, springing out of Israel.'

Or as Oehler finely represents it: 'The prophetic view ascends in these discourses step by step, as it were, from the broad space covered by the foundations of a cathedral up to the dome, on which the cross is planted.' Indeed, in various parts of this prophecy the Servant of the Lord is contrasted with and distinguished from the people of Israel; as for example to the Messiah only, and not to Israel, can these words apply: 'And now, saith the Lord that formed me from the womb to be His Servant, to bring Jacob again to Him, Though Israel be not gathered, yet shall I be glorious in the eyes of the Lord, and my God shall be my strength. And He said, It is a light thing that Thou shouldest be my Servant, to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give Thee for a light to the Gentiles, that Thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth.' (Isa. xlix. 5, 6).

Another remarkable peculiarity connected with this prophecy is that it is a prediction at once of a suffering and of a victorious Messiah. Isaiah here, as St. Peter expresses it, 'testified beforehand of the sufferings of the Messiah, and of the glory that
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should follow' (1 Pet. i. 11). In other predictions these two phases of the Messiah's character and life are generally found separately. In some prophecies Messiah is a mighty King, sitting on the throne of David, ruling in the midst of His enemies, extending His dominion over all the nations of the world; the kings and rulers of the earth kiss His sceptre; He rules in righteousness, and executes judgment and justice on the earth. He is the great Prince of Peace, and under His protection His people shall dwell securely, and none shall make them afraid. But in other prophecies the portrait is changed, and a suffering Messiah is presented to our view. His countenance is marred more than that of other men; He appears as a worm and no man—the object of the people's scorn; His hands and His feet are pierced, and the sword of divine vengeance is raised against Him. Now, in this prophecy, both of these descriptions are combined; the suffering precedes the glory. He who was the Man of Sorrows, despised and rejected, wounded and bruised, who was led as a lamb to the slaughter, and who was cut off out of the land of the living, who made His grave with the wicked and with the rich in His death, is the same who, after the conflict, shall see His seed and prolong His days, and who shall divide His portion with the great and share the spoil with the strong. Here suffering and glory,
the cross and the crown, are combined. In any other being these opposite qualities of glory and shame would be regarded as plain contradictions, but they meet in Jesus with their full accomplishment.

The doctrine of a suffering Messiah was peculiarly offensive to the Jews; and, considering the views of a victorious Messiah which then prevailed, we do not wonder at the rejection of Jesus by His countrymen. Even the apostles themselves could with great difficulty and extreme reluctance be brought to assent to the notion of a suffering Messiah. Peter rebuked Jesus when He spoke of His sufferings; and even after His resurrection, our Lord had to reprove the erroneous views of His disciples: 'O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: Ought not the Messiah to have suffered these things, and to enter into His glory?' (Luke xxiv. 25, 26). And in the present day the doctrine of a suffering Messiah is to the Jews a stumbling-block; it forms no part of their creed, and therefore they refuse to see in the Fifty-third chapter of Isaiah a Messianic prediction.

But although recent Jewish writers are unanimous in considering Isa. liii. as non-Messianic, yet this was not the view of their ancient Rabbis, though many of those ancient writers who acknowledged the Messianic character of the prophecy explained away those parts of it which appear to foretell a
suffering Messiah. Thus the Targum of Jonathan freely admits that the Messiah is the subject of this prediction. Isa. lii. 13 is thus paraphrased: ‘Behold, my Servant, the Messiah, shall prosper: He shall be exalted and increased and strengthened exceedingly;’ and the Messianic idea is represented as pervading the whole prophecy. But there is no admission of a suffering Messiah. It is not the Messiah who is to be led as a lamb to the slaughter, but the Gentile nations who are thus to be led captive by Him. ‘He will give the mighty nations like sheep to the slaughter, and like a lamb dumb before its shearers, so not one shall open his mouth before Him. He will strip all kings of their glory; they shall be feeble and in pain, like a man of sorrows, and one delivered over to diseases.’ And the tenth verse is thus rendered: ‘It pleased the Lord to prove and purify the remnant of His people in order to cleanse their souls from sin; they shall look upon the kingdom of their Messiah, and their sons and their daughters shall be multiplied; they shall prolong their days, and the doers of the law of the Lord shall prosper in His good pleasure.’¹ The portrait is removed and another is substituted in its place; instead of a suffering, a victorious Messiah is presented to our view—not the Man of Sorrows, but the King of glory is here displayed. It certainly required no little ingenuity

¹ Young’s Christology of the Targums.
to explain away all those passages which so obviously speak of suffering.

There are, however, numerous quotations from ancient Jewish documents which not only admit the Messianic character of this prophecy, but also involve the notion of a suffering Messiah. According to these quotations, the sufferings described in this chapter refer to the Messiah—He is the Sufferer; indeed, there is in these views a near approach to the Christian Messianic interpretation of this prophecy, without, however, any acknowledgment of its application to Jesus. These quotations are collected by Wünsche in his valuable tract, entitled, *Die Leiden des Messias*. They are of a most interesting nature, and prove satisfactorily that the denial of a suffering Messiah by the modern Jews is a departure from the faith of their ancestors. Thus in the tract *Sanhedrim*, in the Talmud, there is a statement of the titles of the Messiah, and in it occurs the following passage: ‘The Rabbis say that His name is the Leprous One of the house of Rab; as it is written, “Surely He hath borne our sicknesses and carried our sorrows; yet we did esteem Him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted.”’ From the *Siphre deé Rab*, a Midrash on Numbers and Deuteronomy, there is the following quotation: ‘King Messiah humbled Himself, and made Himself of no reputation on account of transgressors, as it is written, “He was
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wounded for our iniquities." Much more shall He merit for all generations, as it is written, "And the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all."

The Bereshit Rabba, belonging to the sixth century, has the following singular note on Gen. xxiv. 67: 'And Isaac brought Rebecca into the tent of Sarah his mother; 'This is King Messiah who lived in the age of the wicked; but He rejected them, and chose the Holy One and His holy name, in order that He might serve Him with all His heart; and He applied His heart to seek mercy for Israel, to fast and to be afflicted for them, as it is said, "He was wounded for our transgressions." When Israel sins, He seeks mercy for them, as again it is said, "By His stripes we are healed;" and again, "He bare the sins of many, and made intercession for the transgressors."' In the cabbalistic book Zohar, there is the following remarkable passage: 'In the garden of Eden there is a certain apartment which is called the apartment of the sick. Into this the Messiah goes, and calls all the diseases, and pains, and chastisements of the Israelites to come to Him, and they all come to Him. And if He took them not away from Israel, and laid them not upon Himself, no man would be able to bear the chastisements of Israel, which are inflicted on them on account of the transgressions of the law; and this is it which is written, "He has taken upon Himself our sick-
And according to the *Midrash Samuel*, the afflictions of the world are divided into three parts: one part is laid on David and the fathers; a second part is laid on Israel in banishment; and a third part is laid on the Messiah; and in proof of this assertion, those words of Isaiah are quoted: 'And He was wounded for our transgressions.'

This ancient application of Isa. liii. to the Messiah is recognised and acknowledged by several celebrated Jewish writers. Thus Rabbi Abarbanel, who lived in the fifteenth century, observes: 'Christian scholars interpret this prophecy as referring to that man who was crucified in Jerusalem about the end of the second temple, and who according to their view was the Son of the blessed God, who became man in the womb of the virgin. But Jonathan ben Uziel explains it as relating to the Messiah who has yet to come. And this is the opinion of the ancients in many of their Midrashim.' And Rabbi Alshech, who lived in the middle of the sixteenth century, observes: 'On the testimony of tradition, our old Rabbis have unanimously admitted that King Messiah is here (in Isa. lii. 13-15) spoken of. Therefore we also, in agreement with them, conclude that the subject of prophecy if: David, that is, Messiah, as is evident, and is confirmed by Scripture, for the prophet Ezekiel in the name of God says: “And David my Servant shall
be king over them.” 1 The probability is that it was not until the controversy arose between the Jews and the Christians that the denial of a suffering Messiah, and the consequent non-Messianic application of Isa. liii. became the recognised opinion of the Jewish Church. Gesenius himself observes: ‘It was only the later Jews who abandoned this interpretation, no doubt in consequence of their controversies with the Christians.’ 2

We can now easily see the solution of that problem—the reconciliation between the prophecies of a glorified and of a suffering Messiah—which so greatly perplexed those Jews who lived before their historical fulfilment in the person of Jesus our Lord. But if we place ourselves in their position, we shall easily see how dark and obscure—what an inexplicable paradox these prophecies must have been. It is not at all to be wondered at, that, attracted by the view of a glorified Messiah, they overlooked entirely the prophetic intimations of His suffering; or that, perplexed by these contrary descriptions, they had recourse to the notion of a twofold Messiah. Indeed, before their fulfilment, I do not see how the prophets themselves could have understood their own prophecies with any degree of correctness. No wonder that they anxiously searched into what ‘the Spirit of Christ which was

1 Quoted in Wünsche’s Leiden des Messias, pp. 43, 44.
in them did testify.' The fulfilment is the only key to the solution of the enigma. The sufferings of Jesus, and the future success of His religion, enable us to decipher the twofold prediction. All that was before dark and perplexing, has now become plain and obvious. And it is this fulfilment of such a complicated prophecy that proves to a demonstration the Messiahship of Jesus. Nay, His glory shines forth from His sufferings; for it was the fact of these sufferings being the expiation of the world's sins, which has given rise to that glory. The cross, the emblem of suffering, has become the emblem of victory; and the crown of shame has been converted into the crown of honour. Surely, then, we may with all confidence give an answer to the question of the Ethiopian eunuch, 'Of whom speaketh the prophet this? of himself, or of some other man?' He speaks of Jesus our Lord, who died for our sins, but who also rose again for our justification, at once the suffering and the glorified Messiah. 'He shall divide the spoil with the strong, because He poured out His soul unto death.'
SUPPLEMENT I.

EXEGETICAL REMARKS ON ISAIAH LIII.

I do not intend to give any exegesis of this wonderful passage. This has been already sufficiently done by many learned biblical critics. The reader is especially referred to the Commentaries on Isaiah by Gesenius, Knobel, and Delitzsch, to Hengstenberg's Christology, to Bishop Lowth's Translation of Isaiah, and to Urwick's Servant of Jehovah. And, indeed, our own version of the prophecy is so peculiarly excellent and happy as to require little emendation. I merely add a few notes on some passages which are either in themselves peculiarly interesting, or in which the reading is doubtful, or of which the interpretation is disputed.

Ver. 4. In this verse the word רעה (Naghia), rendered in our version stricken, has given rise to the curious notion that the Messiah was to be a leper. This verb, signifying to touch, is the term usually employed for being stricken with leprosy. The noun רעה is used sixty times in Lev. xiii. and xiv. of leprosy.¹ From this circumstance, the Vulgate renders the passage et nos putavimus eum

¹ See also 2 Kings xv. 5, where the same word is applied to Uzziah, who was a leper until the day of his death.
quasi leprosum. Hence among the Jews the idea arose that the Messiah was to be a leper. Sometimes this notion is restricted to the Messiah ben Joseph, but generally it is referred to the Messiah without qualification. Thus in the Talmud it is said of the Messiah, that He sits before the gates of Rome among the sick and leprous. And in the tract Sanhedrin, we have the following curious passage: 'What is the name of the Messiah?' They of the school of Rabbi Shilo said Shilo is His name; for it is said, 'till Shilo comes.' They of the school of Rabbi Jannai said Jinnon (He shall flourish) is His name; for it is said, 'His name shall flourish before the sun.' They of the school of Rabbi Chanina said Chanina (favour) is His name; for it is said, 'He will show you no favour.' Some say Menachem (the Comforter) is His name; for it is said, 'The Comforter that shall relieve my soul is far from me.' But the Rabbis say, 'His name is the Leper of the house of Rab; for it is written, "Surely He hath borne our sins and carried our sorrows, and we did esteem Him stricken (יְם),,"'¹—that is, according to the Jewish interpretation, stricken with the plague of leprosy.

Ver. 8. The words, 'He was taken from prison and from judgment,' might perhaps be better translated, 'From oppression and from judgment He was taken away.' The Septuagint renders them: ἐν τῇ

¹ Wünsche, Die Leiden des Messias, pp. 62, 63.
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His judgment was taken away. And these words are given almost verbatim in Acts viii. 33. The meaning has, however, been much disputed. Calvin supposes that the reference is to the glory of the Messiah. 'The prophet,' he observes, 'here declares that He was rescued from oppression and judgment or condemnation, and afterwards was exalted to the highest rank of honour.' In this interpretation he is followed by Vitringa and Hengstenberg. Gesenius and Meyer suppose that the meaning is that He was taken away or delivered from judgment by death. And Bengel and Lechler render the passage, 'The judgment pronounced on Him by His enemies was taken away, that is, cancelled or set aside by God.' The words appear to refer not to the glory, but to the sufferings of the Messiah, and to denote the oppression and unjust judgment which was passed upon Him, and put into execution by His death; hence the meaning would be, 'By an oppressive judgment He was taken away,' that is, put to death. So substantially, Knobel, De Wette, and Ewald.

The next clause, 'And who shall declare His generation?' has given rise to a great diversity of opinion. הֵיקִי signifies an age or generation of men. The Septuagint renders the passage: τὴν γένεαν αὐτοῦ τίς διηγήσεται; and the Vulgate: Genera-

1 Calvin, in loco.
There is thus no difficulty in the translation of the words. The Fathers in general referred it to the mystery of the Messiah's deity: 'Who shall declare His generation, His divine Sonship?'—a meaning which ill suits the connection with the following clause. Calvin, Vitringa, Wordsworth, and Hengstenberg refer the words to the duration of the kingdom and the spiritual seed of the Messiah: 'Who shall count the number of His spiritual offspring?' Bishop Lowth renders the passage, 'His manner of life, who shall declare?' and thinks that it refers to the custom among the Jews, that before any one was punished for a capital offence, the proclamation was made, 'Whoever knows anything of the innocence of this man, let him come and declare it.' And the prediction is, that in the case of the Messiah no one would be found to stand up in His defence. But the most obvious and natural meaning is to refer it to the contemporaries of the Messiah, that generation in the midst of which He lived. Thus Meyer and De Wette render the passage, 'Who shall set forth the extreme wickedness of His contemporaries?' Such a meaning certainly best suits the context, 'for,' as a proof or demonstration of this indescribable wickedness, 'He was cut off from the land of the living;' that is, He was put to death.

1 Lowth, in loco.
There is a difficulty in the construction of the last clause of ver. 8: "for the transgression of my people was He smitten." It is asserted that לְָָּוַּלַא is plural, and used instead of מַעַרַּבְּ. The non-Messianic interpreters refer it to the collective idea of the Servant of Jehovah; but this is inappropriate, as throughout the whole prophecy an individual is represented. Hengstenberg renders the clause, 'For the transgression of my people, whose the punishment.' Others, however, assert that לְָָּוַּלַא is in the singular, and used instead of לְָָּוַּלַא. It is so used in other parts of Scripture (Gen. ix. 26, 27; Job xxii. 2; Ps. ix. 7; Isa. xliv. 15). Accordingly they render the passage, 'For the transgressions of my people strokes were to Him.' The Septuagint evidently read מַעַרַּבְּ, for they thus render the passage: "אֶלֶּוֶּלֶּלֶּל אֱוֹוִיִוֹו קָו אוֹו מַעַרַּבְּ יַיִוָּוָּו מַעַרַּבְּ, for the transgression of my people, He was led to death." This appears also to have been the reading in the time of Origen; for he appeals to this passage, in his controversy with Celsus, in proof of the assertion that not the nation of Israel, but an individual was meant. 'We seemed,' he observes, 'to press them (the Jews) hardest with the expression, "For the transgression of my people was He led away to death." For if the people, according to them, are the subject of prophecy, how is the man said

to be led away to death because of the iniquities of
the people of God, unless he be a different person
from that people of God?" No doubt Origen
quotes from the Septuagint; but as he was well
acquainted with the Hebrew original, and was
accustomed to quote from it, it is argued that we
cannot suppose that he would have urged this
passage in a controversy with a Jew, as so decisive,
if the Greek version had not here agreed with the
Hebrew text. Hence Michaelis, Kennicott, and
Lowth suppose that this was the original reading,
and that the letter נ has dropped out of the
manuscripts. This certainly removes all difficulty
and gives a clear sense to the passage. It is, how-
ever, not easy to understand how a reading so
clear should be changed into one so obscure; and
the mere authority of the Septuagint and Origen is
not sufficient to cause it to be adopted. I would
therefore retain the present reading, and interpret
יִפְטָי in the singular.

Ver. 9. There are several difficulties connected
with this verse. In our version it is rendered: 'And
He made His grave with the wicked, and with the
rich in His death.' The Messiah Himself is here
represented as having made His own grave.
Others suppose that the implied subject is God:
'He assigned Him.' It is best to take the verb as
impersonal: 'Man appointed Him His grave with

1 Origen, Contra Celsum, i. 55.  2 Lowth On Isaiah, p. 364.
the wicked.' And hence the reference is to the enemies of the Messiah or the Jews, who are also referred to in the previous verse: 'For the transgression of my people was He smitten.'

The phrase, 'with the rich in His death,' is supposed to be analogous to the preceding phrase, 'He made His grave with the wicked.' Hence some suppose יִשְׂפָּת to denote wicked men. Thus Calvin observes: 'By rich men he meant violent men; for men grow haughty and disdainful on account of their riches, and abuse their wealth to savage cruelty. And thus by wicked men and rich men the same thing is denoted.' But there is no reason for assigning this meaning to the word: it is used in Hebrew to signify rich without any reference to character.

The word יִשְׂפָּת, rendered in our version in His death, is supposed by some to be the plural of יָשָׁה, a high place, and hence rendered by them His sepulchre. The word is supposed to be used in this sense in Ezek. xliii. 7, where mention is made of 'the carcasses of their kings in their high places,' that is, in their sepulchres. This meaning of the word is advocated by such distinguished critics as Lowth, Castalio, De Wette, Ewald, Böttcher, and

1 The Septuagint renders the verse: 'And I will give the wicked for His burial, and the rich for His death.'
2 Calvin's Commentary on Isaiah, in loco.
3 'Cum divite sepulchrum,' Castalio's Biblia sacra.
Dr. Samuel Davidson. 1 This would give to the passage a meaning at once plain and appropriate: 'They appointed Him His grave with the wicked, but with a rich man was His tomb.' 2 The two clauses assert what was the appointment of His enemies, and what was the actual occurrence. The first clause states that His enemies assigned Him His grave with the wicked, that is, with criminals; the second clause informs us with whom it was actually assigned in the providence of God: 'but with a rich man was His tomb.'

SUPPLEMENT II.

THE NON-MESSIANIC INTERPRETATIONS OF ISAIAH LIII.

1. As stated in the lecture, the most prevalent opinion among recent Jewish writers is that by the Servant of Jehovah, whose sufferings are here portrayed, is meant the nation of Israel. According to them, the prophecy describes the misery to which Israel is subjected, his steadfast adherence to the worship of the one living and true God amid the

1 Davidson's Introduction to the Old Testament, vol. iii. p. 72.
2 See Lowth On Isaiah, p. 364.
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idolatry of the nations, and his final deliverance and glory. This opinion has been adopted and maintained by Rashi, Abenezra, David Kimchi, Lipmann, Adler, and other distinguished Jewish writers. Among them, however, there is some diversity of opinion. Some suppose that the whole Jewish nation is personified; whilst others, as Rashi and Lipmann, restrict the prophecy to the pious portion of the people. Thus Rabbi Rashi, commenting on Isa. lii. 13: 'Behold, my Servant shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high,' explains the words: 'Behold, in the latter days my servant Jacob shall prosper, that is, the righteous who are in his midst.'

Most of those Christian writers, who have adopted a non-Messianic interpretation, have also given a somewhat similar explanation, but with a considerable diversity of opinion. Eichhorn, Rosenmüller, Hendewerk, Köster, and Hitzig suppose that the whole nation of Israel is the subject of prophecy; Ewald, Bleek, Riehm, and Dr. Davidson think that the ideal Israel—Israel in the imagination of the prophet—is referred to; whilst Paulus, Thenius, Anger, and Kuenen restrict the application to the true worshippers of God as contrasted with the ungodly. Knobel supposes that we must distinguish the Servant of

1 Quoted in Wünsche's Leiden des Messias, p. 36.
Jehovah in a wider and narrower sense: in a wider sense, the whole people of Israel are meant, so far as they had not apostatized from Jehovah, thus both the true and false worshippers; in the narrow sense, the true worshippers of Jehovah, the kernel of the nation, are meant; and he asserts that in this prophecy the phrase is sometimes used in the one sense and sometimes in the other. Oehler adopts the peculiar opinion that at first the Servant of Jehovah was used in a collective sense, denoting Israel; but as the prophet proceeded, the collective sense is dropped and an individual is represented, as is especially the case in this Fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. 'The figure,' he observes, 'represents first the servants of God collectively, from which the holy seed proceeds which is to form the stock of the new church, and then culminates in an individual. This Servant, the ideal Israel, is accordingly called to establish judgment in the earth, and the isles wait for His law. He is the light of the Gentiles, and through Him the salvation of the Lord is to penetrate to the end of the earth.' And, again, he observes: 'The prophetical intuition of the Servant of Jehovah in the Book of Isaiah (xl.–lxvi.) commences with the nation, but culminates in an individual. So early as chap. xlii. and xlix., the view is gradually transferred from the nation to an individual distinct from the nation, who (xlii. 6) negotiates a covenant for

1 Knobel, Der Prophet Isaiah, p. 435.
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the people, and then becomes the light of the Gentiles, who, as mediator of the covenant, re-settles the people, like a second Joshua, in the possession of the land (xliv. 8). Even if these passages are got over by referring the Servant, so far as He is distinguished from the people, to that germ which represents the genuine Israel, the aggregate of the servants of God, including the true prophets, chap. liii., on the contrary, can only refer to an individual.¹ This theory is very ingenious; it accounts for all those passages in which the Servant of Jehovah is called Israel and the 'Seed of Jacob;' and it tries to reconcile both views—the opinion of those who consider that by the Servant of Jehovah the nation of Israel is meant, and the opinion of those who consider that a personal Messiah is intended.

2. The second non-Messianic interpretation mentioned in the lecture is, that by the Servant of Jehovah is meant the prophetical order. This opinion is not nearly so generally maintained as the idea that the nation of Israel is intended: still it is adopted and defended by several distinguished theologians. Among its advocates are to be reckoned Gesenius, De Wette, Schenkel, and, to some extent, Umbreit and Hofmann. Umbreit remarks: 'The Servant of Jehovah is the collective body of the prophets or the prophetical order, which is here repre-

presented as the sacrificial victim taking upon itself the sins of the people.’¹ But he considers that the prophetical order is only fully realized in the Messiah, the ideal prophet; and he thus finds an application of the prophecy to Jesus, as the Anointed Prophet, in whom resided the fulness of the prophetical gift. The view of Hofmann, as given in his Schriftbeweis, so far as the meaning of that obscure but most suggestive writer can be understood, is somewhat similar. The vocation of Israel, he observes, is that of a prophet or of a witness of God to mankind, as it is said: ‘Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord, and my Servant whom I have chosen’ (Isa. xliii. 10). This is especially seen in the prophetical order, who were despised and rejected by the people, as was pre-eminently the case with Isaiah himself. But the culmination of this prophetical mission will be especially seen in Him who is the ideal prophet, namely, the Messiah.² In this view Hofmann carries out his peculiar notion that history itself is prophecy.

3. The third non-Messianic view adverted to in the lecture is, that by the Servant of Jehovah an individual is meant. The personal traits in the prophecy have constrained to the adoption of this view. Accordingly various persons have been fixed upon. Augusti supposes that Uzziah is here

¹ Quoted in Hengstenberg’s Christology, vol. ii. p. 323.
² Hofmann’s Schriftbeweis, ii. 1, p. 95 ff.
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meant, Bahrdt fixes on Hezekiah, and Steudel on the prophet Isaiah himself. Rabbi Abarbanel at first supposed that the nation of Israel was meant, but he changed his opinion, and made King Josiah the subject of the prophecy. 'The whole prophecy,' he observes, 'was uttered with reference to King Josiah.' The person, however, who has been most frequently fixed upon is the prophet Jeremiah. This opinion was first promulgated by Rabbi Saadiah Gaon; it was afterwards favoured by the illustrious Grotius, and has recently been defended by Baron Bunsen. Professor Williams, in his theological essay on Bunsen's Biblical Researches, expresses himself favourably regarding it. He observes that if any single person should be selected, it is Jeremiah, and that 'the figure of Jeremiah stood forth amongst the prophets, and tinged the delineation of the true Israel, that is, the faithful remnant (whom he considers to be meant by the Servant of Jehovah), just as the figure of Laud or Hammond might represent the Caroline Church in the eyes of her poet.' Ewald was so struck with the personal characteristics of this prophecy that he relinquished in regard to this chapter the view that the ideal Israel is meant, and supposes that some unknown sufferer—some single martyr—is intended; and he regards this portion as inter-

1 Wünsche's Die Leiden des Messias, p. 40.
2 Essays and Reviews, p. 74, 8th ed.
polated from an older book. To such straits are non-Messianic interpreters forced to have recourse.

SUPPLEMENT III.

THE DOCTRINE OF A TOWOFOLD MESSIAH.

An interesting account of this doctrine is given by Wünsche, in an appendix attached to his admirable treatise, *Die Leiden des Messias*. According to this doctrine, the Messianic prophecies refer not to one, but to two Messiahs. There is a glorified Messiah, to whom all those prophecies which speak of an Anointed King, the glories of His reign, and the extent of His mighty empire, refer; and there is a suffering Messiah, to whom refer all those predictions which foretell suffering, lowliness, and death. The suffering Messiah is to precede the glorified. The first is Messiah the son of Joseph, who is to precede, to prepare the way, to suffer, and to die. The second is Messiah the son of David, who is to follow, to conquer, to reign, to sit on the throne of David, and to abide for ever. Thus the Targum on Cant. iv. 5 says: 'Thy two Redeemers who shall deliver thee, Messiah ben David and Messiah ben Ephraim, are like to Moses and Aaron, who
again are compared to the two young roes which are twins." This fiction of a twofold Messiah arose about the second century, from an attempt to interpret Zech. xii. 10: ‘They shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and shall mourn for Him.’ According to this view, the Messiah who is pierced is Messiah the son of Joseph, and whose death was the cause of bitter lamentations among the Israelites.

The reason of the name Messiah the son of David is obvious. According to the prophets, the Messiah was to be a descendant of David, and hence ‘the son of David’ became one of the most common Messianic titles. The other Messiah appears to have been called the son of Joseph, or the son of Ephraim, because He was supposed to arise from the kingdom of Israel, as the Messiah ben David was to spring from the kingdom of Judah; so that both kingdoms were to give birth to a Messiah. Thus an ancient book, entitled, *Mikweh Israel*, written by Manasseh ben Israel, and which treats chiefly of the redemption of Israel, gives the following reason of the name: ‘We may affirm that He is called ben Ephraim, because He sprang out of the tribe of Ephraim, and became the head of the ten tribes which in the Sacred Scriptures are called by the name of Ephraim,

1 Wünsche’s *Leiden des Messias*, p. 111; Young’s *Christology of the Targums*. 
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because their first King Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, was of the tribe of Ephraim. He is also called ben Joseph, and that not only because He was descended from the tribe of Joseph, but because Joseph was in a manner a type and emblem of the whole house of Israel. Like as Joseph experienced sufferings, was shut up in prison, was for a long time concealed from his brethren, but afterwards prospered and attained to the government, so is it with the ten tribes who are shut up, imprisoned, and concealed from all men. But in the latter days they will, as Joseph, attain to great prosperity and riches.\(^1\)

Very different opinions are entertained among Jewish writers concerning the work and office of Messiah ben Joseph. It is, however, generally agreed that the Messiah ben Joseph will be the forerunner of Messiah ben David, that He will suffer and be put to death. To Him this prophecy in the Fifty-third chapter of Isaiah refers: He is 'the Servant of the Lord,' 'the Man of Sorrows,' spoken of by the prophet. Some describe Him as a warrior, who shall be slain in battle; whilst others regard Him as a voluntary sufferer, who shall expose Himself to sufferings and death for the sake of others. 'The Messiah ben Joseph,' observes an ancient Jewish writer, 'will not come on His own account, but for the sake of Messiah

\(^1\) Wünsche's *Leiden des Messias*, p. 116.
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ben David; for He will sacrifice His life and pour it out in death, and His blood will atone for the people of the Lord.¹ He is represented as living a life of sorrow and hardship, exposed to persecution, sitting in sackcloth and ashes, and at length falling a prey to His enemies—the Gentile nations—and by them put to death; but this death paved the way for the advent and triumph of Messiah ben David. As stated in the lecture, this view of a twofold Messiah is now generally relinquished by Jewish writers, and is chiefly interesting as an ingenious attempt to reconcile the apparent contradiction between the prophetic intimations of a suffering and of a glorified Messiah—intimations which, as we have seen, are blended together in the prophecy under consideration.

¹ Wünsche's Leiden des Messias, p. 115.
LECTURE VII.

INFERENCES FROM THE MESSIAHSHIP OF JESUS.

We have now come to the last lecture of our course, and it may be advisable to review the ground over which we have traversed. Our first lecture was of an introductory character; in it we offered some suggestions on the nature and importance of prophecy in general. In our second lecture, after adverting to the claim of Jesus to be the Messiah, we considered the argument arising from the Messianic prophecies, and showed that these prophecies are contained in records which were indisputably written centuries before the birth of our Lord; and that they are of such a nature that, if fulfilled, this fulfilment could not have been predicted by human sagacity. In our third lecture, we considered the nature of the Messianic prophecies, and proved that there are in the Old Testament primary prophecies concerning the Messiah,—that is, prophecies which apply to Him only, and cannot be predicated of another,—that there is an ideal King who is the subject of
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Hebrew prophecy. Our fourth lecture was devoted to a consideration of the nature and validity of the secondary and typical prophecies. The fifth lecture may be considered as the principal one of the series: it formed the application of the argument; in it we proved, by a variety of particulars, that there is a correspondence between the Messianic prophecies and the life and character of Jesus of Nazareth, and that, consequently, Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah divinely foretold in the Old Testament. And in the sixth lecture we illustrated our argument by a special reference to the remarkable prophecy of the suffering Servant of Jehovah contained in the Fifty-third chapter of Isaiah.

We now proceed, in this concluding lecture, to the application of the whole subject; to advert to those important doctrinal and practical inferences which are deducible from the Messiahship of Jesus. We have demonstrated that Jesus is the Messiah; the important question remains to be discussed, What are the lessons which we learn from this truth?

I. The Old Testament contains a Divine Revelation.

The books of the Old Testament contain many undoubted prophecies of the Messiah,—prophecies of events beyond the reach of human foresight,
uttered centuries before their occurrence, and the accomplishment of which prophecies depended on the Providence of God. These prophecies have been fulfilled in the life and character of Jesus of Nazareth, and in the success of His religion. Here, then, is a clear proof of revelation. These prophecies are from God: He alone could thus foresee and foretell the future, and 'call the things which are not as though they were.' It is also to be observed that the prophets were widely separated from one another in time: a thousand years intervened between Moses and Malachi, yet they all point to the same series of events, and prophesy of the coming of the same person; and although their descriptions of the Messiah are apparently opposite,—at one time celebrating the triumphs of a victorious King, and at another time bewailing the sufferings of a righteous prophet,—yet these descriptions are harmonized in the fulfilment, and all these particulars culminated in the Person of Jesus of Nazareth. There is but one individual in the history of the world to whom these prophecies can apply, 'whose name is great among the Gentiles, and who is the source of salvation to the ends of the earth.' He is the Coming One—the Redeemer of the human race. It may be asserted that such a supernatural interference is impossible—that it is directly at variance with the theory of Providence. But such an a priori consideration cannot
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contradict a plain and indisputable matter of fact. Here are the prophecies: there are the events said to be their fulfilment. We can exercise our own judgment, and unless we be prepared to deny our rational nature, we must admit a supernatural interference.

In the fulfilment of prophecy, we have a proof of the divine origin of Judaism. The prophets were Jewish prophets, and Moses, the author of the Jewish religion, was the greatest of them: they were the revealers of the will of God, and their announcements contained a divine revelation. The prophecies are to us what miracles were to the Jews. The miracles of Moses in Egypt and in the wilderness were the credentials of his authority, the proofs to the Jews that he was their divinely-commissioned leader and legislator. And so the prophecies which we see fulfilled are sensible proofs to us that the Spirit of God was the real inspirer and author of the Mosaic dispensation. Judaism is a revelation from God, and Moses, the mediator of that system of religion, was a teacher sent from God. We must not undervalue the Old Testament; we must not refuse to believe Moses and the prophets; we must not, as is too much the custom of the present day, speak slightingly of the religion of the Jews. It was from God: a preparatory dispensation indeed; in many respects imperfect and defective; a religion suited to the human race in a state of nonage; an instruction by
means of signs and symbols; a pictorial religion, as much addressed to the senses as to the mind, but adapted to the circumstances and condition of the Jewish people. 'All Scripture,' says St. Paul, meaning thereby the books of the Old Testament, for those of the New were not then collected, 'is given by inspiration of God' (2 Tim. iii. 16).

II. The Truth of Christianity.

The fulfilment of the Messianic prophecies is a clear and convincing argument not only in favour of Judaism, but especially in favour of Christianity. Jesus is the Messiah predicted in ancient prophecies, and therefore is that great prophet that should come into the world. The argument amounts almost to a demonstration; it is of a cumulative nature; it rests not on the fulfilment of a few predictions, but on the combination of the prophecies. It may be easy to carp and cavil at some of the predictions, and to assert that they have only a probable reference to Jesus; but in evidence the combination of many probabilities leads to a certainty: indeed, as a profound mathematician has proved, the amount of evidence in favour of the Messiahship of Jesus is almost incalculable.¹ And further, the Messiah was foretold as

¹ See Supplement II. to Lecture V.
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the author of a dispensation of religion, better and more glorious than Judaism; as an illustrious Prophet, like to Moses the founder of a new religious system. Jesus, then, being the Messiah, His religion is thus asserted to be from God. Thus Christianity appears to be no unrelated, disjoined, or isolated part of the divine economy—not an unforeseen system of religious truth superseding Judaism, but that new and better dispensation foretold by the prophets: 'It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my Servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give Thee for a light to the Gentiles, that Thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth' (Isa. lxxix. 6.)

There is a speciality in the evidence of prophecy. It has in some respects all that force which arises from the sight of miracles; it may be called a visible miracle—a sensible proof of the supernatural. We have not here to depend, or at least in a very small degree, on the testimony of others; and thus all those objections which arise from the imperfection of the evidence of testimony, compared with that of experience, lose much of their force, and all those a priori objections to the possibility of a miracle do not touch the question of prophecy. We have the records of the prophecies in our hands; and the facts, said to be their fulfilment, are not only recorded in history, but, as
regards the Messianic kingdom, the publication of the gospel to the Gentiles, and the exaltation of the name of the Messiah are visibly realized prophecies: we can see the fulfilment with our eyes. Moreover, prophecy is a growing evidence. The greater the number of fulfilled prophecies, the more numerous are the proofs. We have now more testimonies from prophecy than the disciples had in the days of our Lord. This, which is especially true of prophecies regarding the state of cities and countries and the condition of the Jewish people, applies also to the Messianic prophecies. All those predictions which foretold the glory of the Messiah, the success of His religion, and the extent of His dominion, have received a more complete verification in our days than when the apostles first began to preach the gospel. Thus there is considerable force in the following observation of Bishop Newton: 'God in His goodness hath afforded to every age sufficient evidence of the truth. Miracles may be said to have been the great proofs of revelation to the first ages who saw them performed; prophecies may be said to be the great proofs of revelation to the last ages who see them fulfilled.'

But, whilst maintaining that the Messianic prophecies and their fulfilment in Jesus afford a powerful argument in favour of Christianity, we

---

1 Newton On the Prophecies, 14th ed. p. 3.
do not overlook the numerous other arguments which combine with it in proving that Christianity is from God. There are the miracles of Jesus and His disciples—miracles, numerous and varied, performed before friends and foes—miracles, the most wonderful and stupendous, which clearly prove the power of God—miracles, in bearing testimony to which thousands upon thousands of witnesses laid down their lives. There is especially the resurrection of Jesus, that crowning miracle, which is as well authenticated as any fact in ancient history, and whose reality is the only rational account that can be given for the very existence of Christianity. There are, in addition to the prophecies concerning the Messiah, many other prophecies of our Lord and His disciples, and especially that most remarkable and minute prophecy concerning the destruction of Jerusalem, the record of the fulfilment of which is contained in the history of Josephus. There is the rapid propagation of the Gospel during the first ages of Christianity, when, notwithstanding the combined opposition of human power, influence, riches, and wisdom, and when one bloody persecution after another threatened to overwhelm it, the Gospel spread and flourished, until the whole Roman Empire submitted to its authority. There are the internal evidences—the morality of the Gospel and the sublimity of its doctrines—taken in connection with
the condition and character of its first writers. And there is the high and holy character of its great Author—the only example of a perfect man, a character original and unparalleled in history, beyond the conception not only of Jewish writers, but of the human mind, and which could only have been painted from the life. These and other arguments go to demonstrate the truth of Christianity, and afford the most complete assurance that 'we have not followed cunningly-devised fables.'

The truth of Christianity is to be judged by the combination of all these evidences. Each evidence taken by itself may be sufficient, but God in His goodness has given such an abundance of proof as to leave those without excuse who reject the Gospel. Besides, one kind of evidence may recommend itself to our mental peculiarities more than another. Indeed, when we take a general view of the evidence, we do not think it any exaggeration to affirm that the proof of Christianity is as strong as that of any other fact which rests on moral evidence. At the same time, it is undoubtedly true that this evidence is of such a nature as gives advantage to the sceptic to attack particular facts, as if Christianity rested on them, rather than on a conjoint view of all the evidence. 'It is easy,' observes Bishop Butler, 'to show, in a short and lively manner, that such and such things are liable to objection, that this and another thing
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is of little weight in itself; but impossible to show, in like manner, the united force of the whole argument in one view.'

The unbelief of the Jews, especially of those who were the contemporaries of Christ and His apostles, is by many considered an objection to the truth of Christianity, and by others as a phenomenon difficult of explanation. The Jews, it is said, had the prophecies in their sacred books; they were conversant with them; they read them every Sabbath in their synagogues; they admitted their Messianic application; but yet they failed to discern any correspondence between them and the life and character of Jesus, and refused to admit His claims to be the Messiah. They were also the eye-witnesses of the miracles of Jesus; but yet these miracles were to them no convincing proof of the truth of His claims: in spite of them they continued in impenitence and unbelief.

The objection is plausible only in appearance. The unbelief of the Jews arose from their misconception of prophecy. They overlooked those prophecies which foretold the sufferings of the Messiah, and attended only to those which predicted the glory of His kingdom; and even these they misinterpreted. The prophets foretold the success of the religion of the Messiah by metaphors borrowed from the glories of earthly kingdoms;

1 Butler's Analogy, Part ii. chap. vii.
and the Jews gave a literal meaning to expressions which were intended to be understood figuratively. According to their interpretation of the Messianic prophecies, the Messiah was to be an earthly Prince who should sit upon the throne of David, rescue the Jews from the bondage and tyranny of Rome, restore the kingdom to Israel, and subdue their enemies. Entertaining such expectations, filled with such hopes, giving such an interpretation to the Messianic prophecies, it is no matter of surprise that they could not see their fulfilment in One whose life and character and fate were so opposite to those of their expected Messiah. The meanness of His birth, the poverty of His earthly condition, the entire absence of all personal ambition, His refusal to nourish their vain expectations or to take any part in their politics, must have disappointed those hopes which His mighty works had inspired, and so blinded their eyes that they could see no signs of the Messiah in the lowly carpenter of Nazareth. The sufferings of our Lord and the ignominy of His death, so far from being any proofs of His Messianic character, as they are to us, were to them evidences of the contrary; that He who expired on the cross could not be that King Messiah who was to occupy the throne of David. And hence, also, whilst the Jews rejected Jesus, they were ever ready to become the dupes of all those impostors and false Christs who
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nourished their dream of an earthly Messiah, and pretended to lead them to victory and freedom.

And not only did the life and character of Jesus run counter to the expectations of the Jews, but His teaching was directly opposed to their national hopes. They prided themselves on being the peculiar people of God: 'to them pertained the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises' (Rom. ix. 4); and they regarded the Gentiles as 'aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise' (Eph. ii. 12). For generations the Church of God had been almost exclusively confined to their nation. How distasteful, then, must Christianity have been to a Jew, proud of his country and his religion, which abolished all those privileges, and established an equality in religious matters between Jew and Gentile! All the attachment of a Jew to his religion, and all the pride of birth, and all the satisfaction arising from a sense of superiority, and the feeling of patriotism which was so strong among the Jewish race, must have revolted against such a doctrine; and hence the Jews who became Christians were regarded as traitors to the religion of their fathers, and branded as apostates to Judaism. We all know the power of prejudice. A man will easily find objections to what he does not wish to believe: he views facts
through a distorted medium. Thus, for example, we are loath to believe the disclosures which revelation makes of future punishment, and in consequence of this we attempt to modify, to explain away, and to distort the plainest declarations of Scripture which bear upon that awful subject. So also was it with the Jewish contemporaries of our Lord. The doctrine of the admission of the Gentiles to equal privileges with them was most distasteful; and therefore a religion which taught this doctrine must have been regarded by them with suspicion, if not with positive aversion.

The statement that the Jews who were the contemporaries of Jesus and His apostles did not believe on Him, must be taken with considerable limitation. The unbelief of the Jews was far from being universal. It is true that, during the life of our Lord, the Jews in general rejected Him. Attracted at first by His miracles, they were afterwards repelled by His sufferings; these were an insurmountable obstacle to their acceptance of Him as the Messiah. But the resurrection of Jesus removed that obstacle: this was to many the solution of their difficulties. Hence we find that after that event multitudes of Jews believed on Jesus; a great company even of the priests became obedient to the faith; believers multiplied in Jerusalem daily; and the Christians were numbered by thousands, even before the Gospel
was preached to the Gentiles. 'Thou seest, brother,' said St. James to St. Paul, 'how many myriads of Jews there are which believe; and they are all zealous of the law' (Acts xxi. 20).

But the Jews, it is objected, still continue in unbelief, notwithstanding their possession and acknowledgment of the Messianic prophecies. The reasons of this are not far to seek. The same motives which were the cause of the unbelief of the Jews in the days of our Lord, still actuate the nation in the present day. They deny the doctrines of substitution, of a suffering Messiah, and of His divine nature; like their ancestors, they nourish the expectations of a temporal Messiah, of a King who shall exalt their nation; and they still regard themselves as the peculiar favourites of heaven. Now it is evident that so long as they entertain these views of the character of the Messiah as a national King, and nourish the expectations of national greatness, they cannot see the fulfilment of their prophecies in Jesus, and will not accept Him as their Messiah. Besides, the Jews have been educated in hostility to Christianity; their prejudices against it are the growth of centuries, and hence the extreme difficulty, humanly speaking, of their conversion. Nor must it be forgotten that the cruel treatment they have received from Christians, the terrible sufferings to which they were exposed in the Middle
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Ages on account of their religion, the contempt with which they have for centuries been regarded,—being continually trodden under foot as if they were an inferior race,—must have embittered their hatred to the Christian faith, and barred their hearts against the entrance of the truth. It must, however, be remembered that, notwithstanding their rejection of Jesus as the Messiah, they admit the existence and authority of the prophecies; they receive them as genuine and divinely inspired, precisely as we do; and the question in dispute is whether they or we are right in their interpretation; and surely we are as able as they to judge of the application and fulfilment of the prophecies.

In point of fact, the unbelief of the Jews, instead of being any argument against Christianity, is an evidence in its favour. 'Their infidelity,' observes Pascal, 'is one of the real foundations of our faith. Here is the miracle, that the same people who were so violent lovers of the predictions should be no less violent haters and opposers of the accomplishments; and that this very hatred and opposition should itself be one of the chief predictions.'\(^1\) Their unbelief was foretold by their own prophets, as well as by our Lord and His apostles, and therefore is no unforeseen event, but a confirmation of prophecy. The Jews are a standing miracle of the truth of Christianity—a visible

---

\(^1\) Pascal's *Pensées*, Part ii. art. viii. 6.
prophecy, which all may observe and ponder over.¹

Over and above these historical and moral evidences, there is an experimental evidence, which is in some respects the most convincing. We can apply to Christianity the test of experience. It is a remedy for moral evil, and it has proved its efficacy in numberless instances. We have only attentively to consider the character of those who are undoubtedly living under its influence, in order to see what beneficial effect it has had upon them—how it elevates, purifies, and strengthens them; delivers them from selfishness; fills them with peace in believing, charity toward men, confidence in God, and cheerfulness in suffering; forms within them a temper similar to that of the Saviour; supports them in the hour of death, and inspires them with the hope of a happy immortality beyond the grave. But the greatest evidence of all is when a man experiences the truth and power of the Gospel in his own heart, in destroying all that is bad, and false, and wrong, and in producing all that is good, and just, and true. He has the witness in himself; he believes in the efficacy of the remedy, because he himself has experienced its curative power; and he thus assents to Christianity with a conviction which no sophism, however
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subtle, can shake; he knows and feels the truth. 'If any man,' says our Lord, 'will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself' (John vii. 17).

III. The Essential Connection between Judaism and Christianity.

We have seen that in the Old Testament there are numerous prophecies concerning the Messiah and His kingdom; and that in the New Testament there is a record of their fulfilment in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ, and in the dispensation of His Gospel. Thus there is a remarkable chain of prophecy which unites the Old Testament with the New. Judaism and Christianity are closely connected. They are not, as some suppose, two different religions founded on different principles, but parts of the same religion. Judaism contains the elements of Christianity: it is, as St. Paul expresses it, 'a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ.' The Gospel is to be found in the law of Moses, as well as in the writings of the Evangelists. The Mosaic economy and Christianity are two dispensations or revelations of the same truths. In the one these truths are revealed in types and symbols, and in the other in plain language. The same Spirit of Christ pervades both. He who spoke by the
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prophets inspired the apostles. Judaism is but the
germ of Christianity, and Christianity is the de-
velopment of Judaism. Judaism is Christianity
in the bud, and Christianity is Judaism in its fulness
and fruit. 'The Old Testament,' as St. Augustine
expresses it, 'is just a prophecy of the New.' In
the words of De Wette, a most impartial judge,
and who certainly laboured under no precon-
ceptions in favour of the Messiahship of Jesus:
'Christianity sprang out of Judaism. Long before
Christ appeared, the world was prepared for His
appearance. The entire Old Testament is a great
prophecy, a great type of Him who was to come,
and has come. Who can deny that the holy seers
of the Old Testament saw in spirit the advent of
Christ long before He came, and in prophetic
anticipations, sometimes more, sometimes less
clear, descried the new doctrine? Christianity
lay in Judaism as leaves and fruit do in the seed,
though certainly it needed the divine sun to bring
them forth.'

The connection between Judaism and Christianity
will be still more clearly seen when we take into
account the secondary and typical Messianic pro-
phecies. These we are now at liberty to employ
as real prophecies of the Messiah on the authority
of Christ and His apostles. In proving the Mes-
siahship of Jesus, we purposely abstained from

1 Quoted by Fairbairn in his Typology, vol. i. p. 55, 6th ed.
their use; but now, having proved that Jesus is the Messiah, we are entitled to employ at least those secondary and typical prophecies, which are affirmed by Himself and His apostles to be applicable to Him, as decidedly Messianic, and as intended by the Spirit of God to foretell the coming of the Messiah, or to describe His character and the nature of His kingdom. These prophecies are numerous. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews plainly intimates that the whole of the Jewish ceremonial law, with all its rites, and washings, and sacrifices, was typical of the gospel dispensation. Many of the predictions of the prophets, and many of the Psalms of David, are secondary prophecies of the Messiah. Many of the historical persons of the Old Testament, as Melchisedec, Moses, David, and Solomon, are types of the Messiah. Many of the events of Jewish history, as the passage of the Red Sea, the paschal lamb, the brazen serpent, the manna from heaven, and the water from the rock, prefigured gospel transactions. So that, taking all these things into consideration, it is hardly an exaggeration to affirm that the rites and ceremonies of the law are types and shadows of better things under the Gospel; that the historical parts were written for our admonition, on whom the ends of the world should come; that the prophecies minister to our comfort and hope; that the devotional portions represent
the experience of believers in every age; and these four, the ceremonial, the historical, the prophetical, and the devotional, constitute the whole of the Old Testament. Jesus, then, is the subject of all prophecy: to Him and to His Messianic kingdom do the prophecies of the Old Testament, either directly or indirectly, apply. The fate of the nations of the world is only mentioned in connection with Israel, and Israel is the Church of the Messiah. 'By Christ,' observes Keil, 'prophecy (and by prophecy, Judaism) is raised from its temporary form to its essence, and through Him the whole earth becomes a Canaan.' Thus, then, all is one great scheme, wherein God works out for His people an eternal salvation. 'O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been His counsellor!' (Rom. xi. 33, 34).

We may discern here the position which the Messiah, that is, the Lord Jesus Christ, occupies in the Old Testament. There is this peculiarity in the books of the Old Testament found in no other writings, that they all point forward to the same illustrious person who was in future ages to appear in this world. A better dispensation of religion is held forth, and at the head of that dispensation, as its Author, an illustrious prophet is predicted. A
kingdom is to be erected by the God of heaven, over which an Anointed King is to be placed. There are constant allusions to this illustrious Prophet and King; they pervade the whole of the prophecies of the Old Testament: the Messiah is the great burden of Jewish prophecy, and His exploits the great subject of Jewish song. He is ever placed in the foreground of the picture. He is the great ideal King who is to sit upon the throne of David, and to rule over the house of Israel for ever. Kings fall down before Him, and princes kiss His feet. His dominion is commensurate with the world, and perpetual as the sun in the heavens. All the efforts of His enemies end in confusion and in shame. 'He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in derision.' At other times He is the mysterious sufferer: He bears the sins of His people: He is wounded for their transgressions: He makes reconciliation for iniquity. But however He is depicted, it is one and the same person, the great Hero of Hebrew prophecy. The Lord Jesus Christ is as much the subject of the Old Testament as of the New: the law and the prophets, as Moses and Elias on the mount of transfiguration, do homage to Him, for He is the substance of the types of the law, and the subject of the predictions of the prophets.
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IV. The Dignity of the Messiah.

Seeing that the Messiah is that mysterious Being, of whom all the prophets bore witness, the great centre subject of the Old Testament, the ideal King, the Anointed Prophet, the Priest upon his throne, the Saviour of Israel, we cannot regard Him as a mere prophet, mighty in word and deed, or only as equal to Moses, the greatest among the Jewish prophets, or, as He Himself testifies of the Baptist, more than a prophet, but still human. We cannot help feeling that there must be something supernatural about so illustrious a Being. And, when we search minutely into the prophecies of the Old Testament, we find these anticipations more than realized. The Messiah is there described in the most exalted and august terms—in terms only applicable to the Supreme Being, and which cannot without blasphemy be applied to another. In the Messianic Psalms, He is introduced as the Son of God, and held forth as the object of supreme worship: 'Kiss the Son, lest He be angry, and ye perish from the way' (Ps. ii. 12). He is expressly called God: 'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre' (Ps. xlv. 6). And He is described as being at once David's Son and David's Lord: 'The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit Thou at my right
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hand, until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool’ (Ps. cx. 1). Isaiah represents Him as ‘Immanuel,’ God with us (Isa. vii. 14). He invests Him with the titles and perfections of God: ‘Unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given: and the government shall be upon His shoulder: and His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace’ (Isa. ix. 6). And again: ‘The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God’ (Isa. xl. 3). Jeremiah represents Him as Jehovah our Righteousness (Jer. xxiii. 6). Micah asserts that ‘His goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting’ (Micah v. 2). In the prophecies of Zechariah, His divine nature is frequently mentioned: He is the Jehovah who is valued at thirty pieces of silver: ‘And Jehovah said unto me, Cast it unto the potter: a goodly price that I was prized at of them’ (Zech. xi. 13); the Jehovah who is pierced: ‘They shall look upon me whom they have pierced’ (Zech. xii. 10); and the equal or fellow of Jehovah: ‘Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith Jehovah of hosts’ (Zech. xiii. 7). And in the prophecies of Malachi, the divine nature of the Messiah is clearly stated: ‘Behold, I will send my Messenger, and He shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly
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come to His temple, even the Messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in' (Mal. iii. 1). We must also take into consideration the probability, founded on the position which the Messiah occupies in the Old Testament dispensation, and on the teaching of the New Testament, that the Messiah is the Jehovah-Angel who so frequently appeared to the patriarchs, guided the Israelites in the wilderness, and announced Himself to Moses in the bush as 'the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, the great I AM THAT I AM.'

Thus the same mysterious doctrine of the divinity of Christ, which is so explicitly taught us by St. Paul and St. John in the New Testament, is not obscurely shadowed forth by the prophets in the Old. The Messiah, the future Deliverer of His people, is there represented as uniting in His person the natures of God and man. We have no words to express a higher dignity than this: the mind cannot elevate itself to a loftier conception; it is an unspeakable mystery, which baffles our faculties to explain, and which is the cause of adoring wonder to the higher intelligences. What a glorious view is here presented to us of our blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, the Messiah of the Jews, the Redeemer of the world, at once the Son of God and the Son of man! Let us adore His condescension; let us be attracted by His love.

1 Supplement I.
The doctrine of the divinity of the Messiah is indeed denied by all recent Jewish writers. The Messiah whom they expect is a mere man, exalted, indeed, above other men in wisdom and holiness, endowed with divine gifts, but still human—a prophet superior to Moses, a king greater than David. Indeed, the Christian doctrine of the divinity of Christ is one of the great obstacles to the conversion of the Jews. They regard it as the peculiar mission of their nation to testify to the unity of God, and to protest against the polytheism of the Gentiles. Thus in their afternoon service there is the following prayer: 'Guardian of a singular people, preserve the remnant of a singular people, and suffer not a singular nation to be destroyed, who acknowledge the unity of Thy name, saying, The Lord is our God, the Lord is a unity.' And in their morning service there is the following declaration: 'Lo, we are ready, all of us together, both day and night, with our mouths and our hearts, to testify of Thy unity, and that Thou alone art God. Thou art our God, and we are Thy servants, and the witnesses of Thy unity.' Hence any opinion which might seem in any degree to affect the doctrine of the divine unity, is regarded by the Jews with peculiar abhorrence; and as they consider the doctrine of the divinity of Christ in that light, it is especially obnoxious to them. 'Of all the Christian doctrines,' observes Dr. Adler,
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'which I have brought before you, and which, in the name of God's truth, I have felt myself compelled to denounce, this dogma, that the Nazarene was literally the Son of God, is surely the most monstrous, the most repugnant to reason. The all-holy God, the essence of infinite moral perfection, whom the seraphim tremble to approach, "the God so pure that the stars are not pure in His sight," the God whom holy writ brings before us as exalted so infinitely high above all the imperfections inherent in man's nature, the Holy One who has said, "To whom, then, will ye liken me, or shall I be equal to?" that same God is dragged down from heaven and likened unto man.'

Now this objection is certainly not to be met by any attempt to modify or conceal this great fundamental doctrine of Christianity. Nor can we here appeal to the full and ample proofs of the divinity of Christ given us in the Gospel of St. John, or in the Epistles of St. Paul; for the validity of such an argument the Jews will not admit. If we would convince a Jew, we must make it clear to him that the doctrine of the divinity of Christ is not at variance with the doctrine of the divine unity; that those who believe in a trinity of persons also believe in a unity of substance; and that although the divine nature must needs be incomprehensible, yet there is no contradiction in affirming a plurality.

1 Adler's Course of Sermons, p. 62.
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in unity. But especially we must show, by a deduction of passages from the Messianic prophecies which assert the divinity of the Messiah, that this doctrine is contained in their own Scriptures; and that, if they were to take an enlarged view of the dispensation of God, they would perceive that it was the Messiah who was with the Church in the wilderness, and the instrument of divine communications made to their fathers.

The question arises, Was this denial of the divinity of the Messiah also the creed of ancient Judaism? In particular, did the Jews in the time of our Lord call in question the Messiah's divine Sonship? The Jews, indeed, from an attentive study of their prophets, might have attained to the conviction that the Messiah was a divine Being; but the question is not what the Jews ought to have believed, but what they actually did believe. Were their views of the dignity of the Messiah the same as those of Christians? Did they, in general, regard Him as the Son of God?

This question is somewhat difficult to answer. There are opposing testimonies, showing that there was a diversity of opinion among the Jews. But still we think that, on a careful examination of the gospels and apocryphal books, this question must upon the whole be answered in the negative,—that

1 For this diversity of opinion, see Kuinoel's 'Prolegomena to St. John,' Novi Testamenti Libri Historici, vol. ii. pp. 284-286.
the Jews in the time of our Lord, in general, though there were exceptions, did not believe in the divinity of their Messiah. During the lifetime of our Lord, those who among the multitude acknowledged His Messianic character, hailed Him as 'the Son of David, who cometh in the name of the Lord' (Matt. xxi. 9). When our Lord asked the Pharisees, 'What think ye of the Messiah? whose Son is He?' they did not reply, 'The Son of God,' but, 'The Son of David' (Matt. xxii. 42). The Jews repeatedly took up stones to stone Jesus when He appeared to them to assert His equality with God (John x. 30, 31). Indeed, the assertion of His divine Sonship was the ground of His condemnation. It was not because He claimed to be the Messiah; there was nothing treasonable or blasphemous in that: the Jews themselves expected the appearance of the Messiah, and hence they could not regard the assertion of it as in itself culpable; it behoved them to examine into such claims. But it was otherwise when Jesus advanced the higher claim, and asserted that He was the Son of God, and thus claimed equality with God: this was regarded by the Jews as blasphemy, and on this ground He was condemned. When, in answer to the high priest, He affirmed that He was the Son of God, the Sanhedrin condemned Him on His own confession: 'They said, What need we any further witness? for we ourselves
have heard of His own mouth' (Luke xxii. 71).
‘We have a law,’ said they to Pilate, ‘and by our
law He ought to die, because He made Himself
the Son of God’ (John xix. 7). This proves that the
Jews in general did not regard the Messiah to be
the Son of God, but looked upon such a claim as a
blasphemous assertion. It would appear that even
the apostles and the immediate disciples of our
Lord, before His resurrection, were but imperfectly
acquainted with the divine nature of their Master.
On a few rare occasions we find them acknowledg-
ing His divine Sonship, as St. Peter when he made
the great confession, and the disciples in general
when He stilled the storm on the lake. Their
continued intercourse with Him must also certainly
have increased their awe and veneration, and must
have convinced them that there was something
supernatural about His person. Especially this
must have been the case with the three favoured
disciples who witnessed His transfiguration; but
still, though they recognised Him as a superhuman
being, they do not seem to have risen to the idea
that He was actually ‘God manifest in the flesh.’
Even after His confession, St. Peter does not regard
Him as so divine that he dares not venture to
rebuke Him and to call in question His declara-
tion. Indeed, it is difficult to see how, if they
believed in His divine nature, they could have
held familiar intercourse with Him. It was not
until after His resurrection that Thomas acknowledged Him as his Lord and his God. Hitherto He was to them Messiah, the Son of David; but now their thoughts were raised to Him as their exalted and risen Lord, as Messiah, the Son of God.

We have a corroboration of this view in the dialogue of Justin Martyr with Trypho the Jew. Justin Martyr maintains the divinity of Christ. Trypho replies that the divinity of the Messiah was not a Jewish, but a Christian doctrine. 'When,' he observes, 'you say that the Messiah existed as God before all ages, then that He submitted to be born and become man, yet that He is not man born of men, this assertion appears to me to be not merely paradoxical, but absurd.' He then expresses the general belief of his nation on this point: 'We Jews all expect the Messiah will be a man born of men, and that Elijah, when he comes, will anoint Him. But if this man appear to be the Messiah, He must certainly be known as man born of men; but from the circumstance that Elijah has not yet come, I infer that this man is not the Messiah.' A similar statement is found in Origen's dispute with Celsus. 'A Jew,' observes Origen, 'would not acknowledge that any prophet said that God's Son would come; for the expression which they employ is, The Christ of God will come. And they often dispute with us about the

1 *Dialogue with Trypho*, chaps. xlviii., xlix.
Son of God, affirming that no such Person exists, or was made the subject of prophecy.'\(^1\) So also Orobio, a learned Jew of the seventeenth century, in his controversy with Limborch,\(^2\) affirms that 'if a prophet or, were that possible, the Messiah Himself were to work miracles, and yet lay claim to divinity, he ought to be put to death by stoning, as one guilty of blasphemy.'\(^3\)

As already intimated, there are some passages adduced from ancient Jewish writings which give a somewhat different view of the subject, and seem to recognise the divinity of the Messiah; but even these passages are not distinct. In the Book of Enoch, the Messiah is called the Son of God; and there are in it indications of His pre-existence.\(^4\) In the Second Book of Esdras, this title, 'Son of God,' occurs six times, and sometimes in combination with the title Messiah; as, for example, in that celebrated passage, to which we have elsewhere referred: 'For my Son Jesus (or, according to the

\(^{1}\) Against Celsus, chap. xlix.

\(^{2}\) Amica collatio cum erudito Judaeo, 1687.

\(^{3}\) Quoted by Bishop Wordsworth, in Smith's Dictionary, article 'Son of God,' vol. ii. p. 1357. The reader is especially referred to this article for some excellent remarks on this subject. For an opposite view of the subject, see Dr. Pye Smith's Scripture Testimony, vol. i. book ii. chap. vii. sec. v.

\(^{4}\) 'Before the sun and the signs were created, His name was invoked in the presence of the Lord of Spirits' (Enoch xlviii. 3). 'I and my Son will for ever hold communion with them in the paths of uprightness, while they are still alive' (Enoch civ. 2). Lawrence's Enoch, pp. 48, 161, 3d ed.
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ancient reading, Messiah) shall be revealed with those that be with Him; and they that remain shall rejoice within four hundred years. After these years shall my Son Messiah die, and all men that have life' (2 Esdras vii. 28, 29). But the most explicit assertions are to be found in that remarkable cabbalistic book, the Zohar. In this book the divine nature of the Messiah is distinctly asserted; the various titles of God are applied to Him. The learned Schöttgen made the Zohar a subject of special study; and the following is his summary of its views regarding the dignity of the Messiah: 'With respect to the names of the Messiah, He is expressly called in the book Zohar by the incommunicable name Jehovah, the Angel of God, the Shekinah or Divine Glory, the Mediator, Michael the Archangel, the Angel of the covenant, the Word of the Lord, God the Holy and the Blessed, the Image of God, the Brightness of His Glory, the Lord of hosts, the Son of God, the Son of the Most High, the Faithful Shepherd, the Lord of ministering angels, the Angel Redeemer.' The near approach of some of these titles and expressions to those used by the apostles is certainly very remarkable.

1 The other passages are xiii. 32, 37, 52, xiv. 9.
2 Smith's Testimony to the Messiah, vol. i. pp. 390, 391.
3 From the near approach to the Christian doctrines, some suppose that the Zohar was the work of a Judaizing Christian; but this supposition is now generally discarded (see Wünsche's Die Leiden des Messias, p. 95).
V. The Purpose for which the Messiah came into this World.

It must have been for the most glorious of all purposes that the Messiah, the Son of God, came into this world. The Jews indeed, suffering from oppression and wrong, and filled with patriotic feelings, were naturally attracted to those prophecies which announced the Messiah as the Anointed King, the Deliverer of His people, the Ruler of the nations. But it was not to fulfill such carnal expectations that Jesus, as the Messiah, came into this world. It was not to deliver an oppressed nation from civil tyranny, to break the iron yoke of Rome, to restore the Jews to their ancient freedom, and to bring back the heroic times of David or the peaceful days of Solomon. The purpose which the Lord Jesus Christ came to accomplish was far more noble and glorious and sublime. He came to deliver a world from ruin; to rescue humanity from that gulf of sin and ignorance and crime into which it had sunk; to elevate and purify human nature; and to restore the glories and the bliss of former innocence. He was to be the Deliverer not of one particular nation, but the Saviour of the human race, the God of the Gentiles as well as of the Jews.

1 Supplement II.
But the prophets foretold not only the glory of the Messiah, but also His sufferings. It is true that the Messiah is held forth more frequently as the ideal King than as the Sufferer, and that those predictions which referred to His sufferings were, for reasons already assigned, overlooked by the Jews. But the sufferings of the Messiah formed an undoubted portion of Hebrew prophecy, and are there represented as of a substitutionary nature. The prophets foretold that the Messiah would suffer as the Substitute of the people. There is no single passage in the New Testament where the vicarious nature of the sufferings of Christ is more plainly taught than in the Fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. In this remarkable prophecy it has been remarked that there are no less than twelve intimations that His sufferings were for our sakes: 'He hath borne our griefs;' 'He hath carried our sorrows;' 'He was wounded for our transgressions;' 'He was bruised for our iniquities;' 'The chastisement of our peace was upon Him;' 'By His stripes we are healed;' 'The Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all;' 'He was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people was He stricken:' 'When Thou shalt make His soul an offering for sin, He shall see His seed;' 'By His knowledge shall my righteous Servant justify many: for He shall bear their iniquities;' 'He was numbered with the trans-
gressors;' 'He bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.' And still more clearly is the expiatory nature of the sufferings of the Messiah revealed in the ceremonial law of the Jews. All their bloody rites and sacrifices, the enactments for which constitute the greater portion of the Mosaic law, were types and emblems of that one great sacrifice for sin which the Messiah was to offer up—prefigurations of the death of the Lord Jesus Christ on the cross—all assertions of that principle which lies at the root of vicarious substitution, that 'without shedding of blood there can be no remission' (Heb. ix. 22). Thus, then, the doctrine of the atonement is taught in the Old Testament as well as in the New: the prophets unite with the apostles in asserting that the sufferings of Christ were substitutionary and expiatory. This is indeed the great characteristic of revelation—that which lies at the foundation of all the disclosures of God: the chief doctrine of Judaism as seen in its sacrifices, as well as of Christianity. 'I delivered unto you,' said St. Paul, 'first of all,' as the doctrine of primary importance, 'that Christ,' the Messiah, 'died for our sins according to the Scriptures,' according to the declarations of the Old Testament (1 Cor. xv. 3).

As recent Jewish writers deny the divinity of the Messiah, so they also deny the doctrine of

1 Wünsche's *Die Leiden des Messias*, p. 35.
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substitution. Notwithstanding the prominence given to the doctrine of the atonement in the Levitical sacrifices, it forms no part of the creed of the modern Jews. It is regarded by them as opposed alike to the mercy and to the justice of God. The Jew does not feel the need of any other righteousness than his own: his repentance, if sincere, will, he believes, avail with God for his forgiveness; he still stands on the ground of justification by the works of the law. 'We have,' says Dr. Adler, 'no mediator to save us from the effects of our guilt but our own sincere repentance, by which we hope to obtain the forgiveness of our God.' And hence also the sacrifices under the law were not vicarious, there was no transference of the sins of the offerer to the head of the victim: 'The only value and efficacy of the offering consisted in this, that it proved the sacrificer to be repentant; it was an outward test and sign of his sincerity.' How the whole sacrificial rites of the Mosaic law with their sin-offerings and trespass-offerings, and especially the ceremonies on the great day of atonement, can be so explained as to be divested of their vicarious nature, it is difficult to see; it may be that the long cessation of sacrifices among the Jews has diminished in their eyes their importance, and obscured their significance.

1 Adler's Course of Sermons, pp. 37, 39.
And now, what is the grand conclusion which should be deduced from the whole discussion? What important practical lessons are we to learn? Surely it is the supreme importance of a personal acceptance of Christianity. Christianity is a revelation from God; it is contained in the Jewish law as well as in the Gospel; it is the end of all history, the result to which all the movements of Providence lead; it comes to us with all the authority of God and all the importance of salvation. Let us feel its truth. Let us realize, in our own hearts and consciences, that there is a personal God at whose tribunal we must one day appear, and a personal Christ who has come into this world of sin and death in order to redeem it. How much does it become us not merely speculatively to assent to the dogma that Jesus is the Messiah, but to submit ourselves to Him as our Saviour and our King, who as our Saviour died to atone for our sins, and who now as our King rules over the souls of men! 'To Him gave all the prophets witness, that through His name whosoever believeth on Him shall receive remission of sins.'
In our lecture we observed that 'we must take into consideration the probability, founded on the position which the Messiah occupies in the Old Testament dispensation, and on the teaching of the New Testament, that the Messiah is the Jehovah-Angel who so frequently appeared to the patriarchs, guided the Israelites in the wilderness, and announced Himself to Moses in the bush as the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, the great I AM THAT I AM.' This is a statement which requires additional remarks in the way of proof or illustration, and is a subject of considerable interest and difficulty.

In the early historical books of the Old Testament, there is frequent mention of this Jehovah-Angel appearing to the patriarchs, receiving from them divine homage, and using the name and titles of God. These appearances are numerous. We can only make a selection, referring our readers to Hengstenberg's Christology, and Dr. Pye Smith's Scriptural Testimony to the Messiah, where the subject is discussed at considerable length.¹

The Angel of Jehovah, we are informed, appeared to Hagar: 'and she called the name of Jehovah that spake unto her, Thou God seest me' (Gen. xvi. 13). On several occasions this appearance was vouchsafed to Abraham. When he interceded for Sodom, there appears to have been a visible manifestation of Jehovah. Three angels in human form appeared to him: two went toward Sodom, the third remained and revealed Himself to Abraham as Jehovah: 'Abraham,' we read, 'stood yet before Jehovah' (Gen. xviii. 22). And when the same patriarch was about to offer up his son, the Angel of Jehovah interfered in these words: 'Now I know that thou fearest God, seeing that thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, from me. By myself have I sworn, saith Jehovah, for because thou hast done this thing . . . in blessing I will bless thee' (Gen. xxii. 12, 16, 17). The same mysterious Being appeared to Jacob when he was alarmed at the approach of Esau: 'And Jacob called the name of the place Peniel: for I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved' (Gen. xxxii. 30). And in blessing Joseph and his sons, he refers to the special providence of the Jehovah-Angel: 'He blessed Joseph, and said, God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God which fed me all my life long unto this day, the Angel which delivered me from all evil, bless the lads' (Gen. xlviii. 15, 16).
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The Jehovah-Angel appeared to Moses in a flame of fire, out of the midst of the bush, and announced Himself as the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Ex. iii. 6). He it was who guided the Israelites in the wilderness: 'Behold, I send an Angel before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Beware of Him, and obey His voice, provoke Him not; for He will not pardon your transgressions: for my name is in Him. . . . Mine Angel shall go before thee' (Ex. xxiii. 20-23). To Joshua He appeared as the Captain of the Lord's host, and demanded the same reverence from him as He did from Moses at the burning bush: 'Loose thy shoe from off thy foot; for the place whereon thou standest is holy' (Josh. v. 15). The Angel of the Lord appeared to Manoah and his wife, revealing Himself to them by the name of Wonderful, and ascending into heaven in the flame of fire, which arose from the burnt-offering: 'And Manoah said unto his wife We shall surely die, because we have seen God' (Judg. xiii. 22). So also in the prophecies of Zechariah there is frequent mention of the Jehovah-Angel. He is represented as the Messenger of God, as assisting Joshua the high priest in his work of rebuilding the temple, and contending with Satan, the great enemy of God and man. And in that very remarkable Messianic prophecy in Malachi, the Messiah is announced as the Angel
of the covenant: 'Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to His temple, even the Messenger (or Angel) of the covenant, whom ye delight in' (Mal. iii. 1).

Thus, then, it is undeniable that there is a mysterious personage, mentioned in the Old Testament as the Jehovah-Angel. He is invested with the attributes of Jehovah; He performs the works of God, forgives sins, and exercises a special providence; He is worshipped by those to whom He appears; He is the Leader of the Israelites in the wilderness, and appropriates to Himself the incommunicable name, 'I AM THAT I AM.' Now the question is, Who is this person? Three answers have been given to this inquiry.

The first answer is, that the Jehovah-Angel is a created angel, the messenger of Jehovah. He uses the name of God, and speaks with His authority, because he is His messenger, just as an ambassador represents his sovereign. This opinion is adopted by Origen, Augustine, and Jerome, among the Fathers; and by Dr. Samuel Clarke, Episcopius, Grotius, Le Clerc, Meyer, Delitzsch, Hofmann, and Pusey. 'The angel of Jehovah,' observes Delitzsch, 'is an angel whom God employs as the organ of His own self-attestation.' Hofmann supposes

1 Delitzsch, *Commentary on Genesis.*
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that it is a particular angel, that it is 'always one and the same spirit who speaks and acts in the name of God.' There are, however, several considerations which militate against this opinion. It is not countenanced in the Scriptures. There is no intimation in any of the above passages that this Being is acting for and personating another, that He is not speaking in His own name and authority; unless, indeed, the title Angel or Messenger be regarded as such an intimation. Nor was it the custom among the ancients for messengers to use the names and titles of their employers; as, for example, ambassadors calling themselves by the names of their kings. Besides, the words and actions of the Jehovah-Angel, were He only a created angel, would inevitably mislead those to whom He was sent. He assumes, without any qualification, the titles of God; He demands and accepts religious homage; He announces Himself as the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Those to whom He appeared could not help believing that He was a divine Being, and confessing that they had seen God. His acceptance of worship is contrasted with the conduct of the angel in the

1 Weissagung und Erfüllung. This is also the view of Dr. Pusey. 'He is called,' he observes, 'not as an epithet, but as a description of his being, the Angel of the Lord; therefore it seems to me most probable that he was a created angel.' He supposes that most probably he is the same as Michael the Archangel (Lectures on Daniel, pp. 520, 524).
Messianic Prophecies.

Apocalypse. When John fell down to worship him, the angel prevented him, saying, 'See thou do it not: for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book: worship God' (Rev. xxii. 9).

The second answer is somewhat more plausible. According to this view, the Jehovah-Angel is not a person, but, like the Shekinah, the visible symbol of the presence of God. There is here a theophany: God here graciously reveals Himself to His worshippers; He gives them a sensible token of His presence, as, for example, the burning bush, the pillar of cloud, or the human form. This view appears to have been the opinion of Philo; and it is also adopted by Rosenmüller, Gesenius, De Wette, and Belsham. 'The Angel of God,' observes Gesenius, 'is nothing else than that secret and invisible Deity which now became manifest to the eyes of mortals.' 'The angels,' observes De Wette, 'are personifications of natural forces, or of the extraordinary works and ordinances of God; hence "the Angel of Jehovah," as having nothing personal in Himself, is interchanged with Jehovah or God.'

Those, indeed, who believe that God manifests Himself by and through His Son, that Christ is the visible image of the invisible God, the true Shekinah, admit in that sense the truth of the explanation, that we have in the Jehovah-Angel a
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visible manifestation of the Godhead. But this is not the sense intended by those who advance this explanation. The hypothesis entirely denies the personality of the Jehovah-Angel: He is regarded as a mere token or sign of the divine presence. In the instances adduced, however, the Jehovah-Angel is represented as a person. He speaks, reasons, moves, walks, commands, and acts. And, besides, in many of these passages He is expressly distinguished from God, even as the person sent is distinguished from Him who sent him. For example, He was the Angel whom God appointed in His stead to be the Leader of the Israelites: 'Behold, mine Angel shall go before thee' (Ex. xxxii. 34).

The third answer is that the Jehovah-Angel is the Son of God, the second Person of the Godhead, the Messiah of the Jews, who afterwards appeared in this world as the Lord Jesus Christ. This opinion is the doctrine generally received by the Christian Church. It is adopted by Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Eusebius, Chrysostom, and almost all the Fathers. Justin Martyr especially insists upon it in his controversy with Trypho the Jew. Thus he asserts that the Angel who appeared to Abraham under the oak of Mamre was God, and that He was distinguished from God the Father.¹ This

¹ Dialogue with Trypho, chap. lvi.
view has also been adopted in recent times by Bengel, Nitzsch, Lange, Stier, Hengstenberg, Pye Smith, Wordsworth, Alford, and numerous other eminent critics. The Jehovah-Angel is called God, speaks with the authority of God, demands and receives the worship of God; and yet He is distinguished from God as His Messenger or Angel. Now the Christian doctrine of the distinction of persons in the unity of the Godhead is the explanation of this. The Lord Jesus Christ is the Messenger of God, the Angel of the covenant, the manifestation of the divine perfections, 'the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of His Person.' He is the Ruler of the Church both under the Old and under the New Testament dispensation: the Head of the Jewish as well as of the Christian Church.

When we direct our attention to the New Testament, we find this view of the subject, namely, that the Jehovah-Angel is the Lord Jesus Christ, supported, though at the same time we admit that it is not very prominently advanced. Christ is represented as the 'Sent of God,' as the Apostle or Messenger as well as the High Priest of our profession (Heb. iii. 1). The most explicit statement bearing on this subject is that made by St. Paul in 1 Cor. x. He there not merely asserts that Christ was the spiritual Rock that followed the Israelites in the wilderness, but that He was
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the Jehovah whom they tempted or provoked: 'Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents' (1 Cor. x. 9). The most obvious meaning of this declaration is that Christ was the Leader of the Israelites in the wilderness, and consequently the Jehovah-Angel. The only passage in the New Testament which seems to favour the opposite opinion, is that contained in the speech of St. Stephen. In alluding to the appearance of the Jehovah-Angel to Moses, he speaks of Him simply as an angel: 'There appeared unto him in the wilderness of Mount Sinai an angel in a flame of fire in a bush' (Acts vii. 30); for it is now generally admitted that the word Kypioú in the textus receptus is not in the original. But this does not necessarily militate against the above view of the nature of the Jehovah-Angel. St. Stephen goes on to say that 'the voice of the Lord came unto Moses, saying, I am the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob; and that the Lord said to him, Put off thy shoes from thy feet'—words which at least admit of the interpretation that the Angel was identical with the Lord who spoke. And, besides, the Mosaic narrative is distinctly in favour of the view that it is the Jehovah-Angel who is here intended.

When we turn our attention to the views of Jewish writers on this subject, we meet with much
discrepancy and many discordant opinions, so that it is difficult to find out whether they regarded the Jehovah-Angel as a person, or merely as the symbol of the Divinity. One very prevalent opinion was, that He was the same with the Shekinah. 'The Angel of Jehovah,' says the book Zohar, 'who appeared to Moses is the Shekinah.'\(^1\) In the Middle Ages the rabbinical writers gave to the Jehovah-Angel the title of Metatron, and seem to have regarded Him as the Mediator between God and man. They distinguished between a superior and inferior Metatron. The inferior Metatron is by some supposed to be Enoch, and to him this appellation was given in the Targum of the pseudo-Jonathan. 'And Enoch served in the truth before the Lord, and behold, he was not with the sojourners of the earth: for he was withdrawn and ascended to the firmament by the Word before the Lord, and his name was called Metatron.'\(^2\) The superior Metatron is identified with the Jehovah-Angel and the Shekinah. Thus in the book Zohar we read: 'The Angel of the Lord which is the Shekinah; 'It is He who liveth for ever and ever, who is arrayed with the name Metatron.'\(^3\) The most exalted titles are conferred upon Him; so much so, that there would seem to be an approximation

\(^1\) Smith's *Testimony*, vol. i. p. 308.
\(^2\) Etheridge's *Targums on the Pentateuch*, vol. i. p. 175.
\(^3\) Smith's *Testimony*, vol. i. p. 390.
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here to the Christian doctrine of the Son of God. Thus Rabbi Solomon, commenting on the words, 'My name is in Him,' says: 'Our Rabbis say, This is the Metatron, whose name is as the name of His Teacher, namely, the all-sufficient God.' ‘He is named the Metatron,’ says Rabbi Bechai, ‘because in this name are comprised the two significations of Lord and Messenger; and because He keeps the world, He is called the Keeper of Israel. It hence appears that He is the Lord of all beneath Him, and that the whole host of things above and things below are in His power and under His hand. He is also the Messenger of all both above Him and below Him; because God has made Him to have dominion over all, and has set Him Lord of His house and all His possessions.’¹ And in the book Zohar the Metatron is identified with the Messiah.

SUPPLEMENT II.

THE DOGMA OF A TEMPORAL MESSIAH.

It has been repeatedly stated in the course of these lectures, that in the time of our Lord the

¹ Smith’s Scripture Testimony, vol. i. pp. 392, 393.
prevailing opinion among the Jews was that the Messiah should be a great temporal Prince. This is a statement which does not require any additional proof or illustration, and, indeed, is generally admitted by all classes of writers. The same view was entertained during His life by the disciples of Jesus themselves. They regarded their Master as the destined King of Israel, and contended among themselves about posts of honour and influence in the earthly kingdom which they supposed He was about to inaugurate. Hence all references to His sufferings and death were most distasteful to them. When He spoke to them of rejection and the cross, they understood not what He meant. His death appeared to put an end to all their hopes, and they expressed their disappointment in these words: 'We trusted that it had been He who should have redeemed Israel' (Luke xxi. 21). His resurrection, whilst it confirmed them in their belief of His Messiahship, at the same time revived their expectations of His temporal reign. The time appeared to them to have arrived when He would take to Himself His mighty power and reign. No power on earth would be able to resist their risen Redeemer. Hence their inquiry, 'Wilt Thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?' (Acts i. 6). And after His ascension it was a very prevalent opinion among the early Christians that Jesus would soon return and set
Inferences from the Messiahship of Jesus. 363

up His kingdom on the earth. No doubt many spiritual elements mingled in these views of an earthly reign among the early Christians; but still these views are a proof that the Jewish notion of a temporal Messiah was not relinquished by the disciples of Jesus.

It is difficult to discover what are the views of the modern Jews on this point. It would, however, seem that their Messianic expectations bear a close resemblance to those of their ancestors. They still cling to the notion of a temporal Messiah, though their idea is not so gross as that of the ancient Jews. They disregard the prophetical, deny the priestly, and attend solely to the kingly office of the Messiah. The same misconception of prophecy which was the cause of Jewish unbelief in the days of our Lord, is still made by them. The general opinion among those Jews who are regarded as orthodox is, that the Messiah shall restore the Jews to their ancient land, rule over them as King, and convert all nations to their religion. He shall reign in truth and righteousness: the maxims of peace and love will everywhere prevail, and all nations will be converted to the worship of the God of Israel. They assign to their own nation a pre-eminence in the kingdom of the Messiah, and expect that Judaism shall become the religion of the world. But what change shall take place in their religious services, whether the
temple shall be rebuilt and the whole Jewish economy re-established, are points which are left undetermined.

These views are stated, though somewhat vaguely, by Dr. Adler. 'At the advent of the Redeemer,' he observes, 'warfare shall cease, and peace be established throughout the earth; Israel shall be gathered into the promised land, and the Messiah shall rule over them.' 'The belief in the unity of God shall be the governing principle of all hearts; all conflicting creeds shall cease, and the animosity and hatred that spring therefrom shall be at an end.' 'Two sayings of our sages enunciate this grand and sublime truth in apt words. We read: "The time will come when Jerusalem will contain within herself all nations and kingdoms." You ask, How is it possible that so small a city shall contain all those multitudes? Another passage from the Midrash answers this question: "The time will come when Jerusalem will comprise the whole of Palestine, and when the boundaries of Palestine will be extended farther on the east and the west, the north and the south." Yes, brethren, in the days of the Messiah, when the worship of one God shall have become the religion of the world, the whole of Palestine shall be a temple, the whole earth a Holy Land.' He thus states the difference between the Christian and the Jewish idea of the Messiah: 'Christians believe
the mission of a Messiah to consist in delivering mankind from the consequences of their hereditary guilt, and in obtaining atonement for the sins that had been committed by them. Judaism teaches us that in the days of the Messiah mankind shall be redeemed from ignorance, error, and injustice, and the one God universally acknowledged and adored.' And there is the following remarkable passage, in which he asserts that the mission of Christianity and Mahomedanism is to prepare the way for a universal Judaism: 'Wherein else did the mission of both Christianity and Mahomedanism consist (notwithstanding their admixture of error), than to teach the worship of one God to a heathen world, and to promulgate the pure and lofty doctrines of the Bible? Two of the greatest and most philosophical minds of our nation, Rabbi Judah Halevy and Maimonides, have declared this truth. The remarks of the latter are especially worthy of note. He says that "the historical mission of these two religions consists in paving the way for the coming of the King Messiah, when all will worship the Lord with one accord. For, by means of these two religions, the predictions relative to the Messiah, and the law and its precepts, have been diffused throughout the world, and have penetrated to distant isles."'  

I cannot better conclude this note than by join-

1 Adler's Course of Sermons, pp. 152–159.
ing in the wish for the Jews with which Justin Martyr concludes his memorable dialogue with Trypho: 'I can wish no better thing for you than that you may be of the same opinion as ourselves, and believe that Jesus is the Christ of God.'

1 Dialogue with Trypho, chap. cxlii.
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—— Biblical Commentary on the Romans. In One Vol. 8vo. (10s. 6d.)

—— Biblical Commentary on St. Paul's First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians. In One Vol. 8vo. (9s.)

—— Biblical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians, and Thessalonians. One Vol. 8vo. (10s. 6d.)

—— Biblical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to the Philippians, to Titus, and the First to Timothy. In continuation of the Work of Olshausen. By LIC. AUGUST WIESINGER. In One Vol. 8vo. (10s. 6d.)

**Dr. Neander.**—General History of the Christian Religion and Church. By AUGUSTUS NEANDER, D.D. Translated from the Second and Improved Edition. Nine Vols. 8vo. (£3, 7s. 6d.)

This is the only Edition in a Library Size.

**Prof. H. A. Ch. Hävernick.**—General Introduction to the Old Testament. By Professor HÄVERNICK. One Vol. 8vo. (10s. 6d.)

**Dr. Müller.**—The Christian Doctrine of Sin. By Dr. JULIUS MÜLLER. Two Vols. 8vo. (21s.) New Edition.

**Dr. Hengstenberg.**—Christology of the Old Testament, and a Commentary on the Messianic Predictions. By E. W. HENGSTENBERG, D.D. Four Vols. (£2, 2s.)

**Dr. M. Baumgarten.**—The Acts of the Apostles; or, the History of the Church in the Apostolic Age. By M. BAUMGARTEN, Ph.D., and Professor in the University of Rostock. Three Vols. (£1, 7s.)

**Dr. Stier.**—The Words of the Lord Jesus. By RUDOLPH STIER, D.D., Chief Pastor and Superintendent of Schkeuditz. In Eight Vols. 8vo. (£4, 4s.)

**Dr. Carl Ullmann.**—Reformers before the Reformation, principally in Germany and the Netherlands. Two Vols. 8vo. (£1, 1s.)

**Professor Kurtz.**—History of the Old Covenant; or, Old Testament Dispensation. By Professor KURTZ of Dorpat. In Three Vols. (£1, 11s. 6d.)

**Dr. Stier.**—The Words of the Risen Saviour, and Commentary on the Epistle of St. James. By RUDOLPH STIER, D.D. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Professor Tholuck.—Commentary on the Gospel of St. John. By Professor Tholuck of Halle. In One Vol. (9s.)

Professor Tholuck.—Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount. By Professor Tholuck. In One Vol. (10s. 6d.)

Dr. Hengstenberg.—On the Book of Ecclesiastes. To which are appended: Treatises on the Song of Solomon; the Book of Job; the Prophet Isaiah; the Sacrifices of Holy Scripture; and on the Jews and the Christian Church. By E. W. Hengstenberg, D.D. In One Vol. 8vo. (9s.)

Dr. Ebrard.—Commentary on the Epistles of St. John. By Dr. John H. A. Ebrard, Professor of Theology. In One Vol. (10s. 6d.)

Dr. Lange.—Theological and Homiletical Commentary on the Gospels of St. Matthew and Mark. By J. P. Lange, D.D. Three Vols. (10s. 6d. each.)

Dr. Dorner.—History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ. By Dr. J. A. Dorner, Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin. Five Vols. (£2, 12s. 6d.)

Lange and Dr. J. J. Van Oosterzee.—Theological and Homiletical Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke. Two Vols. (18s.)

Dr. Ebrard.—The Gospel History: A Compendium of Critical Investigations in support of the Historical Character of the Four Gospels. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)

Lange, Lechler, and Gerok.—Theological and Homiletical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. Edited by Dr. Lange. Two Vols. (21s.)

Dr. Hengstenberg.—Commentary on the Gospel of St. John. Two Vols. (21s.)

Professor Keil.—Biblical Commentary on the Pentateuch. Three Vols. (8l. 6d.)

Professor Keil.—Commentary on Joshua, Judges, and Ruth. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)

Professor Delitzsch.—A System of Biblical Psychology. One Vol. (12s.)

Dr. C. A. Auberlen.—The Divine Revelation. 8vo. (10s. 6d.)

Professor Delitzsch.—Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah. Two Vols. (21s.)

Professor Keil.—Commentary on the Books of Samuel. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)

Professor Delitzsch.—Commentary on the Book of Job. Two Vols. (21s.)

Bishop Martensen.—Christian Dogmatics. A Compendium of the Doctrines of Christianity. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)

Dr. J. P. Lange.—Theological and Homiletical Commentary on the Gospel of St. John. Two Vols. (21s.)
CLARK’S FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY—Continued.

Professor Keil.—Commentary on the Minor Prophets. Two Vols. (21s.)
Professor Delitzsch.—Commentary on Epistle to the Hebrews. Two Vols. (21s.)
Dr. Harless.—A System of Christian Ethics. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Dr. Hengstenberg.—Commentary on Ezekiel. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Dr. Stier.—The Words of the Apostles Expounded. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Professor Keil.—Introduction to the Old Testament. Two Vols. (21s.)
Professor Bleek.—Introduction to the New Testament. Two Vols. (21s.)
Professor Schmid.—New Testament Theology. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Professor Delitzsch.—Commentary on the Psalms. Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)
Dr. Hengstenberg.—History of the Kingdom of God under the Old Covenant. Two Vols. (21s.)
Professor Keil.—Commentary on the Books of Kings. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
— Commentary on the Book of Daniel. One Volume. (10s. 6d.)
— Commentary on the Books of Chronicles. One Volume. (10s. 6d.)
— Commentary on Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
— Commentary on Jeremiah. Two Volumes. (21s.)
Winer (Dr. G. B.)—Collection of the Confessions of Christendom. One Volume. (10s. 6d.)
Bishop Martensen.—Christian Ethics. One Volume. (10s. 6d.)
Professor Delitzsch.—Commentary on the Proverbs of Solomon. Vol. I. (10s. 6d.)
Professor Oehler.—Biblical Theology of the Old Testament. Vol. I. (10s. 6d.)
Professor Christlieb.—Modern Doubt and Christian Belief. One Volume. (10s. 6d.)

And in connection with the Series—

Murphy’s Commentary on the Book of Psalms. To count as Two Volumes. (12s.)
Alexander’s Commentary on Isaiah. Two Vols. (17s.)
Ritter’s (Carl) Comparative Geography of Palestine. Four Vols. (32s.)
Shedd’s History of Christian Doctrine. Two Vols. (21s.)
Macdonald’s Introduction to the Pentateuch. Two Vols. (21s.)
Ackerman on the Christian Element in Plato. (7s. 6d.)
Gerlach’s Commentary on the Pentateuch. 8vo. (10s. 6d.)
Dr. Hengstenberg.—Dissertations on the Genuineness of Daniel, etc. One Vol. (12s.)

The series, in 141 Volumes (including 1878), price £37, forms an Apparatus without which it may be truly said no Theological Library can be complete; and the Publishers take the liberty of suggesting that no more appropriate gift could be presented to a Clergyman than the Series, in whole or in part.
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HAMILTON, ADAMS, & CO.
L A N G E' S
COMMENTARIES ON THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.
Edited by Dr. PHILIP SCHAFF.
There are now ready (in imperial 8vo, double columns), price 21s. per Volume,
OLD TESTAMENT, Fourteen Volumes:
The Book of Genesis. One Volume.
Exodus and Leviticus. One Volume.
Numbers and Deuteronomy. One Volume. (Shortly.)
Joshua, Judges, and Ruth. One Volume.
The Books of Samuel. One Volume.
The Books of Kings. One Volume.
Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther. One Volume.
The Book of Job. One Volume.
The Psalms. One Volume.
Isaiah. One Volume.
Jeremiah and Lamentations. One Volume.
Ezekiel and Daniel. One Volume.
Minor Prophets. One Volume.
NEW TESTAMENT, Ten Volumes:
The Gospel of St. Matthew.
The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans.
The Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians.
The Epistles of St. Paul to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians.
The Epistles to the Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, Philemon, and Hebrews.
The Epistles of James, Peter, John, and Jude.
The Book of Revelation.
The price to Subscribers to the Foreign Theological Library, St. Augustine's Works, and Meyer's Commentary on the New Testament, or to Purchasers of Complete Sets of either the Old or New Testament Commentary, will be
FIFTEEN SHILLINGS PER VOLUME.
Dr. Lange's Commentary on the Gospels and Acts (without Dr. Schaff's Notes) is also published in the FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY, in Nine Volumes demy 8vo, and may be had in that form if desired. (For particulars, see List of Foreign Theological Library.)
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