



LIBRARY

OF THE

Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

PROVING THE DIVINE ORIGIN

*Case*

BR 123 .M32 1846

*Shelf*

McCaul, Alexander, 1799-  
1863.

*Book*

Lectures on the prophecies  
concerning the second advent of  
Christ.







# LECTURES ON THE PROPHECIES

PROVING

## THE DIVINE ORIGIN OF CHRISTIANITY,

DELIVERED IN THE  
CHAPEL OF THE HON. SOCIETY OF LINCOLN'S INN,  
ON THE FOUNDATION OF THE LATE  
BISHOP WARBURTON.

BY

ALEXANDER M<sup>c</sup>CAUL, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON, AND  
PREBENDARY OF ST. PAUL'S.

LONDON:  
JOHN W. PARKER, WEST STRAND.

1846.

ALEXANDER MACINTOSH,  
PRINTER,  
GREAT NEW-STREET, LONDON.

TO THE  
MOST REVEREND WILLIAM,  
BY DIVINE PROVIDENCE  
LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY,  
PRIMATE OF ALL ENGLAND, AND METROPOLITAN,

*These Lectures,*

PREACHED IN CONFORMITY TO

HIS GRACE'S APPOINTMENT,

ARE DEDICATED,

WITH SINCERE GRATITUDE AND RESPECT,

BY HIS GRACE'S

OBLIGED HUMBLE SERVANT,

ALEXANDER M<sup>c</sup>CAUL.



## ADVERTISEMENT TO THE READER.

It was intended to have prefixed to these Lectures a critical examination of the Text and Context of the Prophecies here cited, and further illustrations of some topics, and therefore the publication has been long delayed.\* Circumstances having prevented the accomplishment of this design, and the Author having been urged by some who heard them to publish them as they are, six are now published with the most necessary references. The remaining Lectures shall be published as soon as possible, and if Providence vouchsafe life and a little more leisure, the whole plan shall be completed.

\* The Lectures were preached in the years 1837, 1838, 1839, and 1840.



# CONTENTS.

## LECTURE I.

	PAGE
Statement of the Argument, and Answer to the Objection, that the Sentence of the Sanhedrin is fatal to the claims of Jesus of Nazareth . . . . .	1

## LECTURE II.

Answer to the Objection that, Incarnation of Deity being impossible, the doctrine of Christianity is necessarily false . . . . .	28
--	----

## LECTURE III.

Fulfilment of the Predictions that a Jew should become the object of universal worship, a matter of fact visible to all . . . . .	58
---	----

## LECTURE IV.

The visible relative position of Jews and Gentiles foretold	85
---	----

## LECTURE V.

Specimen of the Fulfilment of the New Testament Prophecy in the History of the Roman Church . . . .	110
---	-----

## LECTURE VI.

The same subject continued . . . . .	140
--------------------------------------	-----



# LECTURES.

---

## LECTURE I.

ISAIAH XLIII. 9.

*“ Let all the nations be gathered together, and let the people be assembled: who among them can declare this, and show us former things? Let them bring forth their witnesses, that they may be justified: or let them hear and say, It is truth.”*

IN the days of Ahab, king of Israel, Elijah the Tishbite terminated a controversy, and proved the truth of his religion by an appeal to Omnipotence. He proposed that the worshippers of the Lord and the followers of Baal should severally prepare an altar and a victim, call upon the object of their adoration, and acknowledge him that should answer by fire as the true and living God. The challenge was accepted, the altars erected, the victims slain, and laid in order. The prophets of Baal cried all day long to their pretended master, and all day long

there was no answer. At length, at the time of the evening sacrifice, Elijah drew near, and poured forth a simple petition to the God of his fathers—an answer of fire from heaven was vouchsafed—the victim and the altar were consumed—and the controversy decided: the people fell on their faces, and cried out, “The Lord, he is the God.” Every doubt was silenced, and every doubter satisfied by the interposition of Omnipotence. All felt that there was no room for imposture—no possibility of delusion—and that nothing short of Divine Power could produce effects such as they had beheld.

To prove the truth of Christianity, a similar appeal is possible. God has not, indeed, commanded us to call for an exhibition of His Almighty Power, nor, whenever a doubter proposes an objection, to look for a display of omnipotence; but he has directed us to appeal to another attribute, as exclusively his own as that of omnipotence, and that is, His power of predicting the end from the beginning. To this the text refers, directing us to consider predictions delivered ages before the events; to compare them with their fulfilment, and thus to satisfy ourselves concerning the inspiration of their record, and the Deity of their author.\*

\* The prevailing idea of modern infidels is, *not that the prophets were impostors*, but that their prophecies are the mere natural offspring of the principles, circumstances, and history of their authors. Thus De Wette says, “That they

The proof arising from this comparison is, to the full, as satisfactory as the other. For to fore-

were based upon the Mosaic doctrine of retribution and faith in the unchangeableness of Jehovah's love to his people; that they were limited by the historic horizon of each respective period, for which reason Isaiah employed the Assyrians, Jeremiah the Chaldeans, when he wished to threaten; and that the prophecies are in part to be regarded only as hopes and wishes, menaces and fears." Einleitung in das Alte Testament, § 204. Compare Gesenius *Vorrede* to the commentary on Isaiah, and § 5, of the Commentary itself. Fleck de regno divino, p. 31, and sqq. Especially Professor Höpfner's "Glaubwürdigkeit der Messianischen Weissagungen von Neuem in Schutz genommen," Leipzig, 1831. G. B. Winer, in his *Biblisches Realwörterbuch*, thinks that, if the word were not usually taken in a bad sense, "The prophets might appropriately have been called demagogues;" and in this, I am sorry to add, he is followed by an Israelite, M. Salvador, who not only denies the supernatural origin of the prophecies relating to the Messiah (liv. iv. c. 1), but of prophecy in general, calling a prophet an "Orateur populaire dans l'Intérêt de la Liberté Commune," and asserting that the prophetic character depended on individual assumption. "Tout homme d'un esprit assez élevé, et d'un caractère assez ferme pour défendre le droit public et la loi, peut le faire en Israel: tout homme, quelles que soient sa naissance sa tribu, sa fortune, peut s'écrier, 'Je suis prophete,'" &c. (liv. ii. c. 2.) If M. Salvador be reminded that to be a prophet it is necessary to have the Spirit of God, he has an answer at hand. "De même qu'on accorde de nos jours un esprit plus au moins élevé à l'homme qui soit de la classe ordinaire, les Hebreux de leurs concitoyens doués de facultés superieures, de raison, d'imagination, de vertu, de genie, qu'ils possedaient *l'esprit de Dieu*, en d'autres termes, l'esprit par excellence; car il faut

tell future events, dependent upon the unruly wills and affections of men, is as far beyond the highest effort of finite wisdom, as to change the course of nature is beyond the utmost exertion of human power. Man may calculate the motions

savoir qu'une des manières d'exprimer grammaticalement *le superlatif* dans leur langue, consiste à ajouter au substantif *un des noms de Dieu*" (ibid.). To any one acquainted, however partially, with the Bible, it is unnecessary to say, that this attempt to get rid of all supranaturalism in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit and inspiration, is as false as it is feeble and inadequate. It will not solve one of the thousand cases in which the Spirit of God is spoken of. Take, for example, 1 Sam. x. 6, the words which Samuel spake to Saul, "The Spirit of the Lord shall come upon thee, and thou shalt prophesy." Did Saul suddenly acquire genius, which he had not before, and as suddenly lose it? The mention of "the superlative degree" here, is mere superlative nonsense. It is, however, only just to M. Salvador to add, that for the original of this idea he refers to Maimonides, (Moreh Nevuchim, part ii. c. 45,) who is in truth the father of every artificer in Rationalism and "Aufklärung." He makes prophecy to depend partly upon natural conformation, partly on art. "Si fuerit homo cujus cerebri substantia in decenti perfectione respectu materia, temperamentis, proportionis et locationis . . . si postea studeat," &c. (ibid. c. 36). To such unwarranted assertions it might be sufficient to remark, that they are pure inventions. The Old Testament says nothing on the subject. The fulfilment, however, proves that the hypothesis is altogether untenable. Rabbi J. Albo teaches much sounder doctrine when he says, "That prophecy is not the offspring of the imagination, but of a divine influence." (עץ שרתול, part iii. c. 8. Compare also, Hottinger Thesaur. Philol. p. 572.)

of the heavenly bodies, predict an eclipse of the sun, or the return of a comet, because these events are dependent upon known, fixed, and immutable laws, but where is the human being who can calculate the destinies of any one individual of the human race—who can determine beforehand the motions of his will, and the development of his intellect—who can point out the various disturbing powers, that will interpose to check their progress, or alter their direction—who can predict the changes to arise from variety of circumstance, from new and unexpected relations with his fellow-men—from sickness and health, from inward caprice or outward violence? Thus to foretell the history of any one individual, it is necessary to know not only his physical constitution, and moral mechanism, but also the infinite variety of circumstances in which he may be placed, the never-ending succession of human beings with whom he may be brought in contact, and the varied effects to be produced and modified by these various causes. But this is clearly beyond the utmost powers of the human intellect. Attention to the natural capabilities of the child may enable the observer to conjecture, if he live, the greatness of the man, but there his power of presentiment finds its limit. Whether the child may live to fulfil the expectations of his friends he cannot determine, and still less can he predict the details of his history. The bystanders might

easily conjecture that the son of Amilcar would be an enemy to Roman power, but none could foretell the splendour and variety of his successes, nor his melancholy end. The friends of the German Reformer, who saw him a devout and fearless boy, might guess or hope the faith and courage of the man. But the most sagacious could not imagine that the child, who sang from door to door, should shake down the pillars of Papal power, and extend his moral influence to the limits of the civilized globe, and the end of time. Yet prophecy takes a still wider range. It does not form conjectures respecting the future destinies of those whose character and circumstances are known. It announces the birth of Him who was yet unborn, and was not to be born until centuries after its voice had been hushed into silence—it assigns the time and place of his birth, the features of his character, the course of his life—the reception which he should meet with from his contemporaries, and the influence which he should exercise as long as the moon endureth. Here then is a direct appeal to God's omniscience. If it be beyond human wisdom to foretell the futurity of its nearest living friend, it is clearly the exclusive attribute of the Divine prescience to announce the life and acts of him who is yet to come. If, therefore, we can show, that prophecies respecting an individual did exist centuries before his birth, and that these prophecies have been

minutely fulfilled, we prove an interposition of Divine omniscience, and have consequently the same species of proof as that offered by Elijah to his countrymen. He appealed to omnipotence, we to omniscience; the one as certainly the attribute of Deity as the other.\*

Such is the object of these Lectures. It is proposed to show that before the appearance of the Lord Jesus Christ certain prophecies existed, which have been fulfilled in his history, and that of the world; thence to infer that the prophecies are divine, and he in whom they are accomplished, the Redeemer of Israel, and the Saviour of the world.

But here we are met by a grave objection. The modern Jews assert that the appeal to prophecy is vain, inasmuch as Christ's claims have been already examined, and not only rejected, but he himself condemned to death, by a tribunal instituted by God, and endowed with infallibility.†

\* “ Si quis mortalis possit esse, qui conligationem causarum omnium perspiciat animo, nihil eum profecto fallat : qui enim teneat causas rerum futurarum, idem necesse est omnia teneat quæ futura sint. Quod cum Nemo facere, nisi Deus, possit ; relinquendum est homini, ut signis quibusdam consequentia declarantibus futura presentiat,” &c.—“ Cicero de Divinatione,” lib. i. 56.

† Thus Orobio reasons. Having cited Deut. xvii., he says to Limborch—“ Ecce, Doctissime vir, ad quos pertinebat Israelis dubia circa legem judicare : et quod majus dubium quam de doctrina, et Propheta eam edocente, in quo consistebat non minus quam negotium religionis et salus tota populi ? Quod

The Sanhedrin, say they, have already adjudicated in the matter, and to their sentence Moses commands an unhesitating and unconditional submission. "If there arise a matter too hard for thee in judgment, between blood and blood, between plea and plea, and between stroke and stroke, being matters of controversy within thy gates: then shalt thou arise, and get thee up unto the place which the Lord thy God shall choose; and thou shalt come unto the priests, the Levites, and unto the judge that shall be in those days, and inquire; and they shall show thee the sentence of judgment. And thou shalt observe to do according to all that they inform thee: according to the sentence of the law which they shall teach thee, and according to the judgment which they shall

*judicium si infallibile non esset, quare Deus eandem et majorem pœnam reluctanti præscripsisset, quam ei, qui vero Prophetæ non auseultaverit? Poterant quidem, vel malitia, vel ignorantia errorem committere; sed jam Deo placuit, ut semper secundum Legem judicium facerent, ne errarent. Talis fuit illa divina providentia, præsertim in iis quæ ad religionem pertinebant . . . ad hoc tribunal mittebatur judicandus propheta.*"—"Amic. Coll. Tertium Scriptum Judæi," p. 113.

In like manner speaks M. Salvador. "De même que les petit-conseils des tribus, et des villes jugeaient les particuliers, de même le conseil general jugeait les senateurs accusés, les sacerdotes, les prophètes, les chefs militaires, les rois, les villes, et les tribus rebelles."—"Histoire des Institutions de Moïse," lib. iv., c. ii. Edit. Bruxelles, vol. ii., p. 78. Compare the whole of ch. iii. and liv. II. c. ii.



tell thee, thou shalt do: thou shalt not decline from the sentence which they shall show thee to the right hand nor to the left. And the man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken unto the priest that standeth to minister there before the Lord thy God, or unto the judge, even that man shall die: and thou shalt put away evil from Israel. And all the people shall hear and fear, and do no more presumptuously." (Deut. xvii. 8.) These words are strong, but to apply them to the case of Jesus of Nazareth, two things are necessary, 1. To prove that the tribunal here described was at all times, and under all circumstances infallible; and, secondly, that the tribunal which condemned him was identical with that whose institution is here prescribed, both of which things are impossible. The history of Israel and the words of the prophets demonstrate that during the first temple every class of the people was involved in the general rebellion against God, erring in doctrine, as well as in practice. Thus it is said, "Moreover, all the chief of the priests, and the people transgressed very much, after all the abominations of the heathen, and polluted the house of the Lord which he had hallowed in Jerusalem. And the Lord God of their fathers sent to them by his messengers rising up betimes and sending, because he had compassion on his people, and on his dwelling-place: but they mocked at the messengers of God, and despised

his words, and misused his prophets, until the wrath of the Lord rose against his people, till there was no remedy." (2 Chron. xxxvi. 14—16.) Yea, God himself says, that in Jerusalem, there was not a single man that executed judgment. "Run ye to and fro through the streets of Jerusalem, and see now, and know, and seek in the broad places thereof, if ye can find a man, if there be any that executeth judgment, that seeketh the truth; and I will pardon it." Yea, "the priests, and the prophets, and all the people" assembled in the house of the Lord, most unjustly condemned Jeremiah, and solemnly declared, "this man is worthy to die," for no other offence than simply declaring the will and purpose of the Almighty. So far were they from infallibility, that they solemnly pronounced the declaration of Divine truth to be a crime punishable with death.

To Ezekiel was exhibited the melancholy sight of the seventy elders, of whose infallibility modern Jews would persuade us, engaged in the practice of every species of idolatry. "He said unto me, Go in and behold the wicked abominations that they do here. So I went in and saw; and behold every form of creeping things, and abominable beasts, and all the idols of the house of Israel, pourtrayed upon the wall round about. And there stood before them seventy men of the ancients of the house of Israel, and in the midst of them stood

Jaazaniah, the son of Shaphan, with every man his censer in his hand; and a thick cloud of incense went up.”\* (Ezek. viii. 9—11.)

David Kimchi states his opinion that this assembly of seventy elders was the Sanhedrin, and sees in the history a fulfilment of the words of Isaiah, “They that lead thee, cause thee to err;” and the modern champion of the sentence pronounced upon our Lord, makes a similar acknowledgment of the corruption and wickedness of this tribunal. “Under the kings,” says he, “this senate experienced many vicissitudes; but it ceased not to exist. The changes introduced into the primitive government, by the concessions made to royalty, entirely destroyed its nature: to the intellectual council which Moses intended to establish, succeeded an aristocratic body which wounded the national laws, and which lent its hands to ordinances of iniquity, against which the prophets will soon be heard to lift up their voices with an ardour without parallel. . . . In one of these visions, in which he describes symbolically the faults which occasioned the Babylonish captivity, Ezekiel per-

\* That these seventy elders were the Sanhedrin, is fully believed by the Jews. So Kimchi on the place says that it is the Sanhedrin, and sees, in the facts, a fulfilment of the words of Isaiah: “They that lead thee, cause thee to err.”

ושבעים איש' ע' כנהדרין להראותו מה שנתן להם האל תחלה שיהיו עליהם  
 שבעים זקנים להורותם הדרך הטובה הם היו מתעים אותם כמו שאמר ישעיהו  
 עמי מאשריך

ceives, through the door of the temple, the seventy-one elders, who dared to offer incense to vile idols.”\* With such facts and acknowledgments, it is plainly impossible to maintain the infallibility of the Sanhedrin, or the necessary righteousness of every sentence which they might pass. If they were not unerring in the time of the first temple, still less can infallibility be claimed during the existence of the second, in which the ark of the covenant, the spirit of prophecy, and the miraculous answers from the oracle of God had ceased—when the high priests were the mere creatures of heathen caprice, and their corruption and injustice were notorious. Were the Sanhedrin the legitimate successors of the tribunal established by Moses, their sentence, under such circumstances, could not be decisive. Both fallible and wicked, the mere legitimacy of their succession could not protect from further appeal. But, in the second place, it is certain, that the Sanhedrin, in the days of the second temple, was a very different tribunal from that which Moses clothed with such authority. The name itself, Sanhedrin, suggests a suspicion that its origin was not Mosaic but Greek.† That an ancient institution might, after the Greek conquest, acquire a Greek name is possible, but not

\* Liv. ii., c. ii., vol. ii. p. 178, 179.

† “Ortum est ex Græco, *σύνεδρος*, unde Josephus eos vocat *συνέδρους*, &c.”—Buxtorf. Lex. Talm. Elias Levita also says—  
הוא לשון יון ממש קורין לבסאות סנהדרי והוא על דרך שמה ישבו בסאות למשפט.

probable. If the Jews hated the Greeks and their language to such a degree as to pronounce accursed any man who should teach his son Greek,\* it is not likely that they would adopt into their sacred laws, and their theological language, the heathen appellation of their religious council; they might have used it in intercourse with their foreign masters, but that the rabbies should have transplanted it into their schools and their oral traditions, is far beyond the boundaries of belief. Yet *Sanhedrin* is the word commonly used in their codes of law, and is even the title of one of the most important treatises of the Talmud. No other instance of a similar kind occurs—none of the original Hebrew names of places or offices has been exchanged for those given them by the Greeks. Priests, scribes, pharisees, judges, sacrifices and feasts, all retain their Hebrew names. It would be therefore unreasonable to suppose that the chief feature in the Jewish polity, as the

\* ארור האיש שיגידל חזירין וארור האדם שילמד את בנו

חכמת יונית.

“Cursed is he who breeds pigs, and teaches his son Greek literature.”—*Bava Kama*, fol. 82, col. 2. From a passage in *Sotah*, it is evident that this was not a mere popular prejudice, but a decree.

בפולמוס של טיטוס גזרו על עטרות כלות ושלא ילמד את

בנו יונית.

“In the war of Titus they made the decree concerning the crowns of brides, also that a man should not teach his son Greek.”—See *Surenhusii Mishna*, part iii., p. 304.

rabbies make the Sanhedrin, should have lost its native appellation, and acquired and retained a heathen name. On the other hand, if the Sanhedrin was a new tribunal instituted by the Greeks, it was perfectly natural that the name given it by those who instituted it should remain.

The suspicion raised by the Greek name is fully confirmed by the silence which prevails in the Old Testament, as to the existence of a tribunal such as the rabbies describe the Sanhedrin. No mention is ever made of it, or of the important duties assigned to it.\* This tribunal, as described

\* The first authentic notice of the Sanhedrin occurs in Josephus, in a passage relating to the life of Herod the Great. So Winer, in his article *Synedrium*, "Die erste beglaubigte Erwähnung des Synedriums findet sich Joseph. Antiq. 14, 9." "Nihil magis Pererium in dubitationem propulit, quam apud Josephum ac Philonem Synedrii magni seu Septuagintaviralis mentionem non habere," says Selden (*De Synedriis*, lib. ii, c. 15, Amsterdam, 1679, p. 366), and then endeavours to prove the contrary; but, as Leydeker observes, "Quidquid alleget, incassum laboravit,"—and adds, "Neque Josephus Gorionides ut serus author, et ex Judæis Thalmudicis sapiens, referre quendam in Historia Machabaica Synedrii M. actum potuit; ut nec ipse author צמח דור או שלשלת הקבלה, ex quo constet illud tum temporis obtinuisse . . . Imo vero in Historiis Machabaicis, non est evidens pro hoc consensu argumentum, quicquid Seldenus et Bertramus requirent."—*De Repub. Heb.* Amsterdam, vol. ii, p. 610. Bertram founds his arguments simply upon the mention of "elders," and a *γερονσία*, which no one denies, but produces no proof of a Rabbinic Sanhedrin. See Bertram *de Politia Judaica*, Geneva, 1574, 92—94.

in the Talmud, fills a place, if possible, more important than that occupied by the High Court of Parliament in the framework of the British Constitution. According to Maimonides,\* the business of the Sanhedrin was to choose a king, to judge the high priest, and the prophet, and to pass sentence capitally—to try and sentence a tribe—to declare war. To it belonged, in fact, the supreme power in all matters ecclesiastical and civil, domestic and foreign. The king was only lieutenant to the Sanhedrin, and could neither proceed against his rebellious subjects, nor his foreign enemies, but by their direction.† The high priest was only their vassal, with no authority to act but by their command.‡ The prophet of God himself, though coming with an extraordinary commission, and armed with extraordinary powers, was only their messenger, for without their sanction his claims were not to be allowed.§ Whatsoever was done in Israel, the Sanhedrin was, according to the rabbies, the doer thereof. How, then, is it possible to imagine that a history of Israel could be written without once mentioning the name or alluding to the existence of the supreme, the moving, and the controlling power? Yet such is the fact. The Old Testament contains a history

\* Hilehoth Sanhedrin, c. v., 1. Compare "Old Paths," where the original is given at length.

† Selden de Syned., lib. iii., c. 9, § 2.

‡ Ibid., c. 8.

§ Ibid., c. 6.

of Israel, extending through nearly a thousand years—it records the rise and fall of dynasties—the setting up and the pulling down of kings of Judah and Israel—and yet never even alludes to the power according to whose will the changes were effected. It describes the progress of wars—the ministry of prophets—the deposition of high priests, and the transfer of the priesthood to others—the apostasy of tribes and cities, and the efforts to reclaim or punish idolaters—and yet the chief actor in all these matters, the Sanhedrin, is passed by in total and mysterious silence. Is this credible? Is such an omission possible? Just as possible as to write a history of Rome, excluding all mention of the senate—or an account of the English Revolution, without once alluding to the Parliament.

But the sacred history is not merely silent. It negatives the possibility of the Sanhedrin's existence. Its statements are so directly opposed to all that the Talmud says of this court, that both accounts cannot possibly be true. The Talmud says that by the Sanhedrin the king was appointed. The Old Testament relates that first Saul, and afterwards David, were appointed kings, and that Samuel was the only human agent that intervened between them and God. The Talmud says, that according to the will of the Sanhedrin wars were waged. The Old Testament describes the wars of Jephthah and Gideon, Saul and David, Hezekiah and Josiah, but ascribes them to the sole will of the



judge or king. The Talmud says, that to the Sanhedrin alone belonged the jurisdiction over the High Priest. The Old Testament declares that both Saul and Solomon deposed High Priests, and set up others, according to their sole will, without opposition or protest from any. To enumerate all the particulars in which the Scripture history negatives the fables about the Sanhedrin would be to transcribe most of the historic books, and no inconsiderable portion of the Prophets. The Scripture ignores altogether the existence of this tribunal in the most eventful periods of Jewish history, and it is only with difficulty that the rabbies can discover an apparent link of connexion between it and the Sanhedrin. The Talmud asks, "Whence is it proved that the great Sanhedrin was to consist of seventy-one members?" and answers, "Because it is written, 'Gather unto me seventy men of the elders of Israel.' Moses in addition makes seventy-one."\* But this is mere assumption. A little consideration of the passage, Numbers xi. 16, will show that these elders did not form a supreme court, nor, indeed, a court at all. Moses required help. "I am not able to bear all this people alone, because it is too heavy for me." (Numb. xi. 14. Comp. Exod. xviii.) But what relief could he have found in seventy assessors? Seventy separate

\* מניין לגדולה שהיא של ע"א שנא' אספה לי שבעים איש  
 מוקני ישראל ומשה על גביהן. Sanhedrin, fol. 1.—

judges scattered through the several tribes would be a help. But, to be obliged, besides hearing the causes, to collect the opinions of seventy disputatious rabbies would have been a remedy far worse than the disease. The words of Moses himself, Deut. i. 15, proves that these persons were not assessors in one court, but subordinate judges, and that to Moses was the last appeal. "So I took the chief of your tribes, wise men, and known, and made them heads over you, captains over thousands, and captains over hundreds, and captains over fifties, and captains over tens, and officers among your tribes. And I charged your judges at that time, saying, Hear the causes between your brethren, and judge righteously between every man and his brother and the stranger that is with him. Ye shall not respect persons in judgment: but ye shall hear the small as well as the great; ye shall not be afraid of the face of man, for the judgment is God's: and the cause that is too hard for you, bring it unto me, and I will hear it." The idea of appeal entirely overthrows that of a supreme court, in which all sat together.

The asserters of the Sanhedrin's authority, feeling the lack of Scripture testimony, have invented a line of succession to supply the defect, but the attempt is too clumsy to require much consideration. At the very commencement there is a chasm of at least 200 years from the time of Joshua to

that of Eli ; \* and where the line proceeds with an appearance of regularity, it is defaced by palpable falsehood. Thus, after David, Ahijah, the Shilonite, is mentioned as the next President of the Council, and it is stated that he was one of those who took part in the Exodus, that is, he was about 500 years old when he was appointed to preside over the Sanhedrin.† In like manner, the Prophet Jeremiah is made president in his days, whereas his whole history shows that instead of being the head of a despotic and powerful tribunal, he was a powerless and persecuted man. The attempt, therefore, to invent a history of the Sanhedrin, far from compensating for the silence of the Bible, increases in a tenfold degree the improbability of its existence.

There is one argument still which proves that the constitution of the Sanhedrin is totally different from the supreme court of appeal instituted by Moses, at variance with that institution, and consequently illegal, and that, therefore, the authority bestowed upon the latter cannot with any reason be claimed by the former. According to the Talmud, the Sanhedrin was to consist of three classes, Priests, Levites, and Israelites, with the proviso, that even though it should consist entirely of Israelites, without any admixture of priest or

\* Preface to the Iad Hachazakah, fol. i., col. 1.

† Ibid.

Levite, it was a lawful Sanhedrin.\* The supreme court instituted by Moses was to consist of only two classes at most, and might consist of priests only. The words are—"Thou shalt come unto the priests, the Levites, and unto the judge that shall be in those days." The Talmud enumerates the Levites as a distinct class. Moses reckons them as one, "The priests, the Levites," from which it is plain that he was speaking only of that one class of the sons of Levi, who held the office of the priesthood: but not of that class whose sole designation was "The Levites." The second difference is more important still. In addition to Levites, the Sanhedrin was to have Israelites, but in the court appointed by Moses, there could be but one lay Israelite at most. For besides the priests, Moses names only the judge, that is, the civil governor. If the judge happened to be a lay Israelite, as was the case with Jephthah, the Gileadite, and Sampson, who was of the tribe of Dan, then the supreme court had one Israelite. But if, as was the case with Eli and Samuel, the judge was himself a priest, then the supreme court consisted exclusively of priests.† In neither case,

\* ומשנה להיות בסנהדרין גדולה כהנים ולויים שנא' ובאת אל הכהנים הלויים ואם לא מצאו אפילו היו כולם ישראלים  
 הרי זה מותר. Hilchoth Sanhedrin, c. ii. 2.—

† The Douay annotators differ from the Rabbies, speaking of this court of appeal as if it were always composed exclusively of Priests. "For a full and assured decision of all

therefore, could it have a plurality of Israelites, which was necessary to the constitution of the Sanhedrin. It was, therefore, a different court.

This is proved decisively by the third difference, which is that the Sanhedrin might consist exclusively of Israelites without any admixture of the priesthood. It cannot therefore be identical with that court, which never could have more than one lay member, and to whose existence the presence of the priesthood was absolutely necessary.\* Thus it appears that the Sanhedrin

controversies," say they, "God here instituted to his people a supreme tribunal, that, in case inferior judges varied in judgment, recourse might be had to the Council of Priests, where one chief Judge, the High Priest, was appointed to give sentence, and all others commanded to receive and obey the same;" and naturally, from the supposed infallibility of the High Priest, infer the infallibility of the Pope. "God ever directed the sentence of the High Priest," referring to the judgment of Caiaphas, "and most specially now Christ preserveth the Apostolike see from error in faith," &c. (Annotations to Deut. xvii. Edit. John Cousturier, 1635.) But these annotators seem to have forgotten, 1st, That the High Priest condemned our Lord to death for saying that He was the Son of God; and 2dly, That Deut. xvii. says not one word about the High Priest giving sentence. On the contrary, it makes the consent of the civil Governor, even though a layman, absolutely necessary to the validity of the sentence, "Thou shalt come unto the Priests, the Levites, AND unto the JUDGE that shall be in those days."

\* M. Salvador admits that if the text, Deut. xvii., be taken in its plain, grammatic sense, the council ordained by Moses

was an entirely different tribunal from that instituted by Moses, and, as being opposed to the

could have only one lay member. "Ou le juge, dont parle le verset du Deutéronome est un être collectif représentant tout le conseil, comme on s'en convaincra bientôt, ou un être personnel: s'il est collectif, les sacerdotes et Levites cités sont positivement hors de la collection; s'il est personnel, et qu'on veuille que ces sacerdotes et Levites fussent membres du Senat, il s'ensuit que tous les membres de ce Senat, moins le juge, devraient appartenir à leur tribu, ce qui est aussi loins de la pensée des docteurs que de la volonté de la loi même." Liv. II. c. 2. vol. i. p. 162. Thus M. Salvador confesses that the grammatic sense of the text is against the Rabbies. He has, however, proposed another means of evading the difficulty, by having recourse to a mystical interpretation. He says that "the Judge" means the whole Sanhedrin. On page 164, he undertakes to prove that this extraordinary use of the word "Judge" is of common occurrence in the Hebrew books. "Mais j'ai avancé que le grand-conseil est très souvent désigné dans les livres Hébraïques par le nom de son président ou du *juge*, de la même manière qu' à Venise on appelait le Sénat, *prince serenissimo*," &c. But, common as he asserts this usage to be, he has not been able to find one case in point. He endeavours to prove, from Exod. iii. 16, 18, that "Moses" signifies "Moses and the elders;" and from Ezra iv. 2, 3; v. 2; vi. 13, 7, that when it is said, "Zerubbabel began to build the house of the Lord," the elders of Israel are included. But this, if true, is nothing to the purpose. M. Salvador's proposition is to prove that the word "Judge" is frequently in the Hebrew books taken collectively for the Senate. His business, therefore, was to cite passages, where this usage is found. But he has not cited one; we may therefore safely conclude that he had not one to cite, and consequently that his proposed *D'rash* is totally unwarranted.

law, so far as that law was concerned, directly unlawful. The objection, therefore, that Jesus of Nazareth cannot be the true Messiah, because he was condemned by a tribunal from whose sentence God ordained that there should be no appeal, is utterly invalid. He was not condemned by any such tribunal, but by one probably established by the Greeks, certainly of very modern date, that had no authority from God, and was directly opposed to the spirit and letter of the Mosaic command.\*

\* M. Salvador (vol. i. p. 154) seems to think it hard that any one should reject the unanimous consent of the Rabbies and their interpretation of the Pentateuch, or doubt the divine right of this tribunal. “Cependant, sans prendre en considération ni les termes précis du Pentateuque, ni l’unanimité des docteurs Hébreux, corroborée par les esprits les plus judicieux des autres croyances, quelques auteurs se sont efforcés de jeter du doute sur l’existence du droit et de fait du grand-conseil d’Israel, appelé plus tard Sanhédrin du mot grec *sunedrion*.” But surely M. Salvador does not ask us to believe all the fables which the Hebrew doctors have handed down respecting it with such perfect unanimity, as, e. g., that each member understood magic, and spoke the seventy languages, &c. It is true that Jost (vol. i. p. 48, of the *Geschichte der Israeliten*) says, “Der Thalmud nemt die runde Zahl von 70 Sprachen;” i. e., that seventy is a round number. But M. Salvador honestly calls it an exaggeration. “Certains docteurs prétendent, dans leur exaggeration, que la grand-sanhedrin parlait soixante-dix langues différentes: ce qui suppose qu’on aurait exigé de chaque candidat qu’il connût au moins une langue autre que sa langue maternelle!” (p. 168). In addition to this opinion of their veracity, M. Salvador, on

The sentence, therefore, was not infallible, and can have no force whatever except what might be derived from the wisdom, integrity, and piety of those by whom it was pronounced. But slender is the argument that can be derived from the personal character of the members of that council which condemned Jesus of Nazareth. At the head of the Sanhedrin appear Caiaphas, the actual high priest, and Hannas who had enjoyed that office, both of them usurpers of a dignity which the law of God made it unlawful for them to hold. Hannas had been put into the high priesthood by one Roman Governor, and deposed by another,\* to make way for a favourite of his own. This new high priest was soon deposed to make way for others, until at

pp. 182 and 183, speaks most contemptuously of those same doctors. “L’esprit du casuiste qui avait flétri les dernières époques de la république succéda à l’esprit du moraliste, du législateur et du juriconsulte: le livre le plus riche de raison et de poésie fut transformé en une lice mortelle pour l’intelligence, et rebutante pour l’imagination; et comme s’il était écrit dans la destinée de ce peuple, qu’il ne pourrait s’arrêter entre les extrêmes, après avoir enfantés des génies, dont l’œil le plus audacieux ose à peine mesurer la hauteur, sa cause fut par momens livrée aux cerveaux les plus délirans et les plus minutieux qui soient peut-être passés sur la terre.” Of what value the testimony of such persons may be, does not require the acuteness of a lawyer to decide.

\* Joseph. Antiq. xviii. 2. Compare Lundins’ Levit. Prierterthum, B. III., c. xxiv. Reland Antiq. Sacr., Part II., c. 2, § 7. Voisin Observ. in Procem. Pug. Fid., Edit. Carpzov., page 21.



last Caiaphas was appointed, whose only title to the office was the will of the Roman procurator, and the power of the Roman legions. Those, then, who figure as the supreme judges of the Lord Jesus Christ were unprincipled and ambitious men, ready to truckle to the heathen idolater, and to trample under foot the most sacred precepts of their religion, in order to usurp an office of wealth and power, to which they had no right. The other members of the Sanhedrin appear in the same light. In the first place, they must be regarded as the willing abettors of the profanation of the high priesthood, the most sacred of all their religious institutions. Had they been men of piety and integrity, before presuming to meddle with the cause of Jesus of Nazareth, they would first have condemned Hannas and Caiaphas as intruders, and utterly unfit for the office of judge in matters of religion. But in the second place, they appear as usurpers themselves. The constitution of the Sanhedrin was contrary to the law of God, and they could not take part in its proceedings without assuming an authority which that law had given to others. The fear of the Roman power cannot be urged in extenuation of their presumption. The Romans left to the Jews great liberty in the observance of their religious laws: and there can be little doubt, that in the period of the decline of the Greek power, and the Roman conquest of Syria, the Jews might, if they

had been so inclined, have restored the Mosaic constitution. But during that time the party of the Pharisees had gradually attained to influence, and had begun to strive after power. They were not a priestly sect; on the contrary, the great object of their ambition was to supplant the priesthood in their rights and their power. For this the Sanhedrin offered the surest means. As a tribunal it was placed above the priesthood, so that the attainment of the majority there necessarily put them in possession of the supreme power, both ecclesiastical and civil. Their selfish gratification was to them dearer than the interests of truth and the ordinances of Moses. To profit fully by their usurpation, it was necessary to persuade the multitude, who were zealous for the law, that this heathen tribunal was a Mosaic Institution. For this it was necessary to pervert the Divine commands, invent a fictitious history of the tribunal from the time of Moses, and to give currency to falsehood. The sentence of men guilty of such practices, who appear as despisers of the religion which they professed, flatterers of a power which they abhorred, and robbers of an authority belonging to others, can never be regarded as a testimony against the character of one who denounced their hypocrisy, and exposed their evil practices.\*

\* That they were guilty of abusing their power to promote fictitious traditions seems to be admitted by M. Salvador himself, in a note occurring vol. i., page 183, where he says, "La

The sentence of the Sanhedrin is rather a testimony to the sincerity and zeal of the Lord Jesus Christ, and at least an indispensable requisite to establish the truth of his claims to the Messiahship.\* No evidence could establish the claims of one, who had not been opposed and persecuted by such wicked men. A true prophet could not but oppose their principles and practice, and was therefore as sure to provoke their wrath as to arouse their jealousy. Persecution by such a body was a necessary testimony to the genuineness of prophetic claims, and this testimony Jesus of Nazareth possesses.

secte des Sadducéens, dont je parlerai plus tard, et qui tenait à la doctrine primitive, s'opposa à l'abus qu'on fit alors des interprétations et des traditions, et voulut les rejeter entièrement. Jesus-Christ lui même s'éleva avec force contre ces abus."

\* With the attempt of M. Salvador to defend the conduct of the Sanhedrin in condemning our Lord, I have thought it unnecessary to meddle. It has been formally treated by M. Dupin, aîné, in a tract entitled, "Jesus devant Caïphe et Pilate," republished in the fourth volume of the Brussels edition of M. Salvador's "Histoire des Institutions de Moïse." I have also treated the same subject in Sermon IV. of a volume entitled "Plain Sermons."

## LECTURE II.

### ISAIAH IX. 6.

*“ 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.”*

THE prophecies relating to the Messiahship of the Lord Jesus Christ may be conveniently divided into three classes. First, Those of which we see the fulfilment with our own eyes. Secondly, Those, the fulfilment of which is recorded in the New Testament. And, thirdly, Those which have not yet been fulfilled, and which, therefore, in the Jewish mind, form a ground of objection, and a reason for unbelief: and in this order I propose to treat them, beginning with those which refer to the Messiah's Deity.

My first assertion is, that there are numerous prophecies announcing that Messiah should be acknowledged as the true God. My first fact, that Jesus of Nazareth has been and is acknowledged as such, and that of such acknowledgement there is no second example in the history of the world.

My conclusion, that the prophecies are true, and that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah.

Our first business, then, is to produce the prophecies in question, and to show, that, according to their obvious grammatical meaning, they announce the acknowledgment of Messiah's Deity. But here we are met with a direct denial. It is asserted not only that such prophecies do not, but that they cannot exist. It is said that the doctrine of the union of Godhead and manhood in one person is impossible in the nature of things, and contrary to the fundamental doctrine and universal analogy of the Old Testament.\* With respect to the former objection, I reply, that if the union of Godhead and manhood in one person be impossible, the impossibility must result from the fact that some attributes of Deity are incompatible with the attributes of humanity, and it is for those who make the objection to point out what they are, and to show the incompatibility. To say that finite and infinite cannot co-exist in one person is

\* *Quod vero sub idea hominis Deus adorandus proponatur : est Christiana doctrina : quippe adorare præcipit Deum incarnatum, hominem Deum, siquidem verbum caro factum est ; eumque facit visibilem, mensurabilem, loco conclusum. Neque obstat distinctio in quantum Deus, et in quantum homo ; quia hoc est quod impossibile putatur, et divinæ ideæ prorsus contrarium, scilicet quod Deus possit limitatam naturam induere salva ejus infinitate. Orobio in Amic. Collat., p. 110.*

not sufficient, for we do not know what infinite is. The term expresses a bare negation. We use the word simply to express an unknown quantity, and, therefore, cannot by any *à priori* argumentations determine anything concerning it. If we apply it to extension, and say that God is omnipresent, that he fills all things, that he occupies immensity, we may ask, where, then, is the place of the creation? If the Deity be an *infinite pleroma*, how was it possible to make room for all created things? \* And we may further ask, how can he who is infinite be wholly present in any given place which is finite? If he be only partially present, then is he composed of parts, and, therefore, not infinite. But if he be wholly present, then is infinity contained in finity. If we apply the term to duration, and say that God is eternal, then we have a similar difficulty; we may ask, how can eternity and time

\* This difficulty has occupied the attention of the Cabbalists as well as others.

“Præ nimietate splendoris vehementissime coruscantis non poterat produci mundus, vel oriri aliud quid.

“Cum autem in mentem veniret extenso huic, quod vellet condere mundos, et emanando producere animantia, atque in lucem proferre perfectionem potentiarum suarum activarum, et nominum atque cognominum suorum, que erat caussa impulsiva creandi mundi, tum compressa quadantenus lux ista, a puncto quodam medio ad latera recessit, atque sic relictus est locus quidam vacuus, dictus spatium inane, æquidistans a puncto illo, exacte in medio ejus constituto.”—Brücker. Hist. Crit. Philosoph. Per. ii., Part I., lib. ii., cap. iii., sect. 2, Tom. 2, p. 997.

co-exist together? Eternity has no past and no future. It is ever present. It cannot be divided. All eternity is, therefore, comprehended in every flying moment of time; but how is this possible? If we apply infinite to power, and say that God is omnipotent, and if omnipotence be as indivisible as eternity, then how is it possible that omnipotence should bring forth finite results, such as we see in creation; and how is it possible that He should communicate to his creatures various degrees of that power, each of which is finite? When I lift up my hand, I do it by the power of God communicated to my naturally lifeless and powerless flesh, and yet this power as employed by me is finite, and can be measured; how is it possible, then, that infinite and finite power can co-exist together? These are a few instances to show that where, on the score of the incompatibility of finite and infinite, men object to the union of Godhead and manhood, they are making a bare assertion, for the truth of which they can offer no proof, because they are reasoning about that of which they know absolutely nothing. When they say, that Christ cannot be God and man *because* that immense cannot be comprehended in limits, they deny that the whole Deity is present with each of his creatures. When they assert that Christ cannot be God *because* the Eternal cannot be comprehended in the limits of time, they deny that the whole Deity is present in every moment of time, and

assert that eternity has a past and a future ; and when they deny the Deity of Messiah *because* omnipotence cannot be circumscribed by human weakness, they deny that the powers of which we are possessed are a communication of God, and that he is present whenever they are exerted. Thus it appears that the main objections urged against the union of Godhead and manhood in the person of the Messiah, will equally show the impossibility of the co-existence of an Infinite Creator and a finite creation, and are, therefore, invalid.

The doctrine of the incarnation of Deity is, then, no more contrary to reason than the fact of the co-existence of God and man. But it is further urged, that this doctrine is altogether opposed to the general tenour, as well as particular texts, of the Old Testament. This is the ground especially taken by modern Jews, who, when pressed with various prophecies, reply, that the meaning which we assign to particular passages cannot possibly be the true one, because it is opposed to the general scope of Scripture. The arguments employed are usually taken from Maimonides, who says, "It is plainly taught in the law and the prophets, that the blessed God is neither a body nor anything corporeal, for it is said, 'The Lord, he is God in heaven above, and on the earth beneath' (Deut. iv. 39); but a body cannot be in two places at once. And again, it



is said, 'Ye saw no manner of similitude.' (Deut. iv. 15.) And again, 'To whom will ye liken me, or shall I be equal?' (Isa. xl. 25.) Whereas, if he were a body, he would be like other bodies."\* But such arguments are nothing to the purpose. They prove at the very most that the Deity is not corporeal, which the Catholic faith also maintains, but say nothing of the possibility or impossibility, probability or improbability, of an union of Deity with manhood, which is the question at issue. When Maimonides concludes from the words, "The Lord your God is God in heaven above, and on the earth beneath," that God is in two places at once, he argues feebly, and departs from the direct intention of the author whose words he quotes. Moses intended to assert, not that God could be in two places, but that there were not two Gods—one the God of heaven, and the other the God of earth—as the Heathens supposed, but that there was only one God, and, therefore, concludes his sentence with the words, "There is none else," which Maimonides omits. But admitting the doctrine of God's omnipresence, as we do, it will not follow from thence that God cannot become incarnate, or that the whole fulness

\* הרי מפורש בתורה ובנביאים שאין הק"ב גוף וגויה שנא' כי יי' אלהיכם הוא אלהים בשמים ממעל ועל הארץ מתחת והגוף לא יהיה בשני מקומות ונא' כי לא ראיתם כל תמונה ונא' אל מי תדמוני ואשוחי ואילו היה גוף היה דומה לשאר גופין.—*Iad Hachazakah. Hilchoth Yesode Torah, c. i., 8.*

of the Godhead cannot dwell bodily in the Messiah. On the contrary, if the whole Deity can be present in heaven, and also on earth, both of which are finite localities, it is proved that the whole Deity can dwell in limits, and, therefore, in the human nature of Messiah. If it be denied that the whole Deity is everywhere present, then it follows, as we have already said, that He consists of parts, and is, therefore, finite, and, therefore, not God. Again, when Maimonides collects from the words, "Ye saw no manner of similitude," that God has no manner of similitude, he draws a conclusion which the words do not warrant. He might just as well argue, that there is no God, because the people did not see him. His last argument, taken from the words, "To whom will ye liken me, that I should be equal?" is also inconclusive, and irrespective of the context. The same words, used in the same way, will prove that God is not a spirit, or that he is not wise or good, or even that he is a body, and corporeal; for Maimonides says elsewhere,\* that the angels are not bodies, nor corporeal. We have only to infer from the words, "To whom will ye liken me?" that God is unlike the angels, and then it will follow, that God is both a body, and corporeal. This text does not assert absolutely that there is no point

\* ומהן ברואים צורה בלא גולם כל והם המלאכים  
 שהמלאכים אינם גוף וגויה אלא צורות נפרדות זו מזו .  
 Iad Hachazakah. Hilehoth Yesode Torah, cap. ii. 3.—

of resemblance between God and his creatures, whether angels or men, but that there is no resemblance in point of equality. "To whom will ye liken me, that I should be equal?"\*

These texts, then, cited by Maimonides, are so far from proving that Godhead cannot be united with manhood, that they do not even establish the point for which he adduced them, namely, that God is incorporeal. They, therefore, and the numerous texts of the same class, cannot be legitimately used to prove that the analogy of the Old Testament doctrine is opposed to the doctrine of incarnation. But we do not think of stopping here, or of resting satisfied with the proof that the Old Testament is not against us, we intend to show that the whole analogy of the law and the prophets is in favour of the doctrine of incarnation.

In the first place, the language of Scripture is such as to imply that God revealed himself to the eyes of men in human form. It is frequently said, in every part of the Old Testament, "The Lord appeared," he "came," "went," "ascended," descended, stood, sat, &c. This Maimonides knew, and, therefore, after asserting, as quoted above, that God is not corporeal, he says, "If this be so, how is it that we find in the law such expressions as 'Under his feet,' 'Written with the finger of God,' 'The hand of the Lord,' 'The eyes

\* So Aben Ezra in loc.—וַאֲשׁוּדָה אֱלֹהִים שׁוֹה עִמּוֹ.

of the Lord,' 'The ears of the Lord,' and such like? The answer is, that all this is said after the manner of men, who are conversant only with bodies, and the law speaks in the language of the children of men. They are *antiphrases*; for it is said, 'If I whet my glittering sword,' and that 'he has a sword,' and that with the sword he slays; but it is only a figure, and all such language is figurative. The proof of the matter is that one prophet says he saw God 'with his garments white as snow.' Another saw him, 'with dyed garments from Bozrah.' Moses our master himself saw him at the sea as a mighty man, making war, and at Sinai, clothed as the angel of the congregation; and all this to indicate that he has no likeness nor form, but that all this existed only in the prophetic vision, and that the reality is that the human understanding cannot apprehend nor search him out, as it is said, 'Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?'"\* In these words Maimonides lays it down

\* Hilchoth Yesode Hattorah, c. i. 9, and Moreh Nevuchim, P. I. c. 45. Joseph Albo, in a passage where he gives a number of examples, says in like manner :

ויתר ההתפעלויות הגשמיים ראוי שיובנו על זה הדרך  
 שהם לחת הבנה אל בני אדם וכו'.

"These and similar anthropopathies are to be understood as being employed to convey a meaning to the children of men." עץ שתול, P. II. c. 14. Manasseh ben Israel gives a similar explanation. "Eandemque viam insistunt propheta,

as a general principle that all such passages are figurative, and this position has a measure of plausibility, because some of them are confessedly so, though if we admit his principle, it will not logically follow that God has no hands nor feet, nor that he never performs in reality those actions which are here ascribed to him in a figure. All these words are used figuratively of man as well as of God, yet no one concludes from thence that man is incorporeal. Thus Isaiah says, "Strengthen ye the weak hands, and confirm the feeble knees," (xxxv. 3,) where every one admits that hands and knees are figures. Moses says, "A gift doth blind the eyes of the wise," (Deut. xvi. 19,) where eyes stand for the judgment, not for the organs of sight. Solomon says, "Whoso stoppeth his ears at the cry of the poor, he shall also cry himself, and shall not be heard," (Prov. xxi. 13,) where ears stand for something else beside the organs of hearing. David says, "Mine eyes are ever toward the Lord, for he shall pluck my feet out of the

quando de ipsa majestate divina loquantur: ut, et *galeam salutis capiti suo*. Sic os Domini, manus, oculi, aures, etc. apud eosdem reperias. Nimirum ei, qui incorporeus est, membra corporea tribuunt: quæ omnia improprie intelligenda sunt. Igitur S. Scriptura ait Deum descendere, quia quando cum hominibus loquitur, necessario limitatur ejus potentia, et magnitudo deminuitur, ut aptetur captui hominis." Conciliator Quæst. xxxiii. in Genes.

net," (Psal. xxv. 15,) where both eyes and feet are taken figuratively. Now, if from these and innumerable similar passages, any one should attempt to conclude, that these words are always used figuratively, and to infer that man is not corporeal, we should at once deny the validity of his reasoning, and common sense itself would suggest that an argument from a particular instance does not warrant an universal conclusion. But if this reasoning be invalid in the case of men, it is equally so when applied to God. It may be proved on the one side, and admitted on the other, that in many passages hands, feet, eyes, ears, &c., are spoken figuratively of God; but the admission as little affects the doctrine that God can be united to a human body and form, as the corresponding admission respecting man proves that he is and must be incorporeal.

But Maimonides asserts further, and here he is followed by many others, the *necessity* of this figurative language. He says, "That as men are conversant only with bodies, the law speaks in the language of the children of men," whereby he implies that if God had spoken otherwise, he would not have been understood. Now, though this explanation is supposed to contain profound wisdom, and is generally received,\* it is in one

\* "Ἀνθρωποπάθεια est metaphora, quâ quod creaturis, et præsertim homini, propriè competit, ad Deum et res divinas per

respect a mere truism, and in another a falsehood. To say that God speaks in the language of men is no solution of a difficulty, but the mere assertion of a matter of absolute necessity. If he will speak to men at all, it must be in the language of men, for they understand no other; and when he says, "Thou shalt not kill," or "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," he as much uses the language of the children of men, and as much condescends to our infirmity as when he uses figurative language, and says, "The eyes of the Lord run to and fro upon the earth," or "The arm of the Lord is not shortened." This, therefore, is no solution, but a mere translation of the difficulty into other words. But when applied to these particular cases, with the addition of an imperative necessity, it is altogether

quandam similitudinem transfertur. Vocatur et *συγκατάβασις*, *condescensio*, quia in sermone sacro Jehova quasi descendit ad nos, et verbis humanis mysteria sua cœlestia exprimit. Hebraei eleganter vocant *דרך בני אדם* *viam filiorum hominis*, quod est *ἀπο τῶν ἡμῖν προσόντων τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰς ἐνεργείας χρηματίζειν*, ut acutè Heinsius loquitur in Aristarcho sacro pag. 66. *Incomprehensibilia* sunt (inquit Flacius), *Dei opera et actiones, neque nos assequi aliquid de iis possemus, nisi sacra Scriptura iis uteretur loquendi de Deo formulis, quæ rebus humanis propinquæ sunt. Itaque Spiritui Sancto, Scripturarum autori, placet, propter captus nostri imbecillitatem, nostro more balbutire, et blandius humiliùsque, quàm majestati tantæ convenit, nobiscum per signa et verba agere,*" &c. Glassii *Philologia Sacra*, p. 717.

false. It is not true that God, to make himself intelligible, was under any necessity of using this figurative language, for it is translated by Maimonides himself, and by every other commentator, Jewish and Christian, into language not figurative, and yet perfectly intelligible. Thus the words, "The eyes of the Lord run to and fro upon the earth," may be interpreted by the words, "God takes constant cognisance of all that passes upon the earth." And again, when I say, That God is omnipotent, I say what is quite as intelligible as the figurative language, "The Lord's arm is not shortened."

This alleged necessity, then, is not real. It is a mere evasion of a difficulty invented by the subtle, and admitted by the unthinking; and, like some other canons of interpretation, is plausible only so long as it is not tested by a particular application. There are passages where no ingenuity can prove a figurative sense, and where no necessity can be pretended except that of truth. Thus it is said in Gen. xvii. 1, "The Lord appeared unto Abram. And Abram fell on his face, and God talked with him;" and then, after recording what was said, it is added (verse 22), "And he left off talking with him, and God went up from Abraham." In the xviiiith chapter, ver. 22, 23, another appearance of the Lord is related, where it is said, "Abraham stood yet before the Lord, and Abraham drew near and



said;" and, after the conversation, the narrative concludes with the words, "And the Lord went his way (וַיֵּלֶךְ), as soon as he had left communing with Abraham; and Abraham returned to his place." Now, in these words, we have it first stated that God appeared, or as the original word strictly signifies, "He was seen." The idea conveyed is, that some visible form was exhibited to the eyes of Abraham. If it was only intended that God made a communication to the mind of Abraham, the word "appear" is altogether out of place, and no necessity can be alleged for its use, for there is in Hebrew an abundance of language to express an inward, mental communication; for which purpose the word "appear," as necessarily implying that which is outward and visible, is singularly inappropriate. Its ordinary and literal meaning is confirmed by what follows, "Abraham stood before the Lord, and drew near to him."\* Here we have necessarily the idea of space and locality. The appearance occupied a certain place before which Abraham stood, from which he was at a certain distance, and to which,

\* It is remarkable that the Masoretic note tells us that this is one of the eighteen passages altered by the Scribes. According to the tradition, the passage was originally, "The Lord stood before Abraham," which they, thinking inappropriate, changed into "Abraham stood before the Lord." See the lesser Masorah in loc. Buxtorf. *Lex. Talm. in Rad.* אָרָק. Hottinger *Thesaur. Philolog.* p. 427.

by an act of locomotion, he approached; and this again is strengthened by the assertion that God ascended, that he went his way, which can only be predicated of some external form subject to the laws of extension. If the whole is only an account of an internal communication to the mind of Abraham, the addition of the words, "He ascended," "He went his way," are not only not necessary, but are altogether without meaning.

But we are not obliged to infer the exhibition of a visible form. The Old Testament Scriptures expressly declare, that God did appear in a visible shape, and that that shape was human. In the first place it asserts, that God has a form or similitude. In the xiith chapter of the book of Numbers, God says of Moses, "With him will I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently, and not in dark speeches; and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold." Now, if the word translated "similitude" signify in every case, where it is not applied to God, an external and visible form, the assertion is proved, unless some valid reason can be given to show, that when applied to God it has a different signification. Maimonides himself admits, that in every other case this word signifies "form," and when he says, that as predicated of God it has a different meaning, he makes a bare assertion, without even attempting a proof. In his "Moreh Nevuchim," he thus speaks: "תְּמוּנָה, *Similitude*, is a noun, applied to

three things. First, it is used of the form of any thing perceptible by the senses, external from the intellect, that is, of the external form, as when it is said, (Deut. iv. 16,) ‘Lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image, the similitude of any figure, the likeness of male or female.’ And again (in the 15th verse of the same chapter), ‘Ye saw no manner of similitude.’ Secondly, it is used of an imaginary form, which exists in the imagination and fancy of a man in a state of ecstasy. In this sense it occurs in Job iv. 13, 16, ‘In thoughts from the visions of the night, when deep sleep falleth on men. . . . Then a spirit passed before my face; the hair of my flesh stood up; it stood still, but I could not discern the form thereof: a similitude was before mine eyes;’ that is, a likeness or image thereof was before mine eyes in sleep.\* Thirdly, it is used of any reality which is apprehended by the intellect. And in this third sense it is applied to God in that verse, ‘The similitude of the Lord shall he behold;’ the sense is, He shall apprehend the reality of God.”† In these words of Maimonides we have the admission, that the proper sense of the word is external visible form, and the bare assertion, that when applied to God it has a different sense. The absence of all attempt

\* Buxtorf read דמינו, and had not בשינה. In the Jesnitz edition the suffix is omitted, and בשינה is found.

† Part I. c. 3. Buxtorf., p. 7.

at proof naturally suggests the suspicion, that there was none to offer, and this is the fact. The word "similitude" occurs ten times in the Old Testament. Eight times it confessedly signifies external form. Twice it is applied to God. Unless, therefore, there be something in these two passages to warrant a change of the signification, there can be no proof for Maimonides' assertion. An examination of these two passages shows that here also the word "similitude" occurs in its proper signification. In the first which we have been considering, God declares that Moses has a privilege vouchsafed to no other prophet. "If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream. My servant Moses is not so, who is faithful in all my house. With him will I speak mouth to mouth, even apparently, and not in dark speeches; and the similitude of the Lord shall he behold." Here God lays it down as a general rule, that whatever other prophets beheld or heard, was in a state of prophetic ecstasy resembling a dream in sleep, and declares that with Moses it was not so; that whatever he beheld or heard was not in this prophetic sleep; and if not, then in a waking state,\* that is, with his bodily senses. But the

\* This is fully confessed by the Jews. Thus Maimonides says:—

ומה הפרש יש בין נבואת נִשָּׂה לשאר כל הנביאים שכל

only thing which men can behold with the bodily eyes, is real visible form or material light. When, therefore, it is said, that Moses should behold the similitude of the Lord, that similitude cannot be any thing intellectual, but must be something sensible. Here, then, the word similitude is taken in its proper sense, and signifies external form; and, therefore, according to this passage, God did appear to Moses in some definite shape, perceptible to his bodily eyes. The other place is in the xviith Psalm, ver. 15, "As for me, I will behold thy face in righteousness: I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy similitude." All commentators, Jewish and Christian, refer this to the vision of God after the resurrection. But then the body, however modified, is still a body, the vision is therefore corporeal, not intellectual. The conclusion, therefore, is that God can reveal himself in a form perceptible by bodily eyes.

We rest not, however, this doctrine on the meaning of a single word, or a solitary passage of one book. It is the doctrine of the whole Old Testament. In Gen. xviii. 1, "The Lord

הנביאים בחלום או במראה ומשה רבינו מתנבא והוא ער ועומד

"What is the difference between the prophecy of Moses, and that of the other prophets? The difference is, that all the prophets prophesied in a dream or vision; Moses awake and standing," &c. *Hilchoth Yesode Hattorah*, c. vii. § 5. Compare *D. Kimchi* on the last verse of Psalm xvii.

appeared unto him in the plains of Mamre; and he sat in the tent door in the heat of the day; and he lift up his eyes and looked, and lo, three men stood by him." One of the three was the Lord, as appears from the whole of the following narrative. Here, then, we have God in human form visible to the bodily eyes. Again, in Gen. xxxii. 23, &c., it is related that a man appeared to Jacob, and Jacob says that this man was God: "I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved." In Exod. xxxiv. 9, we read, "Then went up Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel; and they saw the God of Israel; and there was under his feet as it were a paved work of a sapphire stone." Here again is an appearance in human form. In 1 Kings xxii. 19, Micaiah says, "I saw the Lord sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him, on his right hand and on his left." In the sixth chapter of his prophecies, Isaiah says, "I saw the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted, and his train filled the temple." In the first chapter of Ezekiel, that prophet describes a vision which he had of the Divine glory, and says, "Above the firmament that was over their heads was the likeness of a throne, as the appearance of a sapphire-stone; and upon the likeness of the throne was the likeness as the appearance of a man above upon it. And I saw as the colour of amber, as the appear-

ance of fire round about within it, from the appearance of his loins even upward, and from the appearance of his loins even downward, I saw as it were the appearance of fire, and it had brightness round about it. This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Lord.”

From these passages,\* selected from the Law, the historical books, and the prophets, it is plain as a matter of fact, that God constantly revealed himself in human form, and this fact fully justifies the Christian doctrine of the incarnation of Deity. The fact may be understood in one of two ways. Either the revelation in human form was always an unreal appearance, a mere idea generated in the mind of the prophets—and

\* To go through all the passages on this subject would require a separate volume. Many of them may be seen in the first part of Maimonides' "Moreh Nevuchim," which, though intended for a purpose diametrically opposite, is perhaps the best treatise ever written to prove, that the Old Testament doctrine of the Revelations of God, is of God in human form. Read the attempted explanations of *פִּסֵּא*, *Throne*; *מִקְוֵא*, *Place*; *יָרַד*, *he descended*; *עָלָה*, *he ascended*; *יָשַׁב*, *he sat*; *קָוִים*, *to stand*; *עָמַד*, *he stood*; *קָרַב*, *he approached*; *עָבַד*, *he passed*; *בָּוֵא*, *to come*; *יָצָא*, *he went forth*; *הִלְךָ*, *he walked*; *שָׁכַן*, *he dwelt*; *אָכַל*, *he ate*; *פָּנִים*, *face*; *אֲחֹר*, *behind*; &c., &c., and observe the desperate twists and contortions that are necessary, in order to explain away the words of Sacred Scripture, as well as the whole theory concerning the remotio corporeitatis, and it will appear evident, that to escape from the Christian doctrine, force the most violent must first be done to the text.

this is the opinion of Maimonides\* and most modern Jews,—or it was sometimes a real appearance perceptible by the bodily senses; either supposition proves the possibility of, and contains the same difficulties as, the doctrine of real incarnation. Whether the human form was real or unreal, the fact that God selected it in which to reveal himself remains the same. It cannot be pretended that the Divine Being was under any necessity of revealing himself in this or any other form. The Omniscient and Omnipotent possesses ten thousand ways of making communications to his creatures, each carrying with it

\* De verbo *Raah* vulgò notum est, ut Vajjar, *Cùm circumspiceret, ecce puteum in quodam agro*, intelligitur de visione oculi. Cùm verò dicitur, *Et cor meum raah vidit multitudinem sapientiæ et scientiæ*, intelligitur de apprehensione intellectus. Hoc sensu semper usurpatur verbum hoc *Raah*, quando de Deo Opt. Max. dicitur: ut: Raithi, *Vidi Dominem*; Vajera, *Et visus est ipsi Dominus*: Item, Vajar, *Et vidit Dominus quòd bonum esset*. Item, Hareni, *Videre fac me quæso gloriam tuam*. Item, Vajiru *Et viderunt Deum Israelis*, omnia ista intelligenda sunt de apprehensione intellectus; nullo modo verò de visione corporali. Abarbanel discusses these appearances at length in his commentary to Gen. xviii. 1. His opinion is, that the miracle consisted in a sort of optical illusion, whereby those to whom these appearances saw what had no real existence, and, therefore, he says, this sort of vision is called

גלו עינים כי לא היה הפלא כי אם בראות מה שאינו במציאות

“An opening of the eyes, for the miracle consisted in nothing else than in seeing what had no real existence.” Edit. Venice, 1584, fol. 66, col. 1.



the fullest assurance to the mind of the recipient that the communication is from God. When Pharaoh had his dreams interpreted by Joseph, and saw the accomplishment; when the Egyptians saw and felt the power of God's wrath in the plagues; when Nebuchadnezzar beheld the three Hebrews walking unhurt in the midst of the fire, and Darius saw Daniel come forth without injury from the lion's den; and when Belshazzar perceived the handwriting upon the wall; they had each of them as full an assurance of a Divine revelation as if they had beheld the appearance of a human form. If, then, the assumption of human form be no necessary part of Divine revelation, it must have been the selection of the Divine choice; and as the Divine choice is not the offspring of caprice, but the result of infinite wisdom, it must have been selected for a particular purpose. But the purpose of all God's revelations is to convey to man the knowledge of the true nature and will of the Deity. The human form, therefore, as forming a part of the Divine revelation to Abraham and the prophets, must itself convey some knowledge of the Divine nature or will. It necessarily intimates either that God did then exist in human form, or that he purposed so to exist in the time to come. It shows at the very least, that the human form is not inconsistent with the Divine perfections; and is directly opposed to the modern Jewish hypothesis, that God is not, and cannot be united

with a human form, for if this were true, it would necessarily follow that God has selected that mode of revealing his nature which is most liable to mistake. Maimonides would persuade us that the Divine intention in revelation was to teach man the utter impossibility of an union between Deity and manhood, and yet that the mode which he adopted was the constant revelation of himself in human form, that is, that he revealed himself as the very opposite of that which he is, and conveyed to the human mind an idea the very opposite of that which he intended; on the other hand, if it had been the Divine intention to prepare the minds of men for his manifestation in the flesh, no better mode can be well imagined than that actually adopted in the Old Testament. The frequent exhibition of himself in human form to the patriarchs and the prophets would naturally associate it with the idea of a manifestation of Deity, and remove all difficulty from their minds. When, therefore, we perceive the adaptation of certain means to the attainment of a certain end, we may fairly conclude that the attainment of that end was the purpose for which those means were selected, and, therefore, in the present case, that the preparation of the human mind for the incarnation of Deity was the end proposed.

This conclusion has been arrived at, on the supposition that the human form in which God revealed himself was an unreal image, a mere idea,

generated in the mind of the prophet, as modern Jews assert. But this is far from being the fact. I have already shown that the revelations made to Moses were not communications to his mind, but appearances presented to his bodily senses, and must, therefore, have been real. The same must be said of the vision vouchsafed to the elders of Israel. "They saw the God of Israel, and did eat and drink." Mentioning the eating and the drinking shows that they were not in an ecstatic state; that the vision was not a prophetic dream, but that they were in the body, and, therefore, it is especially noticed, that although they saw God, yet "upon the nobles of the children of Israel he laid not his hand," a remark altogether superfluous, if the whole scene had been a mere imaginary representation to the mind. The revelation vouchsafed to Abraham also necessarily implies reality. He was sitting in the tent-door, in the heat of the day; he lifted up his eyes and saw; he ran from the tent-door to meet the Lord, and bowed himself to the ground. Every one of these assertions forbids the idea of a mere intellectual communication. But his address to God places it beyond doubt. He said, "O LORD,\* if now I have found favour in thy sight, pass not away, I pray thee, from thy servant: let

\* The English version has, "My Lord," but this is wrong. אֲדֹנָי pointed with Kametz is never used except of the Divine Being.

a little water, I pray you, be fetched, and wash your feet, and rest yourselves under the tree, and I will fetch a morsel of bread." After which it is narrated that Abraham made the proposed preparations, and that his heavenly visitors did eat. Here, then, we have every difficulty that can be suggested against the Christian doctrine of incarnation.\*

\* The excessive difficulty which modern rabbies have found is evident in their commentaries. Abarbanel, as we have seen, makes all a mere illusion of the senses. Levi ben Gershom says, that the three who appeared to Abraham were mere men, prophets. Aben Ezra appears to have entertained the same opinion, though he shelters himself under the expression *מפרשים אחרים אמרו* "Other commentators have said." The value of this opinion is well expressed by Abarbanel in the words *הוא שקר מבוואר* "It is an evident falsehood." Solomon Jarchi and Bechai give two interpretations, one contradicting the other. According to the first, *חול* is *אֲדוֹנָי* "common," i.e., *my Lords*, applicable to creatures. According to the second, this same word is not "common," but *קודש* "holy," and refers to God. In this latter case the appearance of the angels is separate from the appearance of the Lord, and Abraham begs the Lord to wait until he shall have disposed of the three travellers. The naïveté of giving two contrary expositions, implies that anything is welcome that can deliver them from the difficulty. Maimonides, P. II., c. 42., treats it not as a history, but a mere vision, to which Nachmanides justly objects, that if chapter xviii. be a mere vision, chapter xix., respecting the deliverance of Lot, and the destruction of Sodom must be a vision, in which he is followed by Recanatensis, who says plainly—

המעשה היה בהקץ ממש

"This history happened in the waking state, in the strict

God appears in human form, performs human actions, and sojourns in the tent of Abraham as a friend. Abraham gives him water for his feet, presents him with food, stands before him to minister unto him, speaks with him, walks forth with him. There can be no mistake, for Abraham's servant is employed in preparing the food, Sarah in making the unleavened cakes, and she hears the conversation with Abraham. Abraham's God was, therefore, a Being who revealed himself in human form, and with human attributes. The Old Testament, therefore, does not oppose, but implies the doctrine of incarnation.\*

sense of the words." They both, like Rashi and Bechai, suppose that the three men were created angels, though all allow that there was an appearance of the Shechinah. Others, according to Aben Ezra's citation, regarded the three men as a revelation of the Lord. According to Buxtorf's copy, the words are—

הנה קנת אמרו כי השם ג' אנשים הוא אחד והוא ג' ולא יתפרדו

"Some have said that the three men are the Lord. He is one and he is three, and they are not divided." The Bomberg edition leaves out some of the words, but still the sense is much the same.

This was probably the opinion of those who appointed Gen. xviii. for Trinity Sunday, as it certainly is the opinion of Augustin. *Contra Maximinum*. Lib. II., xxvi. 5—7.

The opinion that one was the Lord, the other two created angels, seems more agreeable to the text.

<sup>3</sup> It may be replied that these appearances in the Old Testament were temporary and transient; but that, if admitted, does not at all affect the question. If it be impossible for God to become eternally incarnate, it is equally so to be united to a

But it may be said further, that this view of the passages considered is one superinduced by Christian prejudices,—and that to a mind free from the bias of a Christian education, the conclusion would be different, as in the case of the Jews. To this I reply, that the doctrines respecting the anthropomorphisms, mentioned in the Hebrew Scriptures, are perfectly modern; and that the ancient Jews drew from the same premises the same conclusion which we have done. From the translators of the Septuagint downwards, it appears that the Jews understood that the Old Testament language ascribed to God a human form. The Greek translators have generally allowed the anthropomorphisms to remain unsoftened and unexplained; but in some places where they thought the idea of corporeality was too strongly expressed, they have altered the text, as when it is said in the Hebrew that Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and the seventy elders saw the God of Israel, the Septua-

body, or human form, for a time. The form in which God appeared to Abraham, Moses, and the Prophets, was as much a creation, as a permanent human nature, and, therefore, involves all the difficulties attendant upon the Christian doctrine, and some peculiar to itself. If this form was not united with Deity, so as to be one with Him, then Abraham and Moses in worshipping this form, worshipped a creature. And if to escape this difficulty, it be admitted, that it was one with God, then, the fact of the union of the created and the Creator, which forms the main difficulty in the doctrine of incarnation, is admitted.

gint says, "They saw the place where the God of Israel stood." But in the Chaldee paraphrases there is a systematic alteration of every passage which implies corporeality. Wherever human attributes are ascribed directly to God in the Hebrew text, the Targums ascribe them to him whom they call, The word of the Lord, the glory of the Lord, and the Shechinah. Now, whatever the idea which they attached to these expressions, and this we do not at present inquire, it is plain that they feared the conclusion, that God has a human form or body, and wished to avoid it. If they had not entertained this fear there could have been no necessity for altering the text. But their anxiety in this respect manifests their opinion that the plain meaning of the unaltered words of Scripture represents God in human form, and implies corporeality. The Talmudists uniformly speak of God as existing in human form; and Maimonides himself acknowledges, in the very first sentence of the *Moreh Nevochim*,\* that a

\* Existimant vulgò homines, צלם *Tzelem* in lingua Hebræa Similitudinem in Formam alicujus rei significare, id quod ipsos induxit, ut crediderint Deum merè esse corporeum, quia dicit, *Faciamus hominem b'tzalmenn kidmutenu in imagine nostrâ, ad similitudinem nostram*, arbitantes, Deum eandem quam homines habere formam et figuram, necessariumque esse corporeitatem. That this was the common opinion appears also from a short remark of R. Abraham ben Dior on a sentence in the *Hilchoth T'shuvali*, c. iii., §. 6, where Maimonides says that every one

God in human form was the prevailing opinion when he wrote his book. The conclusion, therefore, which we have drawn is not the result of Christian prejudice, but the legitimate inference from the language employed — common to the Jews before the coming of Christ, as appears from the Septuagint—at the coming of Christ, as is evident from the Targum,—and for a thousand years after the coming of Christ, as appears from the Sohar, the Talmud, and most rabbinical writers down to Maimonides, and even after his time, until his opinions acquired authority.

The result, then, of the present inquiry is, that the doctrine of the revelation of God in human form is the universal doctrine of the Old Testament; that, therefore, there is no reason for explaining away the prophecies which, when interpreted according to their grammatical sense, imply that the promised Messiah was to be an incarnation of Deity. The next step is to examine those prophecies; but this must be deferred to another opportunity. We must conclude for the

who asserts that God is corporeal, and has a definite form, is a heretic, where the former rabbi says—

ולמה קרא לזה מין וכמה גדולים וטובים ממנו הלכו בזה המושג לפי מה שראו במקראות ויותר ממה שראו בדברי ההגדות המשמשות את הדעות

“Why does he call such an one a heretic, when many, greater and wiser than he, have walked in this opinion, according to that which they saw in the Scriptures, and still more in the Agadoth, which imply that doctrine.”



present with the remark, that the God revealed in the Old and New Testament is not a bare abstraction, utterly removed from the cognisance and the love of his creatures, but a Being who may be known and loved, who created us by an act of his will, who redeemed us by an act of his love, who watches over all our concerns, and is afflicted in all our afflictions, whom, though we see not now, we can know and love until that happy hour when we shall see him as he is. Now, then, let us ascribe unto him, the Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost, all glory and honour, might, majesty, and dominion, now and for ever.

## LECTURE III.

### ISAIAH IX. 6.

*“ 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.”*

IN order to prove the Messiahship of the Lord Jesus Christ, my first position was, that there are prophecies announcing that Messiah should be universally acknowledged as the true God, that Jesus of Nazareth has been acknowledged as such in a manner, and to an extent unparalleled in the history of the world, and that, therefore, He is the true Messiah, and the prophecies themselves are of Divine origin. But to this it is objected, that there can be no such prophecies, because the doctrine of the union of Deity and manhood in one person is contrary to the universal tenour and general analogy of the Old Testament teaching. This objection I answered in the last Lecture, by showing that the revelation which the law and the prophets make of the Divine Being, necessarily implies the doctrine of the incarnation of Deity; our business,

therefore, now is, to examine the particular passages which announce that the Messiah was to be acknowledged as the true God, and to point out their fulfilment.

Of these, some are couched in language which necessarily implies the acknowledgment of Messiah's Deity; there are others expressly asserting it. To the former class belongs the Forty-fifth Psalm, which refers, as the Jews themselves confess, to the Messiah and his glory,\* and which concludes with a promise, that to him should be ascribed eternal praise—"I will make thy name to be remembered in all generations; therefore shall the people praise thee for ever and ever."† Now,

\* Aben Ezra hesitates between David and Messiah his Son. But the Targum, David Kimchi, and even R. Isaac, in the "Chizzuk Emunah," interpret it positively of the Messiah. It cannot apply to any mere earthly king. I. It is found amongst the hymns intended for public worship, and, therefore, cannot be an epithalamium. II. If it be a poem laudatory of a king, it must be either a Gentile or a Jewish king. The first is impossible; the latter inapplicable. Solomon was not a warrior. None of the other kings sufficiently prosperous. III. The anointing by God, the righteousness of the king, the universality of the kingdom, the eternal praise to be offered by all nations, are applicable to the Messiah alone.

† The modern translators, as Rosenmüller and De Wette, take יְהַלְלֶנּוּ in the sense, "I will celebrate thy name in all generations." But this makes no difference. They interpret it of the king, who is the subject of the Psalm. Kimchi says plainly, that it is the Messiah whose name is mentioned in all generations, and whom the Gentiles shall praise.

it is true that praise may be ascribed to man, as well as to God, but not such praise as is here spoken of, which is universal and everlasting, and described in the very same terms as that universal worship which is to be given to the true God.\* The Seventy-second Psalm, which the Jews also interpret of Messiah speaks in like manner, and predicts the universal homage of all kings and nations, saying, "They that dwell in the wilderness shall bow before him; yea, all kings shall worship him; all nations shall serve him" (9—11.)†

\* Comp. 1 Chron. xvi. 4. "He appointed certain of the Levites to minister before the ark of the Lord, and to record לְהַזְכִּיר and to thank and to praise the Lord God of Israel." (Isaiah xii. 4.) "Praise the Lord, call upon his name, declare his doings among the people, make mention that his name is exalted." (Ps. lxxvii.) "Let the people praise thee, O God, yea, let all the people praise thee," &c., &c. Mendelssohn felt the awkwardness of these words when applied to a mere man, and, therefore, substitutes, "Dich soll die Nachwelt glücklich preisen." Dr. Solomon gives the words their natural force—"Darum werden dich die Völker preisen immer und ewig."

† So the Midrash in Ialkut Shimon, Part II., fol. 112, col. 2. The Targum says, that the king is Messiah, the Son of David. Aben Ezra applies it to Solomon, or to the Messiah. But his preference for the latter interpretation is perceptible. And still more so in Kimchi, who upon the words, "They shall fear thee as long as the sun and moon endure"—says, that if applied to Solomon it can only be hyperbolically, and then adds—

ואם על מלך המשיח הוא מפורש כי בני מלך המשיח תמלא הארץ  
דעה ה' וכן יהיה לעולם לא תפסוק יראת ה' מבני אדם לעולם  
ואינו דרך הפלגה אלא כן יהיה לעולם .

Isaiah announces that when Messiah shall have established judgment in the earth, the utmost isles shall acknowledge his word as the Word of God, "The isles shall wait for his law." Jeremiah says, explicitly, that the name whereby he shall be known is the incommunicable name of God. "This is the name whereby he shall be called, Jehovah our righteousness." (Jer. xxiii. 6.) More proof is unnecessary to show that in Messiah the prophets announced a person who was to be acknowledged as the true God. A more public and unequivocal acknowledgment of Deity cannot be imagined than eternal praise, universal worship, and general invocation by the name of God. But if more proof still be required, it is amply furnished in the words read as the text. Him, whom mankind invoke as Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace, they plainly acknowledge as the true God. The predicates, Mighty God and Everlasting Father, in themselves put this beyond all doubt. That Isaiah, whose words we are considering, intended by the epithet, Mighty God, the true God, appears from the following chapter, where he says, "And it shall come to pass in that day, that the

"But if it be interpreted of the King Messiah it is plain, for in his days the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord, and so it shall be for ever; the fear of the Lord shall not cease from the sons of men for ever, and in this case the language is not hyperbolical, but so it shall be for ever."

remnant of Israel, and such as are escaped of the house of Jacob, shall no more again stay upon him that smote them; but shall stay upon the Lord, the Holy One of Israel, in truth. The remnant shall return, even the remnant of Jacob, unto the Mighty God." And that Everlasting Father, or Father of eternity, signifies the Eternal, we know from the idiom of the language, according to which Father signifies proprietor or possessor.\* Here, then, if the passage be rightly translated, and refer to the Messiah, it is announced, that he is to be acknowledged as that Being to whom the Israelites are to return as to the Holy One of Israel, and who is the possessor of Eternity, that is as the true God. The modern Jews, however, assert that the prophet speaks of King Hezekiah, and that the prophet's words should be differently translated. This their interpretation is, however, rendered suspicious by its novelty. The old opinion of the Jews was, that it applied to the Messiah, as appears from the Chaldee paraphrase of Jonathan, and even from the Talmud itself, where the first application to Hezekiah is found. The former says expressly, that the Child born and the Son given is the Messiah, in whose days peace shall be multiplied, and the latter, when it applies the words to Hezekiah, says, that God wished to make him the Messiah, thereby implying that to the Messiah the

\* Hengstenberg *Christologie* Ersten Theiles 2<sup>te</sup> Abtheilung, p. 119.

passage primarily and properly refers. But that Hezekiah cannot be the person intended, is plain from a mere inspection of the words and their context. In no sense can Hezekiah be called the Prince of Peace. In no sense, literal or figurative, can it be said of him, that "Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it and to establish it from henceforth even for ever." Hezekiah's reign was neither peaceful, nor prosperous, nor eternal. Instead of the increase of his government having no end, the misfortunes and calamities which happened in his reign, were almost without parallel. In his days the ten tribes were carried into captivity. The kingdom of Judah was all but destroyed by the Assyrians, and he himself received the melancholy tidings that all his treasures should become the spoil of a foreign conqueror, and that his own posterity should be slaves in the palace of the King of Babylon. He never reigned over the kingdom of David, which included all the twelve tribes. He did not even reign in peace over Judah. He did not increase, but lost the little power which he possessed. He did not reign for ever, but after a life of calamity he died in grief, and left his dominions to another. He cannot therefore in any sense be said to have fulfilled the words of the prophet. If Isaiah spake these words of Hezekiah, he was a false prophet. If Isaiah

was a true, he did not speak here of Hezekiah.

But the modern Jews, in order to give even a semblance of plausibility to this interpretation, have been obliged to alter the rendering. Instead of translating as our English version does, "His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace," they say, "He who is Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, shall call his name the Prince of Peace." But this translation, like the interpretation, is a comparatively modern invention, and was evidently adopted to serve a purpose. The Septuagint, whatever its variations in different copies, shows that the Jews before the coming of Christ, and therefore before any controversy could arise, construed the words as we do. The early Christian Fathers, as Ignatius and Irenæus,\* give the translation almost exactly as our English version,

\* See the note in *loc.* in Bos. LXX. Comp. also the Syriac. Amongst the modern translators, Dr. Solomon tries another plan, "Man nennet seinen Namen: Wunder, Rath des Mächtigen Gottes, des Ewigen Vaters." But this does not diminish the Jewish difficulty, for He who is "Counsel" or "Counsellor of the Mighty God," must be more than a creature. The learned Dr. Zunz, and his colleagues, Arnheim, Fürst, and Sachs, render as we do, "Und man nennet seinen Namen: Wunder, Berather, Starker Gott, Ewiger Vater, Fürst des Friedens." Gesenius also retains the construction of our version, though he explains away the terms.



and as they were no Hebrew scholars, but had simply received what the Jews bequeathed to the Christian Church, show that this was the received version in their days. Even the Talmud itself declares against the modern Jewish version, for when it applies the text to Hezekiah, it says that he had eight names, and then proves its assertion by enumerating the eight words, Wonderful, Counsellor, God, Mighty, Father, Eternity, Prince, Peace.\* The Talmud, therefore, construes exactly as the English Bible. Moreover, the accentuators of the Hebrew Bible, who, wherever they lived, were certainly Jews, point out the same mode of construction, and are equally opposed to the modern Jewish gloss. According to the accents no other version can be given, than that adopted by the English translators.† It is true that there are various opinions about the age of the accents. Some say, they were affixed by Ezra, others by the learned men of Tiberias—others that they are the production of a still later period; but whichever opinion be adopted, it will confirm the correctness of the English version. The first and second opinions will show

\* Talm. Bab. Sanhedrin, fol. 94, col. 1. Compare also Ialkut Shimoni, Part II. fol. 37, col. 2. See also Bereshith Rabba in דברים, which also applies the passage to Messiah.

ד' א' אחר לו עד עכשיו לי להעמיד נקב המשיח שנתנו בו כי יולד יולד לנו •

† See Vitringa in loc.

the great antiquity of our present rendering; the last supposition will prove that it was the rendering known to the most learned Jews down to the tenth century after Christ, and consequently that the Jews, as a nation, did not depart from it until a very late period, and when they were forced to do so by the pressure of controversy. But, lastly, this modern Jewish translation is false, because it is directly opposed to the idiom and usage of the Hebrew language, as could be easily shown, were this the place to do so.\*

We have now, then, got to this point, that the version of the text contained in our English Bibles is correct, and that, whoever the person spoken of, he is to be acknowledged as the Mighty God, and the Everlasting Father. It remains to be

\* It is contrary to the idiom of Scripture to put שמר . referring to the person named, before the namer. In the Bible elsewhere שמר is always put between the namer and the person or thing named. See Gen. xvi. 15 ; xxi. 3 ; xxii. 14 ; Exod. ii. 22 ; Ruth iv. 7 ; 1 Sam. iii. 20 ; 2 Sam. xii. 25. Compare Gussetius's answer to the Chizzuk Emunah, Wagenseil's answer to the Carmen Lipmanni, p. 721, et sqq., and Vitringa. Aben Ezra, though a keen controversialist, could not receive this interpretation. He says:—

יש אומרים כי פלא אבי עד הן שמות השם ושם הילד שר שלום  
והנכון בשיני כי כל אלה שמות הילד .

“There are some who say that *Wonderful, Everlasting Father*, are the names of God, and that the name of the child is *Prince of Peace*, but that which is correct in my opinion is, that all these are the names of the child.”

shown that that person is the Messiah. I have already said that this was the opinion of the ancient Jews. The prophecies which confessedly speak of the Messiah, compared with the text, will shew that this ancient opinion is the true one. In the text the personage announced is called the Prince of Peace, and the preceding verses show that he bears this name, because, as the Targum says, in his time war was to cease and peace to abound. The 72d Psalm, and numerous other passages, predicate the same of Messiah, "In his days shall the righteous flourish, and abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth." (v. 7.) The text declares that the person spoken of is to possess the kingdom of his father David. The Psalms, and the prophets announce that the kingdom of David is to be restored in the days and person of the Messiah. The text assigns to its subject an universal and everlasting kingdom. Other prophecies promise this kingdom to the Messiah, as it is said, "He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth." Daniel says, "To him was given dominion and a kingdom and glory, 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.) Unless, therefore, there are to be two persons possessing universal and eternal empire, which is

impossible, the person described in the text is identical with the Messiah.

But there is one feature in this scripture which applies to him, and to no one else. The person announced is declared to be the true and everlasting God. The prophets assert and imply this of the Messiah, but of no other person. In the first place they give to Messiah the peculiar names of God. The 45th Psalm calls him Elohim, God. "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever."\* The 110th Psalm calls him Adonai, Lord, with a peculiar punctuation never employed of any one but God. "*Adonai*, † the Lord, shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath." The prophet Malachi calls him *Haadon*, "The *Lord*," which word with the article is never applied to any one but God; "The Lord ‡ whom ye seek shall suddenly come to his temple." The prophets Jeremiah and Zechariah both call him Jehovah.

\* To escape from this plain passage, R. Isaac (P. II. c. 95) is obliged to put in a word not in the text, interpreting the words "*Solium tuum est solium Dei*," in which he is nearly followed by Gesenius. (Comment. in Jesai. vol. i. p. 363, note.) But Dr. Solomon has "*Dein Thron, O Herr, steht ewig*." The Jewish-Spanish also has "*Tu silla, Dios, para siempre y siempre*." Ed. Amsterdam, An. 5522.

† "*אֲדֹנָי* (per Kametz) *Dominus*, ubique (teste Masora 134 locis) *κατ' ἐξοχήν* de Deo." Gesen. Thesaur.

‡ *הַמִּשְׁפֵּט*, on which Rashi says, *אלהי המשפט*, "The God of Judgment." Kimeli, *הוא מלך המשיח והוא מלאך הברית*, "That is the King Messiah, and he is the angel of the covenant."

But the Scriptures not only appropriate to Messiah the names of God, they invest him also with the predicates and attributes of the Divine Being. God and Messiah are both emphatically called, the King of Israel. Thus Zephaniah says, "Sing, O daughter of Zion; shout O Israel: be glad and rejoice with all the heart, O daughter of Jerusalem. The Lord hath taken away thy judgments, he hath cast out thine enemy: The King of Israel, even the Lord, is in the midst of thee." (iii. 14.) Zechariah speaks in the very same language of Messiah, "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem, behold thy King cometh unto thee." Now, when we remember that the peculiar constitution of the Jewish monarchy was at first a theocracy, and that the great promise of the prophets, and the hope of the Jews, is a restoration of that first constitution, the only way to avoid a palpable contradiction is to suppose that God and the Messiah are identical. In like manner it is said, that in the happy days yet to come, "The Lord shall be King over all the earth." The same thing is predicated in many passages of Messiah. The Scriptures assert that eternity is God's peculiar attribute. Micah and the Psalms assert of Messiah, that "his goings forth have been of old from everlasting." God says of himself that he is the Redeemer of Israel. "I will help thee, saith the Lord, and thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel." Isaiah says

that Messiah is the Redeemer, "The Redeemer shall come to Zion, and to them that turn from transgression in Jacob." Hosea says that Jehovah is the Saviour of Israel, "I will have mercy upon the house of Israel, and will save them by the Lord their God." God says of himself that He is the *only* Saviour, "I, even I, am the Lord; and beside me there is no Saviour." Yet Isaiah ascribes salvation to the Messiah. "Say ye to the daughter of Zion, Behold thy salvation cometh; behold his reward is with him, and his work before him." Hosea compares the gracious influences of God's favour to the rain. "Then shall we know, if we follow on to know the Lord; his going forth is prepared as the morning, and he shall come unto us as the rains, as the latter and the former rain." The Psalmist speaks in the very same language of the grace of the Messiah, "He shall come down like rain upon the mown grass; as showers that water the earth." In one place the prophet Isaiah speaks of the Lord God as the light of the world, "The Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God thy glory. Darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the people; but the Lord shall arise upon thee, and his glory shall be seen upon thee, and the Gentiles shall come to thy light." In another place he says that the Messiah is to be the light of the world, "I will give thee for a light to lighten the Gentiles, that thou mayest

be my salvation unto the ends of the earth." Lastly, God is declared to be the Judge of mankind. Isaiah says, "He shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people." Joel says, "Let the heathen be wakened, and come up to the valley of Jehoshaphat; for there will I sit to judge all the heathen round about." Abraham calls God the Judge of all the earth. The Psalms say, "He shall judge the world in righteousness, and the people with equity," and yet other scriptures declare that Messiah is to be the judge. The 72d Psalm says, "He shall judge thy people with righteousness." The 110th Psalm says of Messiah, "He shall judge among the heathen, he shall fill the places with dead bodies; he shall wound the heads over many countries." Isaiah says of him, "He shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears; but with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth." Daniel describes him as coming to judgment with the clouds of heaven. Many more predicates common to God and Christ might be added, but enough has been said to show that the inspired writers speak of the Messiah as equal in majesty, and possessing the same attributes as the true God. He who has the names of God, and the attributes of God, he who is described equally with God,

as the Head of the theocracy—the universal Sovereign of the world—the Redeemer—the Saviour—the Light of the World, the righteous Judge of all mankind, must be acknowledged as the true God, unless we suppose that God has intentionally constructed his word in such a manner as to mislead. As therefore the personage spoken of in the text is described as the true God, and the universal King, and the whole range of Scripture points out Messiah, and Messiah only, as the person to whom these attributes belong, he is the person here spoken of.

Thus I have made good my first assertion, that there are prophecies which announce that Messiah should be acknowledged as the true God. It now remains for me to show that Jesus of Nazareth has been acknowledged as such, in a manner and to an extent unparalleled in the history of the world. And I shall begin with the writers of the New Testament, looking upon them at present not as inspired apostles and evangelists, but simply as the earliest Christian writers, which no infidel, of even moderate information, can deny; and further, in referring to the New Testament, it is not my intention to cite those passages which are usually considered as proofs of the Deity of Christ, but some incidental expressions, commonly overlooked, but which, as showing the habit of mind of the New Testament writers, and the aspect in



which they constantly looked upon the character of Christ, are perhaps still more satisfactory to the unprejudiced thinker.

The first of these to which I shall allude, is the word "Bridegroom," used by most of the New Testament writers, as a title of the Lord Jesus Christ. Thus St. Matthew says, "Jesus said unto them, Can the children of the bride-chamber mourn, as long as the bridegroom is with them? but the days come, when the bridegroom shall be taken from them, then shall they fast." In the parables the return of Christ is described as the return of the bridegroom—as the marriage of the King's son. In the Epistle to the Ephesians, St. Paul speaks of Christ as the husband of the Church. And in the Revelation, St. John describes the re-union of Christ with his Church as the marriage-supper of the Lamb. Now, what was the idea in the minds of the New Testament writers, when they apply this figure to Christ? What is the idea of Christ which this figure would naturally suggest to the minds of persons acquainted with the Old Testament, or even with the Rabbinical writers? Simply this, that Christ is God. In the Old Testament, and in the Rabbinical writers, the union of the Church with God is looked upon as a marriage; God is the Bridegroom or husband of the Church. The Church is the Bride or Spouse of God, and excepting to Christ, this figure is applied to no one else. Thus Isaiah says, "Thy

Maker is thy husband ; the Lord of Hosts is his name ; and thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel ; the God of the whole earth shall he be called." (liv. 5.) Thus Jeremiah describes the union of God with Israel, when he brought them out of Egypt, as a marriage, " Thus saith the Lord, I remember thee, the kindness of thy youth, the love of thine espousals, when thou wentest after me in the wilderness, in a land that was not sown." (Jer. ii. 2.) And thus Hosea describes the future restoration of Israel to the favour of God as a marriage, " I will betroth thee unto me for ever ; yea, I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness and in judgment, and in loving-kindness, and in mercies ; I will even betroth thee unto me in faithfulness, and thou shalt know the Lord." (ii. 19, 20). And hence the common figure for idolatry and departure from God is the violation of the marriage vow. When, therefore, the New Testament writers applied this figure to Christ, and represent him as the husband of the Church, they must have considered him as God—for they could not mean that the Church was to forsake God, her first and lawful husband, and be married to another. A study of the Rabbinical writers, as, for instance, the Chaldee paraphrase, and the Jewish commentaries on the Song of Solomon, will lead to precisely the same conclusion. They use the same figure in the same way. The habitual thought of the

Jews was and is that God was the husband of the Church; when, therefore, the New Testament writers who were Jews, thought of Christ as the bridegroom and husband of the Church, they thought of him as God.

Another figure which St. Matthew and St. Luke both use of our Lord, is that of a bird gathering her chickens under her wings. "How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not." (Matt. xxiii. 37; Luke xiii. 34.) Now, this figure also is in the Old Testament and Rabbinical writings applied exclusively to God. Thus, in Deut. xxxii. 11, Moses, "As an eagle stirreth up her nest, fluttereth over her young, spreadeth abroad her wings, taketh them, beareth them on her wings, so the Lord alone did lead him, and there was no strange god with him." In the book of Ruth, ii. 12, Boaz says to Ruth, "The Lord recompense thy work, and a full reward be given thee of the Lord God of Israel, under whose wings thou art come to trust." And, in like manner, David prays to God, "Hide me under the shadow of thy wings." (Ps. xvii. 8.) The Rabbinical writers use the figure in precisely the same way, "To be gathered under the wings of the Shechinah," is an expression of frequent occurrence, and commonly is used of a Gentile who has been converted to Judaism.\* The

\* See Schöttgen on Matt. xxiii. 39.

New Testament writers, therefore, used an expression occurring frequently in their sacred writers, and one in common use amongst the Jews. If they used it in the Old Testament sense, then they understood that Christ was very God; if in the Jewish sense, then they believed him to be the Shechinah, that is, the Divine Person who appeared to Abraham, Moses, and the prophets, and whom they worshipped as God.

Another figure of common occurrence is that of Shepherd. In St. Luke's Gospel, chap. xv., our Lord compares himself to a man who left his ninety-nine sheep to seek the one that he had lost. In St. John's Gospel, he calls himself the Good Shepherd, and by St. Peter he is called the Chief Shepherd. Now, in the Old Testament the word shepherd is applied to men as by Isaiah to Cyrus, and by Jeremiah and Ezekiel to the teachers of Israel. But there is a peculiarity in its application to our Lord in the New Testament, which is found with respect to God in the Old Testament, and which shows that evangelists and apostles thought of our Lord as very God. He is spoken of as the owner and possessor of the flock, and not simply as a shepherd, who may only be another's servant. Thus, in St. John's Gospel, Christ distinguishes between himself and others who did not own the sheep, "I am the Good Shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep. But

he that is an hireling and not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and fleeth. I am the Good Shepherd, and know my sheep, and am known of mine. And other sheep I have which are not of this fold: them also I must bring that they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold and one shepherd." St. Paul says to the elders of Ephesus, "Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." Here the flock is represented as the property of Christ, which he had purchased. In the New Testament the flock is never said to belong to any other than God or Christ, and this is the usage of the Old Testament also. There the flock is represented exclusively as God's. Thus, the Psalmist says, "We are his people, and the sheep of his pasture." (Ps. c.) Isaiah says, "He shall feed his flock like a shepherd." In Jeremiah xxiii. 1, God says, "Woe unto the pastors that destroy and scatter the sheep of my pasture, saith the Lord. Therefore, thus saith the Lord God of Israel, against the pastors that feed my people, Ye have scattered my flock," &c. And so in all the Old Testament writings, God is spoken of as the owner and proprietor of the flock. Never are they said to belong to either king, or priest, or prophet, whom

he had sent to feed them. The doctrine of the Old Testament is, that the flock is God's; that of the New, that the flock is Christ's. It follows necessarily that the New Testament writers thought of Christ as God, and when they spoke of him as the Shepherd, acknowledged him as such. In close connexion with the preceding figure is the New Testament doctrine that "we are all to stand at the judgment seat of Christ." I have already noticed the general fact, that the Old Testament speaks of God and Messiah as judge. But I wish to direct your attention to one account given in the Gospel of St. Matthew, which in itself abundantly shows that that Gospel teaches the proper Deity of Messiah. "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations, and he shall separate them as a shepherd divideth sheep from goats." Now this representation is composed of passages taken from the prophets, each of which speaks of the true God. The words, "the Son of man shall come, and all his holy angels with him," exactly agree with what Zechariah (xiv. 5) says of the day of the Lord. "The Lord my God shall come, and all the holy with thee," where the Jewish commentators interpret holy ones of angels. The Son of man sitting upon a throne, agrees with the vision of God vouchsafed to Ezekiel, who saw the likeness of a man sitting upon the throne. The expression,

“ throne of glory,” occurs only once in the Old Testament, where it signifies the throne of God. “ Do not disgrace the throne of thy glory.” (Jer. xiv. 21.) But it is in the Jewish writers, and amongst the Jews themselves, a very common expression to this day, and always means the throne of God. The words, “ Before him shall be gathered all nations,” agree with the Prophet Joel’s account of God’s judgment of the world. “ I will also gather all nations.” “ Assemble yourselves, and come, all ye heathen, and gather yourselves together round about: thither cause thy mighty ones to come down, O Lord,” where the Jewish commentators also interpret mighty ones to mean the angels. The representation that he shall “ separate them as a shepherd divideth sheep from goats,” is taken from the 34th of Ezekiel, where God says, “ As for you, O my flock, thus saith the Lord God, Behold I judge between cattle and cattle, between the rams and the he-goats.” Thus, we see, that the New Testament ascribes to Christ, not only the act of judgment, which in the Old is attributed to God, but describes every circumstance of that judgment in language which the prophets had employed of the true God. How can this be accounted for, except on the supposition that the New Testament writers so habitually thought of Christ as of God, that they interpreted most of the Old Testament passages where God is spoken of as referring to Christ? But if we

take Christian ground, and grant that these writers were inspired, and have faithfully recorded the words of Christ, then it is impossible to deny that Christ laid claim to proper Deity, and that it is the will of the Father that we should believe in him, and worship him as the true God.

Enough has been said to show that Christ was acknowledged as the true God by the evangelists and apostles. Several writers of our Church have shown that he was acknowledged as such by the Christian Church before the Nicene Council, and ever since all Christian Churches, Latin, Greek, Oriental, and Reformed have worshipped him as the Second Person of the ever-blessed Trinity. The prophets declared that a descendant of the tribe of Judah, a man, should be acknowledged as the mighty God, the everlasting Father. Jesus has been, and is acknowledged as such by the greatest, the wisest, the most civilized, and the most powerful nations upon earth. There is no parallel case in the history of mankind. The deified mortals of the ancient mythology cannot here be brought into comparison; they were never acknowledged as very God from eternity, and even the dim light of heathen philosophy overthrew their claims to Deity altogether. It cannot be said that the prophecies which we have considered have wrought their own fulfilment, nor that the state of the world, as it



existed in the time of the prophets, suggested the predictions. Never was there anything more improbable than it was in the time of David, Isaiah, or Jeremiah, or even of Christ, that an individual of the Jewish nation should be acknowledged and worshipped as the true God, and that to the very ends of the earth. But of all the individuals of the Jewish nation the most unlikely to fulfil the prophecies was Jesus of Nazareth. Who that saw him condemned by the Sanhedrin as an impostor, and expire on the cross as a criminal, could possibly have conjectured that his name should be remembered to all generations, and that all people should praise him for ever? Who that beheld him mocked by his own people, as they bowed the knee, and cried Hail, could have predicted that the greatest of kings should fall down before him, and the most enlightened nations do him service? Who that read the inscription upon the cross, which implied that he was crucified for calling himself the King of the Jews, could have a presentiment that his name should be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace? If he had been a mighty conqueror, whose arms could have compelled, or whose glory could have dazzled the sons of men, or a wonder of learning, rising above all the knowledge of his times, surprising the world by his discoveries, and appearing as superhuman by the powers of science, the fulfilment would not have been so satisfactory;

or even, if lacking these things, he had been of any other nation than the Jews, the acknowledgment would not have been so astonishing. But that a man without any power or human learning—despised and rejected by a nation itself despised and hated by all the world—that such an one should be received, acknowledged, and worshipped as God, and thus fulfil the prophecies, baffles all human wisdom, and proves that He is truly what men acknowledge him. That the prophecies existed cannot be denied. Even Infidels, capable of judging of the original language, have confessed that the prophecies which we have quoted are the genuine words of David, Isaiah, and Jeremiah, and the other prophets; that is they admit that from two to three thousand years ago, a succession of individuals announced that a man should be born in Judea whom all nations should worship as their God. It is equally impossible to deny the fulfilment. An individual has arisen, and has been so worshipped. How, then, are we to account for the coincidence? It cannot be explained by the philosophy of the human mind. It cannot be attributed to any power of human sagacity. Other nations have not produced conjectures that have been so extraordinarily accomplished. The individuals who delivered these predictions were all of one nation. Two difficulties are here to be solved; the first, if these men were not true prophets, how they came to utter true predictions. The second, how it

has happened that one nation, and one nation only, has produced such fortunate impostors. But these are not the only difficulties which the deniers of Divine revelation have to solve. They must show, further, why these pretended prophecies were accomplished rather in Jesus of Nazareth than in Bar Kochab, or Shabthi Tzevi, or any other of those individuals who laid claim to the character of the Messiah, some of whom had all the wealth and power and learning of their nation on their side, but whose deaths annihilated all their pretensions, and whose names are now almost forgotten. They must further explain how a God of truth, as he must be, if there be a God, has in his providence suffered pretended prophecies to be fulfilled, and thus stamped the seal of truth on falsehood. They must explain how a God of love can suffer his creatures to be the victims of so dreadful a delusion, and leave them without any remedy. If the Scriptures be true, there ever has been a remedy for every error which has appeared in the world. But if false, there is none. The existence of the prophecies is certain; their accomplishment we behold with our own eyes. We must, therefore, either conclude that they are fictitious, and were fulfilled by chance; and then we must further conclude that God is not the Governor of the world, or that God, as Governor of the world, either permitted or ordered their accomplishment, and, therefore, that he has willingly given over his

creatures to delusion, or, as every reasonable mind must reject such blasphemous conclusions, we must admit that the fulfilment shows that the prophecies were true, and that Jesus of Nazareth is the promised Messiah.

## LECTURE IV.

### PSALM XVIII. 43.

*“Thou hast delivered me from the strivings of the people ;  
and thou hast made me the head of the heathen : a  
people whom I have not known shall serve me.”*

THE object of the present course of Lectures is to show that a series of predictions delivered long before the birth of Jesus of Nazareth, have been fulfilled in his history, and thence to conclude that these prophecies must themselves have a Divine origin, and that He who accomplished them is the promised Redeemer. The first class of prophecies selected for this purpose is that of which we see the fulfilment with our own eyes. It is a fact which cannot be denied, that certain persons living many centuries before the Christian era, sketched the great outline of the religious portraiture of mankind, as at present exhibited to the eyes of the observer in every part of the world. Some of these, referring to the acknowledgment of Messiah's Deity, we have already considered. The feast which the Church this day celebrates, the commemoration of the manifesta-

tion of Christ to the Gentiles, reminds us of one of the most striking features of prophetic history. The distinction between Jew and Gentile is universally known, and the most unobservant cannot be ignorant of the fact, that the most civilized portion of the Gentile world professes the religion founded by a member of the Jewish nation, one to whom his own people refused to hearken when he was amongst them, and whose doctrines the majority have ever since continued to reject. It requires no ingenuity to prove, and no range of reading to understand, that Jesus of Nazareth is believed on by the Gentiles and rejected by the Jews. This is a fact of which all the world to this very hour is cognizant. The distinctive nationality of the Jew is still plainly inscribed upon the foreheads of a people scattered amongst all the families of the earth, and their unbelief is as notorious as their existence. Here then is a remarkable trait in the moral and intellectual history of man, rendered doubly so by its extension over a space of nearly two thousand years. The morals, faith, and practice of those nations who have played the chief part in the history of the human race, have been and are moulded and directed by the precepts of a Jew who lived and died in Palestine, whilst his countrymen, far from being proud of their relationship to this most wonderful of men, still pursue his memory with reproach and contempt. But what is more striking still is, that this promi-

ment feature in the destinies of man, forms the subject of a chain of prophecies extending for fifteen centuries more through the period that preceded the birth of that individual—of prophecies so clear, explicit, and free from every shade of ambiguity, that we must either admit that they are from God, or deny that the Almighty Creator of the universe has any share in the moral government of the work of his own hands. To these prophecies I now request your attention.

The first step would naturally be to prove that the oracular enunciations of which we speak were really delivered before the dawn of the events to which we refer as their fulfilment. The proof is both easy and satisfactory. We possess the supposed prophecies in two distinct recensions derived from independent sources. The Christian Church has preserved and transmitted to us a translation which even sceptics admit to have existed at least 130 years before the appearance of the Lord Jesus Christ.\* The Jews treasured up the Hebrew originals with exemplary and pious care. The comparison of the two in their differences as well as their agreement, is sufficient to prove their identity, and their previous existence. The examination of the originals, however, leads us back with

\* "Nur so viel ist wahrscheinlich, dass die ganze oder der grösste Theil des A. T. zur Zeit des Enkels des Jesus Sirach (130 J. v. Chr.) in griechischer Sprache vorhanden war." De Wette Einleitung, pp. 75, 76.

certainty to a period far more remote. The most inattentive student readily distinguishes the Hebrew books into two classes, those written before and those written after the Babylonish captivity; and this distinction proves at once that the prophecies existed at least five hundred years before the reputed accomplishment commenced. The more accurate student learns to distinguish different eras in the first of these two classes, and thus, by an inspection of the language and the internal evidence, to bring us back to the time of Moses. And it is to be noted that the high antiquity of the books in which these prophecies are contained, is asserted not only by the orthodox Christian, but by the leading champions of German Rationalism. One of their most celebrated orientalists asserts decidedly, in his "History of the Hebrew Language and Literature," that the antiquity of some of them reaches back at least to the days of Solomon and David, that is to a thousand years before Christ,\* and maintains, with the exception of some pas-

\* "Of the greater historic writings, the Pentateuch, the books of Joshua, and Judges, Samuel and the Kings, may be reckoned to this first class; the chief component parts, at least, were certainly written in this period, although the supposition of a later redaction, with addition of some portions, remains necessary. The collection of Psalms contains, especially in the first books, many old, genuine Davidic pieces, or such as proceeded from his school." Gesenius *Geschichte der Heb. Sprache*, p. 23.



sages, the genuineness of the prophetic books, remarking that the dates of these writings are the most easily determined.\* Indeed, this is one of the indirect advantages which has resulted from the positive evil of this form of infidelity, that sceptics have applied themselves to the diligent and critical study of the sacred books, and have arrived at conclusions most important to the lover of Christian truth, and entirely subversive of the blind and ignorant incredulity of earlier free-thinkers; so that, on the testimony of adversaries, we can assert that the latest of the prophetic books to which we now refer was written 500 years before the Christian era, and that they commence at least 500 years more before that period. This degree of antiquity is quite sufficient for our present purpose. He who can foretell the future history of mankind at a distance of 500 years, cannot be condemned as an impostor, nor esteemed an enthusiast for having laid claim to the character of an inspired prophet; and if we can show that writings so ancient predict the religious state of the leading portion of mankind as we behold it with our own eyes, we exhibit a sufficient warrant for our faith, and may safely challenge the unbeliever to account for a prescience so truly marvellous.

Our assertion is, that the ancient books of the

\* Gesenius Geschichte der Heb. Sprache, p. 24.

Hebrews contain a prophetic announcement that one of the posterity of Abraham should be believed on by the Gentiles, and rejected by those of his own nation. We commence our proof with the books commonly and justly ascribed to Moses. The first of them contains, in its 22d chapter, a promise to Abraham, thrice reiterated, that in his seed all the families of the earth should be blessed. The 49th chapter is more definite in determining that this promise should be accomplished in an individual, at the same time intimating that the belief of the Gentiles should be accompanied by the rejection of the family of Judah. I allude to the well known prophecy of Jacob, which says, “The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet until Shiloh come, and to him shall be the gathering (or, as it is elsewhere rendered, the obedience) of the nations.”\* When Jacob says,

\* Various attempts have been made to get rid of the testimony which this passage gives to Christianity. Some modern Jews endeavour to explain Shiloh of the place so called, and not of the Messiah. But then they cannot agree whether Judah is to come to Shiloh, or he from Shiloh to come to Judah. Dr. Solomon is for the first, Dr. Zunz for the second. Others, Aben Ezra tells us, would take יבֵּא in the sense of “set,” i. e., until the end of Shiloh come. Others, again, would separate עֲדֵיכִי and translate עַד “for ever,” making the sense, “The sceptre shall not depart from Judah for ever, for Shiloh shall come.” But this is contrary to the accents, and all these various attempts to get rid of the ancient rendering

that the sceptre and lawgiver shall not depart from Judah until the coming of Shiloh, and the obedience of the nations, he plainly implies that then they shall depart; that is, that the independent existence of the Jewish state was then to cease, and the hitherto favoured tribe to be deprived of its privileges. This deprivation cannot be regarded in any other light than that of a punishment, and punishment again presupposes disobedience, so that in this most ancient and early prediction, the faith of the Gentiles in the promised descendant of Judah is expressly announced, and the disobedience and unbelief of the Jews as plainly intimated.

The conversion of the Gentiles is again predicted in the 14th chapter of Numbers, and that in a connexion which implies that the extension of the knowledge of God to them should be a consequence of Jewish unbelief. On the return of the spies from the promised land, faithlessness took entire possession of the mind of Israel. They had heard of the strength and valour of the inhabitants of Canaan, and would not believe that even the Almighty himself was able to give the inheritance. God threatened to destroy them, but, moved by the intercession of Moses, he says, "I

only show how strongly the argument is felt against Judaism. Onkelos, the Talmud, Midrash, Rashi, &c., &c., and even the Jewish-Spanish version, give the same interpretation that we do, both as to construction, and as to its reference to the Messiah.

have pardoned according to thy word; but as truly as I live, all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord." Here, then, is an announcement that the peculiar privileges of Israel were to cease, and that the knowledge of God not only to be offered to, but accepted by, the Gentiles. As unbelief was the occasion of the prediction, it is natural to infer that unbelief should also be the cause of the fulfilment. And this is confirmed by a similar passage in the song of Moses. There, in Deut. xxxii. 43, the calling of the Gentiles to a participation of Jewish privilege is plainly announced in the words, "Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with his nation." And that the first communication of Divine truth was to be a punishment for Jewish unbelief, is as plainly declared in the 21st verse, where God says, "They have moved me to jealousy with that which is not God; they have provoked me to anger with their vanities; and I will move them to jealousy with those which are not a people; I will provoke them to anger with a foolish nation."

Thus the books of Moses plainly announce the rebellion of the Jews, and the belief of the Gentiles in one to spring from Abraham in the family of Judah. The Psalms are still more express. In the 72d Psalm we are told of one "who is to have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth; before whom all Kings shall fall down; and whom all nations shall serve."

And in the 2d Psalm it is promised that he shall have “the heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession.” In the 22d Psalm it is intimated that this conversion of the heathen is to take place in consequence of the help vouchsafed by God to one who had been greatly afflicted and despised by the Jewish people. Thus, from the 24th verse it is said, “He hath not despised nor abhorred the affliction of the afflicted, neither hath he hid his face from him; but when he cried unto him, he heard. My praise shall be of thee in the great congregation . . . the meek shall eat and be satisfied; they shall praise the Lord that seek him. Your heart shall live for ever. All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord; and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee.” Here the conversion of the heathen is made to follow the deliverance of one that had been afflicted. In the 6th verse we are told that the Jewish people were they who despised him. “I am a worm, and no man; a reproach of men, and despised of the people.” The 69th Psalm describes the same person as despised and persecuted by his own brethren. “Because for thy sake I have borne reproach; shame hath covered my face. I am become a stranger unto my brethren, and an alien unto my mother’s children.” The Psalm also from which the text is taken, describes one delivered from the persecution

of the Jews, and made of chief authority over the heathen. "Thou hast delivered me from the strivings of the people; and thou hast made me the head of the heathen: a people whom I have not known shall serve me."

The prophets speak of the reception of the Messiah in similar terms. The prophet Isaiah, in chap. xlix. 7, after announcing that the hope of Israel was to be a light to the Gentiles, and salvation unto the ends of the earth, goes on immediately to describe the Jewish contempt and abhorrence of this same person. "Thus saith the Lord, the Redeemer of Israel, his Holy One, to him whom man despiseth, to him whom the nation abhorreth, to a servant of rulers, Kings shall see and arise, princes also shall worship, because of the Lord that is faithful, and the Holy One of Israel, and he shall choose thee." In that well known passage, descriptive of Messiah's humiliation and sufferings, he in like manner asserts the belief of the Gentiles, saying, "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 they shall consider." And then, speaking of the conduct of his own people, adds, "he was despised, and we esteemed him not; we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted."\* In

\* See a Tract of mine, entitled, "The Doctrine and Interpretation of Isaiah liii." London, Wertheim, 1845.

the 65th chapter, without mentioning the person, he again confirms his former accounts of the conduct of Jew and Gentile, by describing the faith of the one, and the unbelief of the others. "I am sought of them that asked not for me; I am found of them that sought me not: I said, Behold me, Behold me, unto a nation that was not called by my name. I have spread out my hands all the day unto a rebellious people, which walketh in a way that was not good, after their own thoughts."

The prophet Hosea describes the long continuance of the Jewish people in a state of religious error in his 3d chapter, and implies that part of this error was unbelief in the Son of David, for he specifies their return to him as part of their repentance. "The children of Israel shall abide many days without an image, and without an ephod, and without Teraphim. Afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the Lord their God, and David their King; and shall fear the Lord and his goodness in the latter days." Daniel implies that the state of the Jews at the coming of the Messiah should be one highly displeasing to the Almighty, for he declares that Messiah shall be cut off, and that this event is to be succeeded by the destruction of the temple and the city, thus intimating, by the severity of the punishment with which they were to be visited,

that they should be guilty of the rejection of the Messiah.

Zechariah is more express, and declares (xii. 10) that the house of David, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, are to be the instruments of his murder, and that for this they are hereafter to repent, saying, "I will pour upon the house of David, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and 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."\* He also declares that the dispersion and calamity of the Jewish people should be the consequence of the death of Messiah, saying, (xiii. 7,) "Smite the Shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered." And at the same time he announces that Messiah, at his first advent, is to be a blessing to the remotest Gentiles, for he says, (ix. 10,) "He shall speak peace to the heathen; and his dominion shall be from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth."

Malachi, the last of the prophets, foretels that God's name should be great amongst the Gentiles,

\* For the interpretation of this and the following passage, see "the Remarks" appended to the xiith and xiiith chapters in the translation of Kimchi on Zechariah.



but that Messiah's coming should be to the judgment of the Jewish priests and nation.

Thus we have shown that a series of prophecies, beginning, as even infidels admit, at least two thousand eight hundred years ago, correctly and truly trace out the history of religious belief, expressly delineate the most striking and prominent feature in the world's history, and describe the relative position of Jew and Gentile as we behold it at the present moment. The facts of the case are indisputable; but how are the phenomena to be explained? Is the marvellous coincidence to be ascribed to chance, or sagacious conjecture—to the efforts of human fraud, or the provisions of Divine wisdom? To suppose that any visible results, moral or physical, are fortuitous, would be not simply to deny the existence of a Divine Being, but to overthrow the first principle of all science, of which the present age is so proud. To maintain that the moral development of the most enlightened portion of the human race, during a period of nearly three thousand years, can be traced to no cause, and accounted for by no laws of moral movement, is possible only to the unthinking or the profoundly ignorant. The production of effects so stupendous, so important and so enduring, must surely be ascribed to some cause of commensurate magnitude, would seem to intimate the existence of previous design, and to be worthy of the counsels of that wisdom which is

infinite. It is undeniable that the Christian nations now possess the impelling force that moves and influences all the families of man in every thing that relates to art, civilization, science, and morals; and it is equally certain that the genius and precepts of the religion of Christ exercise an unlimited control over the mental and moral development of the Christian nations, so that in truth the present happiness and future welfare of the world are dependent upon the fact that a certain Jewish individual was rejected by his own people, and received by a portion of the Gentile world. Can any one believe that there is a living, intelligent, merciful Creator of the world, and believe at the same time, that he has left the growth and perfection of his creature's powers and faculties, as well as his happiness, individual and generic, to the unguided operation of chance? If such a supposition be impossible, still more so is the other, that the course of this fortuitous development should be foreknown and accurately foretold, for here we should have the double difficulty of fortuitous prediction agreeing with the fortuitous development of history. To foretel the course of events traced out in the counsels of the Most High is miraculous, but accidentally to describe what may or may not happen, and accidentally to hit the mark that was never held up to the arrow of conjecture, is to assert a miracle far more incredible than any received by the faith of Chris-

tians. It is to teach that results, unknowable and uncertain to the ken of Omniscience, may be fortuitously spied out by the conjectures of rude and ignorant mortals.

To ascribe, therefore, the pre-existence of these prophecies and their fulfilment to chance, is utterly impossible. Some may, however, say that the prophecies are of that kind which is perfectly natural, and likely to arise in the minds of every nation, however unenlightened and barbarous; that for the seers of any one people to predict the conversion of all other nations to their own religion, is the simple dictate of national egotism, and that such predictions merely express a hope common to all who have ever had a religion to propagate. This solution is a little more reasonable and plausible than that offered by the assertion of chance, but it is far from being satisfactory. The question still remains, how and why it was that the hope of the Jew has been realized, whilst the corresponding hopes of all other nations have been falsified. There was no necessity why the wishes of any one of all should be accomplished. They might have been all equally disappointed. The religions of antiquity might have all perished alike, and new and various religions succeeded. Besides, this proffered solution does not state the case as it actually is. It is not true that the Gentiles have been converted to the national religion of Israel, nor that the prophets of Israel

simply embodied that vague and universal hope of the triumph of their own religion. The Hebrew Scriptures nowhere announce that other nations should become Jews, or that the rite of circumcision should be universally observed. They predict the conversion of the Gentiles to the worship of the true God, not to the form of their religion, and make a distinction between the form and substance of faith, which seems beyond the powers of a rude and uncultivated age and people, at the same time that by the concomitant prediction of the unbelief of their own people, and the consequent punishment, they emerge entirely from the sphere of national egotism. The hope of the prophets is unnational, and totally different from any expectation entertained by other nations, inasmuch as it makes the peace and conversion of others to the truth to contemporize with the unbelief and calamity of their own brethren.

Another attempt may be made to account for the coincidence of prophecy and fulfilment, by referring the former to sagacious conjecture. It may be said that the Hebrew prophets, being pious men, were convinced that truth must ultimately triumph; and, believing that their religion was the truth, naturally conjectured the conversion of other nations, and perceived, in the follies and corruptions of idolatry, the seeds of necessary decay. This may apparently account for the prophecies, but is very far from explaining the fulfil-

ment, and leads directly to one of two conclusions, either that the prophets were correct in their expectation, and then their religion is really true, or that they were wrong, and therefore that the course of Providence has stamped the seal of truth upon the page of falsehood. But a very slight examination of the prophecies is sufficient to show that their delineation of future history is far beyond the sphere and the power of conjecture the most sagacious. There is an accuracy of outline, and a minuteness of detail, to which even now that the predictions are accomplished, the historian can add but little to make the picture more complete. A wise and thoughtful Israelite might attain, by the exercise of his reason, to a full assurance of the certainty of the unity of God, and consequently be persuaded of the folly and wickedness of the polytheistic systems by which he was surrounded; and, being equally assured of the goodness of the Creator, he might infer that, at some future period, God would send out his light and his truth to the very ends of the earth. But this is the utmost of what could be conjectured. It would be utterly impossible for such an one to foresee and to foretel that the mighty and health-bringing change—the vast and universal overthrow of all the existing superstitions—the moral earthquake that was to shake the nations to the limits of the world, and to the end of time, was to be produced by the most feeble and unlikely

of agents—by the teaching of an individual known to his own nation only as a condemned and executed criminal. Still less would he enter into the detail of that individual's history, or entertain the remotest conception that the friends and disciples of truth should be found amongst the ignorant and debased polytheists, whilst the favoured people of God should prove its bitterest foes—or that the dawn of light upon the heathen should be contemporary with the destruction of the temple, and the dispersion of the holy people. Yet all this, and much more, the prophets of Israel saw and foretold. They predicted that which to their unassisted reason must have been utterly improbable, and even contrary to all the data upon which they could argue. They foretold that the conversion of the heathen should be a source of jealousy and a punishment to the Jews, and that their own favoured people should continue many days in error and dispersion, whilst the hope of Israel should appear as the head of the heathen. All the nations of the world now see that they spoke the truth.

The more these prophecies are studied, the more certain will it appear that they are beyond the range of conjecture. But the question may still be asked, whether they and their fulfilment are not the result of successful fraud—whether the prophets were not impostors, who, pretending to supernatural wisdom, and obliged, in support of

their assumed character, to predict something, uttered the prophecies which we consider, whilst succeeding generations of impostors determined to accomplish them? To this we reply, that an imposture of this kind is in the highest degree improbable, and its success altogether impossible. That any number of Jews should conspire to do good to the Gentiles, and to deprive their own nation of their religious ascendancy, is utterly incredible to those acquainted with the religion, opinions, and practice of that people from before the appearance of Christ to the present hour. Modern Judaism is far from breathing good will towards the other nations of the earth, and the expectations of the Rabbies are the very contrary of those expressed by the prophets. They regard the Jewish people as incapable of any departure from the truth, and look not for the conversion so much as the destruction of the Gentiles.\* Their idea of conversion is also totally opposed to that entertained by the ancients. They believe that those Gentiles who shall be converted, will submit to circumcision, and embrace modern Judaism, whilst the prophets simply expected a conversion to the God of Israel, not to the forms of the national religion.† The Rabbies, and the

\* See "Old Paths," No. 37.

† In the present time no proselytes are received, unless they consent to circumcision, and every tittle of the law, (Maimonides' *Hilchoth Issure Biah*, c. xiv.,) and in the days of Messiah

great body of the nation, at the time when Christianity began to be propagated, and, from that time to the present hour, have considered it unlawful to receive converts, as the apostles did, without circumcision. Their principles make them zealous to proselyte, but unwilling to communicate to a Gentile, as such, the light of truth.\* It is, therefore, in the highest degree improbable that any body of impostors, educated in such principles, should be able even to understand, much less have a desire to fulfil, the predictions of the prophets. There have been Jewish impostors enough who have pretended to the character of the Messiah, almost in every age from the apostolic to the end of the seventeenth century, but not one amongst them all ever attempted to fulfil the prophecies which announce Messiah as the light of the Gentiles. From Bar Kochav to Shab-thai Ts'vee they all confined their efforts to the restoration of the kingdom and political power of Israel, and manifested hostility to the Gentiles. Here, then, history proves what we have already inferred from the genius and principles of Judaism, that Jewish impostors were not likely to engage in an undertaking for the benefit of the heathen, and the depression of their brethren.

the Talmud says that no proselytes at all are to be received. See *Avodah Zarah*, fol. iii. col. 2.

\* The oral law does not allow them even to keep a slave, unless he consents to be circumcised. See *Maimonides loc. citat.*



But even if they had, success was entirely beyond the limits of possibility. To procure national unbelief on the part of the Jews; to overthrow the existing religions of heathenism; to effect the dispersion of the Jewish people, and their continued preservation in unbelief for eighteen centuries, and during the same time to maintain the fidelity of the Gentiles, is plainly beyond the capabilities of human wisdom or power. It might, perhaps, have been possible, in their life-time, to avert the minds of the Jews from Christianity, and to win some of the Gentiles; but to set in motion an imposture which should operate successfully for seventeen centuries after their death, ensure the existence of the Jewish nation and the Christian Church, and maintain its influence over their minds in every clime, age, and nation, and under all circumstances, is more than all mankind joined hand in hand can effect, and to believe it, is to ascribe omnipotence to imposture. More than twenty pretenders have laid claim to the character of the Messiah, some of them having at their command the wealth and arms of the Jewish nation, and possessing strength sufficient to scatter the legions and defy the power of imperial Rome. Time has obliterated every trace of their pretensions and their operations.\* The only

\* See the account of the false Messiahs in "Kidder's Demonstration," P. III. c. x.

claimant of Messiahship, the effects of whose pretensions have been permanent, and are still visible to the eyes of the whole human race, is he who had neither arms, nor wealth, nor power—and who alone of all endeavoured to realize the expectations of the ancient prophets by teaching a religion separate from national form, and suitable for all people. It is for the sceptic to explain why those who apparently possessed the means of ensuring success, have totally failed, whilst he who wanted all means succeeded; why those who departed from the lines traced out by the prophets have come to nought, whilst he who followed them has produced effects co-extensive with the wanderings of mankind, and as permanent as his existence. Will any man, possessed of the use of reason, ascribe effects so vast, so mighty, and so enduring, to the agency of fraud? Such a supposition cannot be entertained, and therefore some other solution must be sought. There is but one other, except the true one, possible, and that one which is of no real service to the sceptic. He may assert in man a power of presentiment, and maintain that there is so intimate a relation, so perfect an analogy between the moral and intellectual development of the individual and the species, that he who is observant of the one, must have an anticipation, a foretaste, an ideal vision of the doctrines of the other; and that out of this relation have arisen both the idea of prophecy, and the apparent simili-

tude of its fulfilment. But, supposing that we grant this, it would only serve to prove the Divine origin of Christianity. The relation of the individual to the species, and the laws of the development of either, must plainly be ascribed to the will and the plastic power of the Almighty. The individual and the race both owe their powers, moral, intellectual, and physical, to the constitution and organization vouchsafed at creation. If, therefore, this organization has led some individuals to predict, and the whole race to fulfil, the doctrines traced out in the Hebrew Scriptures—one people to reject, and other nations to receive, Jesus of Nazareth, such effects, as proceeding from God's work of creation, must be ascribed to the deliberate exertion of his wisdom and his will, and as no one has yet ventured to maintain that God wills that his creatures should be in error, the Christian religion must be received as the Divine truth.

This hypothesis, therefore, if true, would not disturb the Christian faith, but it is far from satisfactory. If entirely and absolutely correct, how is it that this power of presentiment was successfully developed in none but members of the Jewish nation; and how is it that it is dormant in this age of science and intellectual restlessness? How is it that it was possessed by those who were comparatively barbarous, and in a great measure ignorant, whilst those who have penetrated the secrets

of nature, and unfolded the laws of her operations, are destitute thereof? This solution, therefore, is as groundless as those previously noticed. Neither chance, nor sagacity, nor fraud, nor human organization, are sufficient to account for the phenomena. There is but one other solution possible, and that is, that these prophecies and their accomplishment are both to be ascribed to God, as their author, and that, therefore, the prophecies are real, and Jesus of Nazareth is the true Messiah, the Saviour of the world. No ingenuity of doubt, no discoveries of science or research can disturb our premises. It is an indubitable fact, that the predictions existed for ages before the Christian era, and equally certain that the religious state of Jew and Gentile answer to their announcements. Every one, therefore, who has eyes to read the one and behold the other, will find sufficient warrant for his faith in Christianity. Without even referring to the New Testament, without asking any admission which infidels are not willing to concede, reason compels us to receive the truth of revealed religion—to acknowledge that the prescience which dictated, and the providence which has fulfilled the prophecies are Divine, or to renounce altogether the idea of an intelligent Creator of the world—to be either Christians or Atheists. Let us, then, in commemorating the manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles, remember how the evi-

dence of our senses confirms our faith, and let us thank the God of all grace for his goodness, in not only calling us to a profession of the faith, but in having predicted the circumstances of the call, to the assurance of our faith and our great and endless comfort.

## LECTURE V.

### REVELATION XVII. 5.

*“ And upon her forehead was a name written, Mystery, Babylon the Great, the mother of harlots, and abominations of the earth.”*

IN proving the Divine origin of Scripture, and the Messiahship of the Lord Jesus Christ, we have hitherto confined ourselves to the prophecies contained in the Old Testament. It may be well, however, before we leave that class of predictions of which we now behold the fulfilment, to show that the same line of argument can be maintained from the writings of the New Testament. To point out and consider all the predictions of this class would far exceed the space allotted to this whole course. We are compelled, therefore, to make a selection, and in our choice are naturally guided by the expressed will of the founder of the lecture. He particularly mentions the prophecies relating to the Church of Rome, and to one of these I this day request your attention. I shall show,

I. That the prophecy of which the text forms

a part, and which, on the admission of enemies, was certainly written about the conclusion of the first century, predicts the destinies of the Roman Church.

II. That enough has been fulfilled to prove that the prophecy is from the source of truth, and, consequently, that the Lord Jesus Christ is the true Messiah.

In proving that the woman exhibited to St. John was a symbol of the Roman Church, I do not mean that the Pope is Antichrist. The chapter before us is in itself a sufficient proof that Antichrist is not the head but the destroyer of that corrupt communion. Neither, in applying the prophecy to Rome, do I assert anything so obscure or doubtful as to be incapable of satisfactory proof.

It is admitted on all hands that the prophecy is symbolical. Neither Protestant nor Romanist ever imagined that its announcements were to be fulfilled in the history of an individual woman. The obvious grammatical sense is too plain to admit of any such literal interpretation; and the writer intimates more than once that the words are to be understood mystically. In the text he says, "Mystery, Babylon the great." In the 9th verse he adds, "Here is the mind that has wisdom," and immediately adds a partial interpretation of the symbol by saying, "The seven heads are seven mountains on which the woman sitteth." And in

the 18th verse he says that the woman described represents “the great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth.” It would, therefore, be scarcely consistent to take the word Babylon literally, even if the things predicated of the subject of the prophecy could be referred to that ancient city, which is impossible. The author himself tells us, in the verse just referred to, that he was speaking of the great city, which in his own days ruled over the kings of the earth, whereas the literal Babylon, far from having any dominion, was then a desolation. This last particular is equally conclusive against the exposition which makes Babylon to stand for the congregation of the wicked. St. John is speaking of a particular city, whose geographical position and universal empire are so accurately described, as to agree to but one city in the world. The city whose wall encompassed the seven hills, and which claimed an empire co-equal with the limits of the earth, cannot easily be mistaken.\* Jewish

\* Tum et situs mulieris Romam manifestè prodit. Idem enim Angelus bestiae, cui mulier insidebat; septem capita facit, ὄρη ἑπτὰ, ὄρον ἡ γυνὴ κάθηται ἐπ’ αὐτῶν, *septem montes, quibus mulier insidet.* Apoc. xvii. 9. Sedebat igitur mulier, quam S. Johannes vidit, *super septem montibus.* Romam indicari, res ipsa clamat. Testatur enim Dionysius Halicarnassensis, lib. iv. Servium Tullium, Regum ultimum, Romae septem colles novo muro complexum esse. Apud Varronem etiam et Plutarchum mentio est. Diei et Festi Romani



rabbies\* and Christian fathers,† Romanists‡ and Protestants, all agree that Babylon is Rome. Some few of the Popish interpreters attempt a different exposition, but the more respectable, not excepting even the Jesuits, Bellarmine and à Lapide, admit that Rome is the subject of the prophecy. So far then, the prediction confessedly announces the destinies of the eternal city. But whether Rome heathen, Rome Papal, or Rome anti-Christian, or Rome absolute, including all three, be spoken of, is a matter of controversy. Romanists adopt either the first and third supposition, or both together, and in some respects, the history of heathen Rome agrees with the prophetic delineation. She was

*Septimontii* dicti, ob septimum collem Romæ additum. *Septimontiale sacrum* Suetonius in Domitiano nuncupat. Apud Sibyl- lum quoque, lib. ii., initio Roma *ἑπταλόφος* *Septicollis* vocatur. Ovidius *Tristium*, l. 4.

“ Sed quæ de septem totum circumspicit orbem.

Montibus, Imperii Roma, Deumque laus.”—J. II.

Heideggeri de *Babylone Magna Diatriba*, p. 24, 25. Compare Wetstein’s *Notes on Revelation* xvii. 9. 18.

\* See Wetstein in *loc. cit.*

† Heidegger and Wetstein, both give the passages.

‡ Pontificii Doctores magno consensu id ipsum asserunt. Cornelius à Lapide *Comment in Apoc., xvii.* consentientes inducit Viegam, Riberum, Lindanum, Aleasarem, Bellarminum, Apringium, Gagneium, Hesselium, Thomam, Rizium. Et qui prius aliter Babylonem interpretati sunt, veluti Aretas, Fore- rius, alii; hos veritatis splendentibus radiis convictos mutasse dictum, et de Roma denique interpretatos esse Ribera fatetur.— Heidegger, p. 23.

idolatrous and reigned over the kings of the earth, as is here asserted ; but a more close examination of the prophecy shows, that either interpretation is untenable. In the first place, it is not of heathen Rome that the apostle speaks. This is evident from the great surprise which he expressed at what he saw. If we suppose that the angel exhibited to his view heathen Rome in the form of an adulterous persecuting woman, possessed of great dominion, what was there in this to excite that profound astonishment which he expresses in the words, “When I saw her I wondered with great admiration?” Heathen Rome did not compel other nations to embrace her creed. St. John knew that Rome was idolatrous—he felt that she was persecuting—he saw that she was in possession of extended empire. There was, therefore, nothing in this to astonish. Had the angel exhibited to him Rome converted from heathenism, the professing See of St. Peter, the centre of the Church’s unity, the mother and mistress of all Churches, this might have astonished the apostle who had seen the fierceness of her opposition to Christianity ; but to be told that she was idolatrous, persecuting, and supreme, could produce no emotion of the kind. It could not, therefore, be heathen Rome which he saw. And this argument is confirmed by the account of the total destruction which follows, not now to speak of the seven-headed beast and the ten kings. Heathen Rome suffered no such overwhelming catastrophe as is

here described ; but was, on the contrary, converted to Christianity, and attained a glory and a dominion in no wise inferior to that which she had before possessed.\*

Some Romanist writers have felt this difficulty, and therefore add, that what Rome was before the time of Constantine, it is again to become at the end of the world: that it will forsake Christianity and the Vicar of Christ, that its name shall again be Babylon, and that then it shall be destroyed.† But this interpretation, if true, would be as fatal to Roman pretension as that adopted by Protestants, for it not only implies the open and formal apostasy of the inhabitants of the Papal Sec, and, therefore, some gross misconduct and careless-

\* *Ethnicam veterem solam intelligi, severè pertendit Alcazar ipse. Cum eodem pertendunt Bellarminus, Baronius, Pererius, Salmeron, Maldonatus, alii. Eos tamen non minus strenuè oppugnant socii et tribules, Ribera et Cornelius à Lapide, eo potissimùm argumento freti, quod gravissimum et finale iudicium Babylo ni magnæ denunciatum in Romam veterem Ethnicam minimè omnium competat. Quando enim, inquit illi, vetus Roma ethnica, venientibus una hora plagis, combusta, funditus deleta, et Babylo ni Chaldaicæ Veteris instar, extremo excidio affecta est, quod Babylo ni magnæ Apocalypsis patheticè adèdè denunciavit?*—Heidegger, p. 27.

† Other and celebrated Romanist Doctors reject and refute this subterfuge. “Suarez *lib. 5, cap. 7, n. 10*, probari eam sententiam posse negat. Alcazar *Not. 13. Proæm.* fusè eam repellit. Justinianus *in 2 Thess. 2*, de ea in loquitur: *Quid hoc aliud est, quam divinare?* Malvenda, qui multum in hac causa sudavit, eam ceu incredibilem detestatur.”—*Ibid.* p. 41.

ness of the shepherd to whose care they had been entrusted, but expressly declares that the place of St. Peter's chair is itself to be destroyed. Now, if there be no city of Rome, there can be no Bishop of Rome, and, therefore, St. Peter's primacy, the apostolic chair, must come to an end; and if there be a primacy at all, it must belong to the Bishop of some other See. But the interpretation is manifestly opposed to the whole context. It supposes this great Roman apostasy and persecution and supremacy to take place in the time of Antichrist, which is plainly impossible, for this simple reason, that there cannot be two supremacies, nor two universal monarchies, nor two dominant religions at one and the same time. The apostle expressly tells us in the thirteenth chapter, that the beast, *i. e.*, Antichrist, is to attain universal dominion; that all whose names are not written in the Lamb's book of life are to worship him. If so, it is impossible that Rome, with whom as we are told in this seventeenth chapter, Antichrist and his ten kings are at enmity, should at the same time possess the same power, and the same idolatrous supremacy. The apostle says, (v. 16,) "The ten horns which thou sawest upon the beast, these shall hate the whore and make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and burn her with fire. For God hath put it into their hearts to fulfil his will, and to agree and give their kingdom unto the beast, until the words of God should be fulfilled."

From these words it is plain, that Antichrist and his auxiliary kings are to oppose Rome, and execute upon her God's righteous judgments, a state of things utterly incompatible with a supremacy either political or religious, such as is here described. It cannot, therefore, be of Rome in the time of Antichrist that the apostle is speaking.

If then, as we have shown, Rome be the subject of the prophecy, and yet, what is here said cannot be applied to Pagan Rome nor to Antichristian Rome exclusively; it necessarily follows, that it does apply to Papal Rome, or more properly, that it depicts the destinies of Rome from the days of the apostle down to the period of her utter and final destruction. Seventeen hundred years of that interval have already elapsed, a space amply sufficient to test the truth of the prophecy. The terms of the prediction also are unequivocal, and the features of the portrait such as may easily be recognised. The apostle describes a Church, the spouse of Christ, faithless to her Lord, and gone astray after idols—the head or mother of many Churches equally idolatrous; a cruel persecutor of the disciples of Christ, and procuring for her false doctrine a pseudo-catholicity. Such is the meaning of the text and its context, “Upon her forehead was written, Mystery, Babylon the great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth. And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the

saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus.” The first feature here is idolatry. It is unnecessary to prove what is known to all readers of the Old Testament, that conjugal infidelity is the symbol employed to signify that religious faithlessness which, to the worship of the true God unites the worship of idols, or that a Church is represented under the figure of a woman who has entered into the marriage-covenant. The true Church is in this very book spoken of as the Lamb’s wife, and the union between Christ and his Church as a marriage, not now to refer to the numerous passages in the Psalms and the prophets. When, therefore, Rome is spoken of as a faithless woman, who had broken her marriage-vows, it is implied, first, that she had by covenant become the spouse of Christ; and secondly, that she had been guilty of idolatry, and this answers the vain distinction which the Romanists in their interpretation endeavour to make between the city of Rome and the Church of Rome. They say that, It is not the Church of Rome, but the city of Rome which is called Babylon, and described as the mother of harlots. We answer, It is that Rome which was the spouse of Christ, for that and that only can be guilty of infidelity. The prophet was not speaking of that pile of wood and stone of which the material city is composed. That inanimate mass never reigned over the kings of the earth—never believed in Christ, and could, therefore,

never apostatize. Babylon stands for the whole complex of the city, Church, State, and people of Rome, just as when the prophet Isaiah speaks in similar language of Jerusalem, saying, "How is the faithful city become an harlot!" (i. 21.) He did not mean to distinguish between the Church of Jerusalem and the city of Jerusalem, or, if he did, surely it was the living Church and not the inanimate city which he intended. The Romanist distinction is, therefore, totally unfounded, and would convict the apostle of absurdity. The apostle, therefore, under this figure, foretells that Rome, which was heathen in his own time, should embrace Christianity, enter into covenant with Christ, and yet, after that, faithlessly break her vows and be guilty of idolatry. That the first part of the prediction has been accomplished, is admitted by all. Rome long since ceased to be heathen, and during some centuries appeared as a part of the faithful Church of Christ. But her fidelity was not of long continuance; she soon turned aside to the worship of images, saints, angels; the worship of a wafer was made the most important part of her religious services, and in the practice of this idolatry she still continues to the present hour. We need only to open our eyes and behold her public worship, the authorized formularies of her devotion, and the authoritative decrees of her Councils, and the theological lessons of her doctors, to be convinced that the author of the Apocalypse was a

prophet of the true God. In every country where the Church of Rome feels herself at perfect liberty, image worship is open and undisguised. The people bow down before the crucifix, or the figures of the saints; cover them with gold and silver, carry them in processions, burn lamps before them, and in token of their gratitude for benefits received, hang up various offerings at their shrines, sing hymns to them, so that the most careful observer cannot perceive any difference between this worship, and the worship of the heathen as forbidden in the Word of God, defended by the ancient idolaters, and denounced by the Fathers of the Church. The Word of God says plainly, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth, thou shalt not bow down thyself to them nor serve them." A more comprehensive prohibition, or more directly condemnatory of the Roman practice cannot be imagined. The word "graven image" might be ambiguous, and the Romanists accordingly say, that it ought to be translated "idol," and that, therefore, the prohibition does not apply to them, but the Word of God provides for this evasion, by forbidding in detail the likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or in the water under the earth. The simple question is, whether the Romanist images are the likeness of any thing in heaven or in



earth.\* The Council of Trent determines that they do bear the likeness of the saints. They are, therefore, included in the prohibition. The Romanist says, he does not worship the image. According to the second commandment, we are to inquire whether they bow down to them and serve them. And the Council of Trent tells us as distinctly that they do, for it commands “that the honour and veneration due to them be given them,” and, as part of that honour and veneration, particularly specifies “Kissing them, uncovering the head and bowing down before them.”† The prophetic descriptions of the nature of idolatry are equally applicable to the Roman image worship. When Isaiah says, “They lavish gold out of the bag and weigh silver in the balance, and hire a goldsmith; and he maketh a god—they fall down; yea, they worship. They bear him upon the shoulder, they carry him, and set him in his place, and he standeth; from his place shall he not remove: yea, one shall cry unto him, yet he cannot answer, nor save him out of his trouble;” are not his words as true of the modern as the ancient Roman? When the Psalmist says, “Their idols are silver and gold, the work of men’s hands. They have mouths but they speak not; eyes have they but they see not; they have ears but they hear not, &c.,” is the description

\* “Sanctos quorum illa similitudinem gerunt, veneremur.”

—Sess. xxv.

† Ibid.

not as true of Popish as of Canaanitish images? The express words, therefore, of the commandment, and the inspired exposition given by the prophets, both convict the Church of Rome of idolatry.

The Council of Trent and the apologists endeavour to excuse this practice, and to establish a distinction between their image worship and that of the Heathen, by saying that the Heathen worship terminated in the image itself, whereas they, in honouring the image, venerate Christ and his saints. But this is overthrown by the most celebrated of their own Doctors. “Aquinas and his followers have at large proved, that where anything is worshipped, merely for the sake of another, it must have the same kind of worship given it, which they give to the thing represented by it; for as Aquinas observes, the motion of the soul towards an image is twofold; either as it is a thing or as it is an image; the first, he saith, is distinct from that motion which respects the object; but the second is the same; so that to the image of Christ, so far as it is wood or stone, no worship is given at all; and therefore, it being given merely on the account of its being an image, it necessarily follows that the same worship must be given to the image which is given to Christ himself.”\*

Azor says, †“It is a constant opinion amongst theologians that the image is honoured and served

\* Thom. Sum. part 3, 9, 25. art. 3.

† Joh. Azor. Instit. Moral. tom. 1. lib. 9. cap. 6.

with the same honour and service wherewith that is served of which it is the image.” And therefore Biel says, \* “that the images of Christ are to be adored with the same adoration as Christ himself, that is latria—those of the Virgin Mary with *hyperdulia*, and those of St. Peter with *dulia*,” and Bellarmine † asserts that the worship terminates in the images themselves. So that if it were true that the Heathen worshipped dumb idols, the same is true of the Church of Rome, if any credit is to be placed in her most learned defenders. But the truth is, that the defence offered by modern image-worshippers presents another argument to prove the identity of their practice with that of the ancient idolaters. The former say, that they do not worship the image, but the being whom the image represents, ‡ and such was the defence also offered by the latter. When the Fathers of the Church pressed the Heathen of their times with the folly of worshipping the lifeless works of their own hands, they replied just as the Romanists do now, and asserted that images were only symbols or representations of the invisible object of their worship. “No one but a fool thinks otherwise of

\* Gabriel Biel. 49. Lesson on the Canon of the Mass.

† De imag. c. 21.

‡ Council of Trent. Sess. xxv. De Invocatione, Veneratione, et Reliquiis Sanctorum, et Sacris Imaginibus.—Bossuet’s Exposition. Sect. v.

them," says Celsus.\* "They are only books for the ignorant," says Porphyry. They deny, in Arnobius, "that they ever thought their images to be Gods, or to have any divinity in them, but what only comes from their consecration to such an use." To St. Augustin they said, "that they worshipped not the images, but through them they worshipped the Deity." The Romanist refers to the example of Moses, who made the brazen serpent, as a justification of their practice, and such, Tertullian tells us, was also an argument used by the image-worshippers of his day. The Romanist doctrine, therefore, concerning the veneration of images, is precisely the same as that of the ancient Heathen, and as the one is confessedly idolatry, so also is the other. Such also was the opinion of the Church, which, both collectively and in its individual members, resisted the introduction of image-worship, and denounced it as idolatry.

But the Roman Church is also guilty of idolatry in giving to saints and angels that worship and honour which is due only to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. I am not now going to enter into the question at large, or into the vanity of that distinction which they make between latria and

\* For these and the preceding passages cited at length, and a full discussion of the subject, see "*Nouveauté du Papisme, opposée à l'antiquité du vray Christianisme . . . par Pierre du Moulin.*" Liv. vii. ch. 2—5. Geneva, 1627. Compare the Homily on the Peril of Idolatry.

douleia,\* but simply to prove the fact, and to conclude, therefore, that if their distinction be well founded, they must, on their own principles, be considered as idolaters. I take for granted what they themselves will not deny, that he who gives to the creature what belongs solely and exclusively to the Deity, is an idolater; and to prove that they do so, refer to the books of devotion in use in this country. The peculiar honour and attribute of Christ is, that he is the sole fountain of salvation and forgiveness. “There is none other name given under heaven whereby we must be saved.” But in the Ordinary of the Mass, forgiveness of sin is in part ascribed to the merits of the saints. When the priest is come up to the altar, bowing down he says, “We beseech thee, O Lord, by the merits of thy saints, whose relics are here, and of all the saints: that thou wouldst vouchsafe to forgive me all my sins.”† The prayer does not even observe the appearance of an allusion to Christ or his merits. Forgiveness is sought for the sake of the merits of the saints. The honour, therefore, which belongs exclusively to the eternal Son of God is given to the creature in the most solemn act of public worship, and therefore the Church which

\* *Institutiones Theolog. auctoritate, D. D. Archiepiscopi Lugdunensis.* Tom. II. p. 430—436, 444—452.

† “*The Ordinary of the Mass, p. xviii.*” London: published by Keating and Brown.

prescribes, and the priest who offers, and the people who join in, this petition, are all idolaters. Again, I say, he that ascribes to a creature the names and attributes belonging to the persons of the ever-blessed Trinity, gives to the creature the honour that is due to God, and is therefore an idolater, as the Lord himself says in reference to his name, "The Lord is my name, my glory will I not give to another." But this the Roman Church does in the case of the Virgin Mary, giving to her the names which the Word of God appropriates to Christ. In the Gospel, Christ says, "I am the door, by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out and find pasture." The Roman Church ascribes this title to the Virgin. In the celebrated hymn it says, "Hail happy gate of bliss;"\* and again, in the Litany of our Lady of Loretto, it is said, "Gate of heaven, pray for us." In the Revelation of St. John, Christ says of himself, "I am the bright and morning star." In the litany just cited the Roman Church addresses Mary in the same language, "O morning star, pray for us." In the Old Testament the eternal God is represented as the refuge of sinners. Thus Moses says, "The eternal God is thy refuge." (Deut. xxxiii. 27.) And again in the 90th Psalm, "O Lord, thou hast been our refuge in all generations." David says, "The Lord will be a refuge

\* "Garden of the Soul," p. 297.

for the oppressed, a refuge in times of trouble." The Church of Rome points to and prays to Mary as the refuge of sinners, saying to her, "Refuge of sinners, pray for us." Nay, the express work of salvation, described in Scripture as the opening of the prison to them that are bound, the giving light to the blind, and the deliverance from the power of sin, is, by the Church of Rome, unequivocally ascribed to the Virgin Mary. Christ says of himself, by the mouth of Isaiah, "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound." In the xlixth chapter of that same prophet, God says of Christ, "I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles." In the Gospel of St. John, Christ calls himself the light of the world. But in the hymn already quoted the Roman Church ascribes all this to the Virgin Mary, and prays to her in these words:—

"Loosen the sinner's bands,  
All evils drive away ;  
Bring light unto the blind,  
And for all graces pray."

In the Gospel it is said, the Saviour received the name Jesus because he was to save his people from their sins; and the apostle says, that he has been made to us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption. The Church of Rome

believes that the Virgin Mary can thus deliver from the power of sin, and therefore prays:—

“ O pure, O spotless maid,  
Whose meekness all surpass'd,  
Our lusts and passions quell,  
And make us mild and chaste.”

In the New Testament the apostle prays to God to preserve the Christians to whom he was writing, saying, “Unto him that is able to keep you from falling, and to present you faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy, to the only wise God our Saviour, be glory and majesty, dominion and power, both now and ever.” (Jude 24, 25.) The Church of Rome prays for the same preservation to Mary, saying,

“ Preserve our lives unstained,  
And guard us in our way ;  
Until we come with thee  
To joys that ne'er decay.”

Here, beyond all doubt, the Church of Rome gives to the creature the honour that is due to God alone, and is therefore, according to her own doctrine of the difference between *latria* and *douleia*, guilty of idolatry. But besides the worship of images and the blasphemous adoration of saints, the Roman Church is guilty of the grossest idolatry in the worship of the bread in the sacrament. The Bible and the voice of antiquity both declare,



that in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the bread still retains its nature, and is therefore a creature as it was before; yet to this creature the Church of Rome commands the highest worship and adoration to be given, and pronounces an anathema upon all who refuse it. It is not a sufficient excuse to urge that according to the doctrine of Transubstantiation they believe the bread to be God, and that therefore their intention is not to worship the bread, but that God whom they suppose to be present. The same argument would justify the worshippers of the sun and every other species of idolater, for the intention of all is to worship God; and yet, notwithstanding, the Bible condemns their worship, and rejects it as an insult to the Majesty of heaven.

It may however be urged, and was actually urged by Roman Catholics more than a century ago, that the assertion of the idolatry of the Roman Church is only the maintenance of a private opinion, and not the voice of the Church of England. To this we can reply, as a learned Bishop of our Church has done, by a reference both to the public acts of the Church, and to the writings of her greatest divines. In the injunctions published in the year 1547, the extirpation of Popery is called the suppression of idolatry and superstition. In Cranmer's Articles of Visitation, published in the second year of Edward VI., the sixth and the last refer to the taking away of images, pictures,

and all other monuments of feigned miracles, pilgrimages, idolatry, and superstition. In the second liturgy of Edward VI., after the Communion, was a rubric annexed, in which the adoration of the host is expressly called idolatry.\* In the Homily against Peril of Idolatry the Church expressly teaches that the Church of Rome has been and is idolatrous. “Thus you see, how from having of images privately, it came to publicly setting of them up in churches and temples, although without harm at the first, as was then of some wise and learned men judged; and from simply having them there, it came at last to worshipping of them; first by the rude people—who specially, as the Scripture teacheth, are in danger of superstition and idolatry—and afterwards by the bishops, the learned, and by the whole clergy. So that laity and clergy, learned and unlearned, all ages, sects, and degrees of men, women, and children, of whole Christendom—an horrible and most dreadful thing to think—have been at once drowned in abominable idolatry; of all other vices most detested of God, and most damnable to man; and that by the space of 800 years and more.” (p. 165.) In the injunctions of Queen Elizabeth, A. D. 1559, Popery is again spoken of as idolatry, and thus also in the form of thanksgiving in 1594, and again in the canons

\* See, Stillingfleet, “An Answer to several Treatises, &c.” General Preface (f. 2).

of 1640; and in the declaration against Transubstantiation, prescribed in the thirtieth of Charles II., the Church requires her sons to swear that the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary, or any other saint, and the sacrifice of the mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous. An oath of this kind, prescribed by the great Council of the Church, and voluntarily taken by some of the most learned bishops we have ever had, settles for ever the question as to the judgment of the Church. If our Church collectively, and our bishops severally, did not believe the Roman Church to be idolatrous, then are both Church and bishops convicted of gross and deliberate perjury.\* It is unnecessary to add the private testimonies of individuals, but those who desire it will find a complete collection made by the learned Stillingfleet, and containing all the great names which adorn the Church's history from Bishop Jewell to his own time. That prelate concludes that list of authorities in the following words:—"By this we see that the most eminent and learned defenders of our Church, of the greatest authority in it and zeal for the cause of it against

\* Mr. Palmer's slippery evasion, in his book "On the Church," Vol. I., p. 315, is borrowed from the Papists themselves, and was long since answered by the present Bishop of Exeter, "Letters to Charles Butler," London, 1825, page 251, as Mr. Palmer ought in fairness to have stated. See also the Bishop's Letter to Earl Grey. App. page 365.

enemies of all sorts, have agreed in the charge of idolatry against the Church of Rome, and I cannot see why the authority of some very few persons, though of great learning, should bear sway against the constant opinion of our Church since the Reformation, since our Church is not now to be formed according to the singular fancies of some few (though learned men), much less to be modelled by the caprichios of superstitious fanatics, who prefer some odd opinions and ways of their own, before the received doctrine and practice of the Church they live in." \*

According then, to the testimony of Scripture and the Fathers, the confessions of Romish divines, and the terms of the Roman formularies, as well as the constant judgment of the Anglican Church, the Church of Rome is guilty of idolatry, and thus the prediction of the Apocalypse is so far accomplished, and the lapse of centuries has only given weight to the apostle's claim to be considered a prophet of the true God. When St. John wrote, few things could be considered more improbable, than that Rome, the centre of heathen idolatry, and the seat of polytheistic dominion, should become the Church and Spouse of Christ. For two centuries the accomplishment of the prediction seemed doubtful.

\* Stillingleet. Preface to "A Discourse concerning the Idolatry practised in the Church of Rome." London, 1672 ; the last paragraph.

After the death of St. John, the Roman hatred of Christianity became fiercer, and the Roman persecution more cruel; but time proved the validity of his claims. Rome, with her Cæsar and her population, confessed the faith of Christ, and the whole tide of imperial power and influence was now directed against idolatry. Who that then witnessed the ardour of Roman faith and zeal, and the purity of Roman doctrine and practice, could have believed that she was to prove unfaithful to her Lord, and one day become the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth? Again, St. John appeared as a false prophet, but a few centuries more rolled on and his character was again vindicated. The old idolatry had, indeed, passed away for ever, but a more subtle form of the same sin appeared, and in course of time manifested itself as distinctly and decidedly as the religion of heathen Rome. St. John declared that this idolatry should continue, and the Church of Rome remain a spiritual adulteress, impenitent, and unreformed to the hour of her destruction. More than a thousand years have elapsed since the worship of images was formally adopted, and the history of that long period confirms the truth of the prophet's word. Three hundred years ago there were some symptoms of a change. Divers National Churches, daughters of Babylon, and harlots like their mother, put away their abominations, and gave glory to the God of heaven. The light of truth once more illuminated the earth,

and Rome herself could not shut her eyes against its glory. God gave his blessing to those Churches—their sons advanced in wisdom, in arts, in science, in power, intellectual and political, whilst darkness and semi-barbarism were the national companions of idolatry. Rome saw and heard the glory and the voice of truth, but resisted the evidence which the experience of three centuries has forced upon her, and still continues as St. John predicted, idolatrous. Her blasphemous assumption of infallibility renders it impossible that she should ever amend, and thus the principles and long-continued practice of Rome lead us to conclude, that as St. John has proved a true prophet in announcing her conversion and return to idolatry, so he will be found in the announcement of her final overthrow.

These particulars in themselves are sufficient to demonstrate the divine origin of the prophecy, and consequently, the true Messiahship of the Lord Jesus Christ, which is here so plainly asserted. The argument will acquire much force from a consideration of the other particulars here specified as forming the character of the Church of Rome; namely, her persecuting cruelty and pseudo-catholicity; but these must be deferred to another opportunity. Enough has been said at present to confirm our faith and to direct our conduct. We have seen how exactly the divine declarations respecting Rome have been already fulfilled, and in

this fulfilment have a warrant for expecting the completion of the remainder. We learn Rome's true character, as the mother of abominations, the enemy of Christ, and of his saints; a condemned adulteress, reserved for execution, and are, therefore, put upon our guard against her wiles, and warned against any participation in her guilt. Let us beware then of palliating her enormities, or making light of those sins which are drawing down an overthrow more signal and more dreadful than that of Sodom. And, though, as our Church hath ever done, we acknowledge her to be a true Church, and her baptism and her orders to be valid, just as Jerusalem and Samaria were the true Church, and their circumcision true circumcision, and their priests and Levites true priests and Levites, notwithstanding their idolatry; let us remember that this it is that makes her idolatry more damnable, and her infidelity to the husband of the Church more inexcusable. Let us learn that all thought of an union with Rome is an abomination in the sight of God, and fraught with imminent danger to our Church, our nation, and our souls. If we unite either nationally or individually with Rome in her idolatry, we must expect that God will unite us with her in her plagues. But God forbid that we should thus hazard our national welfare, or our eternal salvation. May he give us grace so to avoid all share in her guilt and punishment, that when Babylon is overwhelmed like a

millstone in the waters, we may add our voice to that of the much people in heaven who then shall say, "Alleluia; salvation and glory and honour and power unto the Lord our God, for true and righteous are his judgments: for he hath judged the great whore which did corrupt the earth with her fornication, and hath avenged the blood of his servants at her hand." \*

\* When these lectures were delivered, it appeared necessary to maintain the old-fashioned doctrine of the Church of England, concerning the idolatry of Rome. That necessity has, unhappily, not diminished. The Roman Church still sends forth the most painful evidences of her adherence to idolatry; and those, who receive not the truth in the love of it, are still given over to strong delusions to believe a lie. To add to the proofs already adduced from older writers, or from foreign publications of the present day, would be easy; but it is, perhaps, more conclusive to give some specimens of the devotional books published, and re-published every day for the benefit of British Roman Catholics. Amongst these "The little office of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, in Latin, and with a new English translation, by the Rev. F. C. Husenbeth," Norwich, 1843, is particularly worthy of attention. The translator states in the preface, that his object in re-translating and republishing was "To encourage the revival of the ancient spirit of devotion among the faithful, and more particularly to promote the veneration, and invocation of the Holy Mother of God." That this devotion is idolatrous will scarcely be doubted by any who read the following extracts:—

"Hail, mistress of the world, and heaven's bright Queen!  
 Virgin of virgins, hail! thou star serene:  
 Thou who in early morn to earth dost shine,  
 Filled with celestial grace, and light divine:



O lady, hasten and thine arm extend,  
Guard us from sin, and from our foes defend."

The Latin is still more blasphemous, as the ascription of what belongs to Christ only, "*Stella matutina*," "*mundi in auxilium Domina festina*" is more apparent.—Again

“LET US PRAY.

“Holy Mary, Queen of Heaven, Mother of our Lord Jesus Christ, and mistress of the world, who forsake no one, and despise none, look upon me mercifully with your pious eyes, and obtain for me of your beloved Son, the pardon of all my sins, &c.” This blasphemous effusion is according to the office to be repeated eight times, so as to work it well into the minds of the unhappy victims, that it is Mary who obtains pardon of sins. This doctrine is inculcated with equal earnestness, in “*The Devotion and Office of the Sacred Heart of our Lord Jesus Christ*,” a book well worthy the attention of those who entertain any doubts concerning the idolatry of the Roman Church. Let the following serve as specimens:—

“A prayer to beg purity of soul and body through the intercession of the Blessed Virgin.

“It is to thee, Holy Virgin! I have recourse, however unworthy of thy goodness. I know thou never abandonest those who call upon thee with confidence, and that the Church does not call thee in vain, the refuge of sinners. . . . . Blessed Virgin, obtain for me the grace to hate what I have loved, and to love what I have hated. Make my eyes overflow with tears that may efface all impurities. This miracle is reserved to thee, O Mother of Mercy. Renew in me those prodigies of conversion which thou hast formerly wrought, and appear now so seldom, in an age so corrupted as ours. . . . . Let not the price of that blood which thou gavest to the Saviour of Men be lost: refuse not to thyself the pleasure of securing a strayed sheep to that heavenly shepherd. Show that thou art the Mother of Sinners, and let it not be said that I perished at thy sacred feet, where

no one ever found but grace and salvation." Dublin, 1845, page 198—200. Again, on page 219, "Rejoice, O most glorious Virgin! The saints and angels in heaven honour thee as the daughter of God the Father, Mother of God the Son, and Spouse of God the Holy Ghost. They pay all due respect, love and homage to thee, the object, next to God, of their complacency, gratitude, and attention. I rejoice in the honours paid to thee, O blessed Mother of God! Look down on thy servant from the height of thy glory, and by thy power and goodness obtain for me from thy son a meek and pure heart, that I may serve thee in this life, and by thy powerful intercession, be happy with thee hereafter. *Amen.* Hail Mary."

Sad as these passages are, they are exceeded in what is called "An Angelical Exercise in Honour of our Blessed Lady," of which it is said, "Whosoever is devoted to this exercise in honour of the Blessed Virgin Mary, on reading over every point, may meditate upon it for the space of one *Hail Mary*, or more; and by God's grace, he will in a short time find himself greatly increase in love towards that blessed Queen of heaven; and at the hour of death will, by so pious a mother, be received as her dearest child. Nor can such a one, according to St. Anselm and St. Bernard, possibly perish, but shall find life everlasting and taste of the joys of eternal bliss." This has much the appearance of ascribing salvation to Mary instead of God, and this appearance is confirmed by many passages, such as the following:—"I am the help and aid of Christians, *Auxilium Christianorum*, says the glorious mother of God. Will you, my dear child, WHOLLY CONFIDE IN ME, and call upon me in your necessities, as did my dear daughter, St. Mary, of Egypt? &c. . . . . Yes, my most dear mother, I will always confide in you; and, although I were as perfidious as Judas or Cain, yet, if you be once pleased to undertake my cause, I shall never despair. And, I do reverence you, O sacred Virgin Mary! happy gate of heaven, and together with all the principalities of the celestial court, I bless and praise you infinitely, for

that you have been found worthy to be the most faithful and humble handmaid of the most Holy Trinity. Hail Mary.' Ibid. page 243, 244. Here Mary asks the sinner to confide *wholly* in her, and the sinner blesses and praises her *infinitely*. What greater measure of affiance, and praise, than *whole* and *infinite* can be given to God? None. To Mary is here given that which pertains only to God. He therefore who gives it, is an idolater. It is generally said, that Mary is asked to be the medium through whom and whose influence blessings are obtained. In the "Thirty Days' Prayer," Mary herself is represented as the great helper of sinners, and instead of prayer being made that, for her sake, Christ may undertake their cause, Christ himself is made only the advocate through whom to approach Mary, and for whose sake Mary may grant their petition. "Thou art the mother of mercy, the sweet consolatrix and *only* refuge of the needy and the orphan, of the desolate and the afflicted. Cast, therefore, an eye of pity on a miserable forlorn child of Eve, and hear my prayer. . . . Whither can I fly for *more secure shelter*, O amiable mother of my Lord Jesus Christ, than under the wings of thy maternal protection. Attend, therefore, I beseech thee, with an ear of pity and compassion, to my humble and earnest request. I ask through the bowels of mercy of thy dear Son. . . . I ask it through his bitter tears and bloody sweat. . . . I ask it through his immaculate life, bitter passion and ignominious death on the cross, &c." page 262—268. The Bible tells us to come to the Father through the Son. The Roman Church tells us to use Christ's passion as the means of obtaining the favour of the Virgin Mary, who is the only refuge of the needy, the most secure shelter of those in danger. If this be not to take the glory from the Creator and give it to the creature, then there is no such sin. All further proof is needless.

## LECTURE VI.

REVELATION XVII. 5, 6.

*“ And upon her forehead was a name written, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH. And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the Martyrs of Jesus.”*

CONTROVERSY is not the most popular nor always the most profitable mode of Christian instruction, but there have been few periods of the Church's history in which it has not been absolutely necessary for the defence of truth as well as the refutation of falsehood. It formed a prominent topic in the teaching of our blessed Lord and his apostles—in the writings of the Fathers, and in the preaching of the Reformers; not because the merciful and compassionate Saviour, or his disciples preferred the exposure of error or ignorance, but because, without it, the maintenance, not to say the propagation, of truth was impossible. On this principle it is that this and similar Lectures have been established, and that the founder pointed especially to the exhibition of Roman corruption, as an efficient mode of

establishing Christian truth. In accordance with this principle also, I endeavoured in the last Lecture, to shew that the past history of the Roman Church, and its present state as still visible to our view, by their agreement with the predictions of St. John, afford a satisfactory proof of the truth of Christianity. I showed in the first place, that in the chapter before us the Church of Papal Rome was intended: and pointed out three particulars,—of idolatry, pseudo-catholicity, and persecuting cruelty, in which the history agrees with the prophecy. Time allowed us then to consider only the first of these topics, my duty therefore, this day, is to discuss the two that remain.

The apostle describes the Church which he has in view, as widely diffused (and the Mother-Church of a large communion), of which she is the centre of unity and the source of doctrine. In the first verse he describes her “As sitting upon many waters;” and in the 15th verse, he interprets this image of the diffusiveness of her dominions, “The waters which thou sawest, where the whore sitteth, are peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues.” In the text he calls her “the mother of harlots;” she is, therefore, the head of many communities similar to herself. He designates her further as “the mother of the abominations of the earth;” that is, the source of the corrupt and abominable doctrines with which the earth is filled, as he himself explains the words in xviii. 3, “All

nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication." In this description, there is evidently an anti-parallelism to the features of the true Catholic Church, which is the bride of Christ. She consists of "a great multitude which no man can number, of all nations, and kindreds, and peoples, and tongues." She is the "general assembly and Church of the first-born;" "the pillar and ground of the truth;" and "the mother of us all." The true Church is catholic because she is made up of all the members of Christ's mystical body; all the children of God belong to her communion, and her doctrine is that which has been received everywhere, always, and by all. The anti-parallel features of the harlot may, therefore, fitly be designated by the term pseudo-catholicity. The word catholic may be referred to the whole Church when compared with a particular member; it signifies orthodox as opposed to heretical, and implies communion with the true Church as distinguished from schism; and in these three particulars, St. John notices the pseudo-catholicity of Rome. The question, therefore, for us to examine is, whether these features are found verified in the actual development and present state of the Papal Church.

He says, in the first place, that the Roman pale was to include, "peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues."\* A diffusion all but universal

\* Rev. xvii. 15.

was to be one characteristic mark of the faithless Church of the prophecy; and is not this the note above all others, in which the Church of Rome especially rejoices; which she points to as to the unanswerable evidence of the validity of her claims, and with the want of which she taunts the Churches of the Reformation? Hear her words in the Trent Catechism. “The third property of the Church is that she be called Catholic, that is universal, which appellation is truly attributed to her; for as St. Augustine testifies, The splendour of the one faith is diffused from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same. Neither, as in human commonwealths, or the assemblies of heretics, is the Church limited by the boundaries of one kingdom only, or by one race of men; but all men, whether barbarian or Scythian, bond or free, male or female, are embraced by the arms of her charity. . . . This, therefore, is to be delivered as a most certain rule whereby to judge of the true and the false Church.”\* To this topic her controversialists have ever referred, to confound opponents. “The Church that is truly catholic (says Bellarmine†) ought to include not only all times, but also all places, all nations, all races of men.” A Gallican divine lays

\* Trent Catechism on the Creed. Article IX. § 17.

† Bellarmine. “Ecclesia enim verè catholica, non solum debet amplecti omnia tempora, sed etiam omnia loca, omnes nationes, omnium hominum genera.” De Notis Ecclesiæ. cap. vii. nota 4.

down the proposition, "The Roman Church alone is truly catholic," and proves it thus. "That society alone is truly catholic, which is diffused through almost the whole world; but such is the Roman Church: for you may find her in Europe, in Asia, in Africa, and in America, as is proved from travellers and historians; but the societies of heretics, on the contrary, are confined to certain portions of the world."\* In like manner an English champion of Popery says, "The catholicity of the Church of Rome actually appears in that immense population of Christians of every country in communion with her in her doctrine, in her sacraments, and in her form of worship; in all which she is completely universal."† And, speaking of those whom he calls heretics, he says, "Here, my brethren, we discover no trace of catholicity. As these societies were composed of the followers of individuals, so also were they confined to a narrow territory, and seldom stretched beyond a province or kingdom; witness the Kirk of Scotland, and the Church of England. The very name of catholic is wanting to them."‡ According to the confession of Romanists themselves, then, they have that diffusiveness which St. John points out as one of the distinguishing features of the idolatrous Church. It is not a mark put on them by opponents; an

\* Institut. Theolog. auctoritate. D.D. Archiepiscopi, &c. Lugdun. 1789, cited above. Vol. I., p. 404.

† Gandolphy, Vol. I., p. 207. ‡ Ibid., Vol. II., p. 200, 207.



invention of enemies, but their pride, their boast, and their glory, the peculiar characteristic, the essential difference by which they distinguish themselves from the Greek and Protestant Churches. They are not satisfied with being a part of the Church universal, but claim to be the only universal Church.

Romanists will no doubt reply, by saying, that this diffusiveness is also a note of the true Church, as is acknowledged by some Protestant writers, that, therefore, when they refer to it, it is in this sense as a note of the true Church, and a proof that their Church is so. To this I answer, that when Protestants speak of diffusiveness as a note of the Church, they speak of the whole Church. No Protestant ever thought of making diffusiveness a proof that his own particular Church is a true Church. Reformed Christians are content with being able to prove that they are catholic, as being a part of the Catholic Church.\* The only

\* “For we do not imagine that the Church began at Wittenberg or Geneva, but that in these and sundry other places of the Christian world, it pleased God to use the ministry of his worthy servants, for the necessary reformation of abuses in some parts of the Catholic Church, which beginning at Hierusalem, spread itself into all the world, though not at all times, nor all places in like degree of purity and sincerity. So that, though the Reformed Churches neither presently be, nor perhaps hereafter shall be, in all or most parts of the world, yet they are catholic, for that they do continue themselves with that Church, which hath been, is, or shall be in all places of the

particular Church that ever attempted to prove itself to be the Church universal is the Church of Rome. She is not content with asserting the diffusiveness of the whole Church, but makes this feature the essential difference whereby the particular Church of Rome is distinguished from other particular Churches, or Christian societies. But I reply, further, that diffusiveness neither is nor can be a note of the true Church. It would, indeed, be strange that the true and the false Church should have one common mark, or that God should confer upon falsehood the semblance of truth.\* The

world before the coming of Christ, or, undoubtedly, already hath been in most parts thereof." Field, of the Church, Ch. VIII. Oxford, 1628.

\* Dr. Fowler, Bishop of Gloucester, on Bellarmine's Fourth Note of the True Church, *Amplitudo, sive multitudo et varietas credentium*, says, "First, I will briefly show, that *this cannot be a Note of the True Church*. By a *Note* is understood a distinguishing character: but this is such a character of the true Church as no one could less distinguish it; and that whether we consider the numbers thereof under either the notion of a great multitude, or a great multitude of believers. Considering them under the notion of a great multitude, the Church which is Christ's kingdom, is far from being distinguishable, as such, from the kingdom of Satan, which was always incomparably more numerous; or from that part of it which consisteth of idolatrous Pagans. What Romanist can boast of his Church in reference to this note, as Demetrius the silversmith did of his Diana, when he said that all Asia and the world worshipped her? Nor can the Church of Christ, by the number of its members, be distinguished from the worshippers of

Romanists themselves cannot make out their proof except by renouncing the primary signification of the word catholic, and by interpreting it to mean *morally universal*, that is, they are obliged to have recourse to a mere fiction. The word *catholic* does

that impostor Mahomet : which the sons of the Roman Church must especially grant to be far exceeding the members of Christ's true Church in number, since they make themselves the only catholics. Again, considering them under the notion of *a great multitude of believers*, there was an age in which the *orthodox* Christians could not be distinguished from the heretics by the greatness of their number (whom the Romanists will not admit to be members of the Church in any sense), for in the reign of Arianism, *ingemuit orbis et mirabatur*, &c. ; The world lamented and wondered to find itself turned Arian, saith St. Hierom. And it became a proverb, Athanasius against the whole world, and the whole world against Athanasius.

“ And lastly, the Church of Christ is not to be *thus* distinguished from the kingdom of Antichrist. I wish our adversaries would impartially consider, *whose* note that of having power given him over all kindreds and tongues and nations is most likely to be ; and who it is that is described by sitting, as upon seven hills, so upon many waters : which waters are peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues. (Apoc. xiii. 7 ; xvii. 1. 15.) Besides, a true note of the Church must be essential to it, must belong thereto *as* the true Church, and, therefore, is inseparable from it. But how could amplitude, or multitude be ascribed to the true Church in the time of our Saviour, when he called it a *little flock*, and said, ‘ Strait is the gate and narrow is the way that leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it ? ’ ”

To the same effect Dr. Freeman, Dean of Peterborough :—  
“ And now there are but three of his fifteen notes of the

not either in its etymology, or its first use, signify *diffusiveness*, but universality, totality; and, however it may be used by the Fathers, or Protestant writers in the secondary sense to mean diffusive, the best writers of our Church, when speaking of the Church universal, attach to it its proper meaning. “What the Catholic Church signifies (says Abp. Bramhall) was sufficiently debated between the Catholic Bishops, and the schismatical Donatists at the colloquy of Carthage: neither the Church of Rome in Europe, nor the Church of Cartenna in Africk, with the several Churches of their respective communions, but the whole Church of Christ spread abroad throughout the world.”\* “The whole company of all those throughout the world (says Bp. Sanderson) who by their doctrine and

Church left. The first concerning the name Catholic, which makes every Church a catholic Church which will call itself so: though *catholic* does not declare what a Church is, but in what communion it is, and is no note of a true Church, unless it be first proved, that they are true Churches which are in communion with each other: for, if three parts in four of all the Churches in the world were very corrupt and degenerate in faith and worship, and were in one communion, this would be the most catholic communion, as *catholic* signifies the most general and universal; but yet, the fourth part, which is sincere, would be the best and truest Church, and the Catholic Church, as that signifies the communion of all orthodox and pure Churches.” An examination of Bellarmine, p. 48, in Gibson’s Preservative, Vol. I. Tit. III., c. 2.

\* Works, p. 60.

worship do outwardly make profession of the name of Christ. This we call the universal visible Church; or the Catholic Christian Church.”\* And similar is the judgment of Pearson. Speaking of the word catholic he says, “We observe the Fathers to use the word *catholic* for nothing else but general or universal, in the ordinary or vulgar sense; as the catholic resurrection is the resurrection of all men; the catholic opinion the opinion of all men,” and, therefore, speaking of its application to the Church, he says, “That Church which was built upon the apostles as upon the foundation, congregated by their preaching and by their baptizing, receiving continued accession, and disseminated in several parts of the earth, containing within it numerous congregations, all which were truly called Churches as members of the same Church; that Church was, I say, after some time called the Catholic Church; that is to say, the name catholic was used by the Greeks to signify the whole. For being every particular congregation possessing the name of Christ, was from the beginning called a Church; being likewise all such congregations considered together were originally comprehended under the name of the Church; being these two notions of the word were different, it came to pass, that for distinction-sake at first they called the Church, taken in the large and

\* Bp. Sanderson's “Discourse of the Church,” p. 1.

comprehensive sense, by as large and comprehensive a name.”\* In this sense then the Church, before its diffusiveness commenced, whilst it was yet contained in an upper room in Jerusalem, was the catholic and the true Church. In this sense, it was catholic and true, “when orthodox Christians could not be distinguished from Arian heretics by the greatness of their number—when the whole world lamented and wondered to find itself turned Arian, and it became a proverb, Athanasius against the

\* Pearson on the Creed. Article ix.

In like manner Sherlock :—“Now it is evident from what I have already discoursed, that the true notion of the Church is the *Cetus Fidelium*, or the Company of the Faithful, of those who profess the true faith of Christ, and are united to him by baptism. . . . If the universal Church in heaven and earth be the whole company of the faithful, the Catholic Church on earth must be the whole number of the faithful on earth.”—Discourse concerning the Nature, Unity, and Communion of the Catholick Church, p. 32.

Thus also Dr. Freeman, Dean of Peterborough :—“The Catholic Church is nothing else but all true Christian Churches in the world, united together by one common faith and worship, and such acts of communion as distinct Churches are capable of and obliged to.”—An Examination of Bellarmine’s First Note, p. 48, in Gibson’s Preservative.

In like manner the present Bishop of Exeter :—“Our judgment then of the Catholic Church is briefly this: that Catholic Church (as the name, you know, expresses) is the universal Church, containing within it many particular Churches, even all congregations which retain ‘the faith once delivered to the saints,’ and contained in the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments.”—Letters to Butler, p. 15.

whole world, and the whole world against Athanasius;" and in this sense it will still be catholic and true, when "the Son of man shall hardly find faith upon earth;" and when "all that dwell upon the earth whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world" shall worship Antichrist, as is foretold in the xiiiith chapter of the Revelation. Diffusiveness, therefore, is no more a note of the true Church universal, than it is of a true particular Church. When it is a little flock, and when, as we assuredly believe it one day shall, it includes all the families of man, and every individual of each family, it is equally the true Church. Diffusiveness as the note of a Church is peculiar to the Church of Rome, as asserted by her last Council, maintained by her divines, and gloried in by her members. She has, therefore, according to her own confession, the particular feature intended by St. John, when he describes her as sitting upon many waters.

But the apostle points also to a pseudo-catholicity of communion. He calls her "the mother of harlots." He predicts that she was not to remain alone, but to have daughters equally corrupt and faithless as herself. Is this then true? Has the course of time so developed her history as to verify the prediction? Has she become the mother of Churches like herself? Is this the appellation by which she is known? and is it the by-word scoffingly put upon her by her enemies, or the title of

glory which she assumes herself, and claims from all her children? Let the creed of Pope Pius IV. answer that question, that creed which she prescribes to all who hold any ecclesiastical dignity, and especially to all converts to her communion. Every such person is required to say, "I acknowledge the Holy Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church to be THE MOTHER AND THE MISTRESS OF ALL CHURCHES." The very words, marked out by the apostle's "MOTHER OF HARLOTS;" "mother and mistress of all Churches," is that which Rome adopts as her distinctive title—a title necessarily distinctive, for there cannot be many mothers. One Church, and one Church alone, can lay claim to maternity. The Church of Rome declares that she is that one—the only Church that ever pretended to be the universal mother. O just and righteous judgment of God upon her presumption! O merciful dispensation of an all-wise Providence! O marvellous and judicial blindness of usurping Rome; that led her to adopt not only the character, but the very word specified by the Holy Spirit as the characteristic of the false and faithless Church—the pretender to catholicity. In her most solemn, her peculiar profession of faith, she calls herself the mother of Churches, and their boasted unity of faith and uniformity of worship proclaims them to be harlots like herself. She is mother of harlots and mother of their abominations. She claims to be and they acknowledge her as the



centre of their unity, and the source of their doctrine. Thus far, then, the pseudo-catholicity of Rome proves that St. John was a true prophet. All that he has predicted concerning her idolatry and her diffusiveness, has been fulfilled. We can compare what we now see with what the prophet wrote, and the evidence of our senses will prove the Divine inspiration of the prediction. But there is another feature still, so dreadful, so revolting, so unlike Christianity, as to cause some hesitation, or even to raise a doubt of the correctness of the prophetic picture, or at least, of the propriety of the application. St. John goes on to say, "I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." Is it possible, that any community calling itself Christian, and professing faith in the meek and merciful Jesus, should be found imbruing its hands in the blood even of idolaters, or persecutors? Is it conceivable that any Church, even of heretics, not to speak of that society which calls itself the Church, the true Church, the only spouse and bride of Christ, should have to answer for the blood of the saints and of the martyrs of Jesus? The wildest imagination could never have fancied anything more abhorrent from the spirit of Christianity. The feverish dreams of the wicked could hardly produce an image more unworthy of the Gospel. And yet, it has been portrayed by the pencil of inspiration. St. John presents the picture of an idolatrous and pseudo-

Catholic Church, glutted with the blood of true and faithful Christians, and history bears witness, that it is no phantom of a diseased imagination, but sober and dreadful truth. "In her may be found even now the blood of prophets, and of saints, and of all that were slain upon the earth." In the first place, Rome is answerable for all the Christian blood shed in wars produced immediately by Papal pretension, or the maintenance of her religious supremacy. Since the day that the VIIth Gregory proclaimed himself arbiter of kingdoms, and donor of imperial and royal crowns, as well as head of the universal Church, the stream of time flowed with Christian blood long before the Reformation. Germany and Italy witnessed the long continued strife between rival emperors, and torrents of Christian blood poured forth by Christian hands at the bidding of a Christian Pontiff.

Since the Reformation, it has been Popery that armed Christian against Christian, and filled Germany, France, and the Netherlands with mourning, and lamentation, and woe. Popish bigotry, that forbad even a short repose, again disturbed the public tranquillity, and desolated Germany for thirty years, and moistened its fields with the tears and the blood of its children.\* These wars, necessarily flowing from Papal usurpations and corruptions, or

\* A particular reference is unnecessary. Schiller, Rotteck, Pölitz, Miller, Robertson, &c., confirm all that has been said.

immediately instigated by Papal and priestly authority, would, in themselves, go far to prove that in the history of Rome this prediction has been accomplished; but this indirect method of proof is unnecessary. The Church has not been content with mere wars; she has herself wielded the sword of the executioner, and with her own hand kindled the fire to consume the witnesses of truth. Need I to remind you of that tribunal which for six centuries has been the scourge of mankind, and the disgrace of Christendom; whose progress through the world has been marked by fire and by blood, or proclaimed by the groans of murdered martyrs? Need I to tell you that by its diabolical agency the light of the Gospel was expelled from Italy, and Spain, and Portugal, and that the sacrifices which it offered, were thousands of the disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ, of every sex, and age, and condition? Need I to relate how the Roman Church representative, in Council assembled, consigned two ministers of the Gospel to the flames under circumstances of aggravated atrocity? or how an hundred thousand persons in the Netherlands were murdered within the period of fifty years, for no other crime but the profession of the Gospel in its purity?\*

\* “*Jam quid querar de numero trucidatorum? Numerari enim infinita quæ possunt? Ut autem infinita videantur, quæ sanè quam simillima sunt infinitis, nostra quoque crudelitas effecit. per nocturna clandestinaque latrocinia assiduè gras-*

that consumed so many of our forefathers, or the infanticidal sword that deprived France of tens of thousands of her best and most devoted children. "Nothing," (says a layman) "Nothing in the Mexican, or Carthaginian superstitions (the most execrable of the heathen world) was ever more execrable than the persecutions exercised in Elizabeth's age, by the Romish Church wherever it was dominant. The cruelty of Nero toward the Christians was imitated in Paris at the inauguration of Henri II. as a part of the solemnity and of the rejoicings. Protestants were fastened to the stake in the principal streets, and the piles were kindled at such times, that the king might see the martyrs enveloped by the flames in their full force, at the moment when he should pass. . . . The massacre of St. Bartholomew's day completed the crimes of that guilty city, and made the perfidy of the Romish Church as notorious, as its corruption

sando. Si tamen divinare per vos, atque simul ex Commentariis et memoria publica conijcere, et conquirere licet aliquid, quod unum reliquum fecit inclementia, reperimus, ni fallor, intra Belgicæ nostræ (ne quid de aliis dicam) quamlibet angustos limites, intraque jam suprascriptum annorum spatium, ob solam religionis professionem, haud minorem centum (quibus nonnulli dimidio plures addunt) millium trucidatorum numerum." Carfennæ oratio ad Belgas. Gerdesii Hist. Reformationis, tom. iii. 162. It is also in Gerdesii Serinium, vol. ii. p. 235, and gives a fearful account of the persecution. See also the petition of the Belgians against the Duke of Alva, in the same collection.

and its inhumanity. The head of Coligny, after having been presented to the King and the Queen-mother, was embalmed and sent to Rome, that the Cardinal of Lorraine, and the Pope, might have the satisfaction of beholding it. Public rejoicings were made at Rome for this cursed event; a solemn service of thanksgiving performed, at which the Pope himself assisted.\* Happy should we be to be able to say that there the cruelty of Romanism held its last festival; but the massacre of 1641—the inhuman persecutions of the Hugonots † in France testify that in the 17th century, the Roman thirst for the blood of the saints was not yet slaked; and the similar persecutions of Protestants in Hungary, ‡ Silesia, Salzburg, § bring us down to the beginning of the nineteenth century, and prove, not only that the prediction of St. John contains nothing impossible, but that it is fearfully and literally true, that a society, calling itself the only true and Catholic Church, the mother and mistress

\* Southey, *Book of the Church*, vol. ii. p. 279.

† See Dr. Kenney's "Facts and Documents."

‡ See "Greg. v. Berzeviczy Nachrichten."

Lehman *Hist. Diplom. Debreceni Hist. Eccles. Reformat. in Hungaria et Transylvania.*

Also, "A short memorial of the most grievous sufferings of the Protestant Churches in Hungary."—London, 1676.

§ "Account of the sufferings of the persecuted Protestants in Saltzburg, with their confession of faith." London, 1732. "Further accounts," 1733. See also the above-mentioned *Serin. Antiq. Gerdessii.*

of all Churches, has rivalled in cruelty the disciples of the ancient heathen superstitions, persisted for centuries in the murderous persecution of the disciples of Christ, until, as the Scripture expresses it, it has become “drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus.”

But it may be asked, whether these deeds of fire and of blood—these outbreakings of demoniacal malignity—these cold-blooded and deliberate massacres—these outrages upon humanity, can be fairly charged upon the religion and the Church of Rome, or whether they are not rather to be attributed to the blind zeal of individual bigots, the fury of the ignorant multitude, or the darkness of the ages in which they were perpetrated; as is said in the case of some few similar deeds committed by Protestants? This is a fair subject of inquiry; but the examination will lead us to the conclusion, that neither time nor circumstances—neither ignorance nor sudden emotion, but the principles of Romanism have been the cause of all these barbarities. That the ignorance of the dark ages has had nothing to do with the commission of these crimes is proved by the fact, that they have been continued for centuries after that darkness has been dispersed, and that some of the most atrocious, most barbarous, and most inhuman of these outrages have been suggested, and when committed, commended and eulogised by men eminent for their learning, and their genius. The

eloquent and learned Bossuet,\* and his contemporary Bishops of France were the instigators, and afterwards the eulogists of those barbarities of which it is impossible to read without pain, nay, without shame and humiliation at the remembrance, that beings partaking of our common humanity should be guilty of such fiendish cruelty. That these bitter fruits have not proceeded from individual bigotry may be inferred from the fact of their universality, that they have been diffused through every age and country where the Roman Church has attained to power—that they are the legitimate offspring of her principles may be seen from the doctrines of her theological systems down to the present day; from the decrees of her Councils, and especially, from the sentences of the canon laws, which the Popes of our own days have pronounced to be irreversible. This law teaches in the first place, that all heretics are *de facto* excommunicate,† and that to kill an excommunicate person is not murder. “We do not (it says) consider those to be murderers to whom in the ardour of their zeal for their catholic mother, it may have happened to kill some

\* See Bossuet’s Funeral Orations on the Queen of France, and on Le Tellier, cited in Dr. Kenney’s “Facts and Documents,” p. 123.

† “Heretici de facto sunt excommunicati in Bulla cœnæ.” See “Paravicini Polyanthea sacra ceu coordinat.” Neo-Pragæ. 1708. Tom. ii. p. 389, col. 1.

excommunicate persons.”\* It inflicts, indeed, a slight penance, for the sake of preserving discipline, but pronounces in express words, that quoad culpam, such persons are altogether free. What a wide door is here opened to the blind fury of superstition, and the development of individual and multitudinous ferocity! This one principle makes the Church of Rome responsible for all the blood which her children have shed under the pretence of maintaining the purity of the faith. But the canon law does not stop here. It declares that “Heretics must be exterminated;”† that “they are not in any wise to be suffered;” “that they are to be punished as guilty of high treason; that they may be taken and reduced to slavery by their catholic captors; that they are to be delivered to the secular arm that they may be burned, and that this is not contrary to the will of God; that

\* “Non enim eos homicidas arbitramur, quos adversus excommunicatos, zelo Catholice matris ardentibus, aliquos eorum trucidasse contigerit.” Tom. ii. p. 275, col. 1.

† “Hæretici diligenter quærendi et extirpandi, ne alios inficiant.”

“Hæretici nullo modo sufferendi sunt.”

“Hæretici, ut rei læsæ majestatis puniendi.”

“Hæretici possunt capi, et fieri servi captivorum Catholicorum.”

“Hæretici possunt comburi, et hoc non est contra Dei voluntatem.”

“Hæreticos persequentes lucrantur indulgentias.” Ibid. p. 388 et seqq.



they are to be exterminated by the emperors." Nay, it promises an indulgence, a relaxation of penance to all those who shall fight against them, citing as authority those memorable words of the Third Lateran Council, "We, confiding in the mercy of God, and the authority of the blessed apostles, Peter and Paul, grant to all faithful Christians, who take arms against them, a relaxation for two years from the enjoined penance." Another decree determines that the merit of fighting against heretics is as great as going on a visit to the Holy Sepulchre. The canon law of Rome, therefore, not only says that heretics may be killed without guilt, and that they ought to be killed according to justice, but endeavours to allure its children to the performance of the sacred duty, by opening the treasures of saintly merits, and promising gifts to the obedient. This is in itself sufficient to prove that the persecutions of which we have spoken are the necessary result of Popish principles; but the Church of Rome is not satisfied with blandishments to lead her children to persecution. She punishes those who refuse, or are slothful in the extirpation of heresy. The canon law declares "that those who are unwilling to persecute heretics, are after an admonition to be excommunicated. And if a secular lord, after admonition, does not within one year eject heretics from his territory, let it be signified to the Pope, who will absolve his vassals from the oath of allegiance. Magistrates and

secular powers are bound to persecute heretics, and to take an oath to this effect.\* They are also bound to swear that they will assist ecclesiastics in the persecution of heretics, otherwise they are to be punished and excommunicated, and their lands placed under an interdict. A Bishop not persecuting heretics is deprived of his bishopric, and another elected. The rector of a city not observing the constitutions against heretics, is to be infamous and incapable of performing any duties." It is not, therefore, individual ignorance, nor bigotry, nor the darkness of past ages, but the sanguinary principles of blood-stained Rome that have shed innocent blood like water in the streets of Christendom, filled the world with violence, caused the name of Christ to be blasphemed by Jew and Pagan, and furnished the Infidel with his most plausible and popular argument against Christianity. These are the laws and the principles which Rome has never repealed, never disavowed, never prohibited. If her doctrine of infallibility makes it difficult to repeal what has been decided by three General Councils; yet, if there had been any sincere desire on the part of her Pontiffs to prevent such excesses for the future, and to inculcate a more merciful spirit, some document declarative of the Pope's opinion might have been expected: or, if this had been too great a compromise, the expurgation of all such persecuting

\* For all these citations, see Paravicini. Tom. ii. 384—408.

passages, would have had the appearance of the prevalence of milder sentiments. But no such expurgation has been made. In the canon law they still are found, and in their systems of divinity they are still taught. They are the principles embodied into her laws by her Councils, professed in bulls by the Pontiffs, and carried out into practice by her most zealous and faithful sons in every age, and in every country of the world where the Providence of God has permitted the development of her power. True, therefore, it is, that Rome is “drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus,” and that in her is to be found the blood of prophets, and of saints, and of all that have been slain upon the earth. St. John’s prophecy has, therefore, been most exactly fulfilled. He announced that after her conversion she should become idolatrous—that she should attain a pseudo-catholicity by a wide diffusion amongst peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues, and by becoming the mother Church of an idolatrous communion, and that to the guilt of idolatry, heresy, and schism, she should add that of imbruing her hands in the blood of Christ’s disciples and martyrs; and all this we have seen fulfilled. We see her idolatry, we know of her extensive diffusion, we behold the crimson hue of those stains with which she is covered, and must, therefore, conclude, that the prediction was Divinely inspired, and St. John a true prophet.

But an attempt to invalidate our conclusion may be made by urging, that this argument proves too much; for, if Rome be guilty of idolatry, heresy, schism, and merciless persecution of the saints, she can be no part of the Church of Christ, which yet the Church of England allows her to be by acknowledging the validity of her orders. This objection has been urged of old by Romanists, and even induced some Protestants to deny her idolatry, heresy and schism. But we answer it in the words of Hooker. "Idolatry severed of old the Israelites, iniquity, those Scribes and Pharisees, from God, who, notwithstanding were a part of the seed of Abraham, a part of that very seed which God did himself acknowledge to be his Church. . . . That which separateth, therefore, utterly, that which cutteth off clean from the visible Church of Christ, is plain apostacy, direct denial, utter rejection of the whole Christian faith, as far as the same is professedly different from infidelity."\* . . . And in another place speaking of one Lord, one faith, one baptism, as the mark wherewith the children of the visible Church are signed, he says, "In whomsoever these things are the Church doth acknowledge them for her children: them only she holdeth for aliens and strangers, in whom these things are not found. For want of these it is that Saracens, Jews, and Infidels, are excluded out of the bounds

\* Vol. ii. 348.

of the Church. Others we may not deny to be of the visible Church, as long as these things are not wanting in them. For apparent it is, that all men are of necessity either Christians, or not Christians. If by external profession they be Christians, then they are of the visible Church of Christ; and Christians by external profession they are all, whose mark of recognizance hath in it those things which we have mentioned, yea, although they be impious idolaters, wicked heretics, persons excommunicable, yea, and cast out for notorious improbity. Such, withal, we deny not to be the imps and limbs of Satan, even as long as they continue such. Is it then possible that the selfsame men should belong both to the synagogue of Satan and to the Church of Jesus Christ? Unto that Church which is his mystical body, not possible; because that body consisteth of none but only true Israelites, true sons of Abraham, true servants and saints of God. Howbeit of the visible body and Church of Jesus Christ, those may be and oftentimes are, in respect of the main parts of their outward profession, who in regard of their inward disposition of mind, yea, of external conversation, yea, even of some parts of their very profession, are most worthily both hateful in the sight of God himself, and in the eyes of the sounder part of the visible Church most execrable.\* In maintaining, therefore, the ido-

\* Vol. i. 352; compare also iii. 443.

latry and wickedness of the Roman Church, I do not depart from that Anglican charity which, nevertheless, allows her to be a member of the Church catholic. Indeed, how should I, when as Archbishop Wake says, “It is not the private opinion only of some particular and forward men in their zeal and heat against Popery, thus to accuse it of idolatry: but it is the deliberate, and sober, and downright charge of the Church of England, of which no honest man can be a member, and a minister who does not make and believe it.”\* There is, therefore, no departure from the doctrine of the Church of England, no contradiction, and no absurdity in the view which I have taken of the fulfilment of this prophecy. The Roman Church may be a portion of the visible Church of Christ, and yet, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth, and drunken with the blood of the saints, as we have proved her to be; and we may, in perfect consistency, point to her lamentable condition for the confirmation of our faith, and a proof that the Christian religion is from God.

This prophecy is, however, profitable, not merely for the confirmation of our Christian faith in general, but of the Protestant faith and practice in particular. The Church of Rome reproaches us as schismatics, because we have separated from her corrupt communion. We reply, that not our will

\* Archbp. Wake in Gibson. Vol ii. p. 339.

but her obstinacy in idolatry and error has been the cause of the separation. In all that she retains of primitive and apostolic Christianity, we hold communion with her as with the Church catholic, but in her idolatry, heresy, and practice of murder, we dare not to participate. Here we separate because communion would be sin, and expose us to the wrath of God. “It is true (says Bramhall) the Protestants separated themselves from the communion of the Roman Church, yet not absolutely, nor in such fundamentals, and other truths as she retains, but respectively in her errors, superstructions, and innovations. And they left it with the same mind, that one would leave his father’s or his brother’s house, when it is infected with the plague, with prayers for their recovery, and with desire to return again so soon as it is free, and that may be done with safety. This was not to forsake the Church of Rome, but to provide for themselves. ‘Come out of her, my people, lest ye be partakers of her sins, and taste of her plagues.’” We have gone forth in obedience to the command of the Almighty, being warned that a longer stay would certainly be perilous, and might possibly be fatal. Assured that no one can safely be guilty of heresy, or schism, or murder, or idolatry, or safely consort with those who live in the habitual practice and defence of these works of darkness, we refuse to hold fellowship with them; and, so long as these elements form the peculiarities of their religion, a

great gulf must remain fixed between us. In these days of spurious liberality and real indifferentism, the assertion of this interpretation may be deemed uncharitable, and branded as ultra-Protestantism,—concession is the order of the day, and men in their ardour to conciliate, do not stop to consider whether they are not by the approximation abandoning the truth. This is intolerable even in secular politics, but the solemn importance of religion forbids any compromise, or any softening down of the awful reality. The peculiarities of Romanism as pointed out in this prophecy, are idolatry, heresy, and murderous cruelty, all mortal and damnable sins, and for these no propriety of external form can atone, no traces of a venerable antiquity compensate. True charity to ourselves, our Protestant brethren, and the unhappy children of the mother of abominations, is to point out the enormity of these doctrines and practices, and their utter incompatibility with a state of salvation. We may hope that God will have mercy upon the irretrievably ignorant, and believe that he will make allowances for the prejudices of birth and education, as we hope also in the case of the children of pirates and robbers; but we must affirm, that they who murder the disciples of Christ by the ten thousand, and the hundred thousand, because they will not worship an idol of wood, or of bread, are not a whit the safer because they are called Catholic Romans, than if they were called heathen



Romans; and that murder is not a less heinous sin because it is committed under the pretence of religion, than if perpetrated for the open and undisguised gratification of vengeful malignity. We may abhor the impiety of schism, and deplore the self-will and prejudice that leads men to take upon them the ministerial office without call, or warrant; but we must never forget that schism is not so daring a flight of impiety as idolatry,\* nor temerity a sin of so deep a die as the deliberate and merciless massacre of Christ's faithful people. The indiscriminate exercise of the right of private judgment may lead, and has led, to much and grave public inconvenience, and, I doubt not, by fostering pride and contention, to the eternal ruin of not a few individuals; but it is mischievous only in the abuse, and is not absolutely and necessarily fatal like the peculiarities of Romanism. We must beware, therefore, of leading the idolater and the persecutor to think that he is safer than the schis-

\* "I am no advocate for schism. Yet this seemeth strange paradoxical doctrine to Christian ears. What, is all schism a more grievous sin than formal idolatry? Who can believe it? Schism is a defect of charity. Idolatry is the height of impiety, and a public affront put upon Almighty God. . . . Idolatry is a spiritual adultery, and so styled everywhere in holy Scriptures. A scolding contentious wife is not so ill as an adulteress. . . . St. Paul calls idols Devils, and their altars the tables of Devils. Can any sin be more grievous than to give honour to the Devil?" Bramhall's Works, p. 145.

matic, or of outraging common sense, and confirming the sceptic in his infidelity, by affirming that Christianity considers the violation of a positive institution a more heinous offence than the transgression of the two eternal and immutable laws, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself.' We must take care that we do not, by palliating image-worship, perpetuate the stumbling-block which has so long stood in the way of Jewish and Mahometan conversion, or confirm them in the main error which keeps them from Christianity, namely, the belief that the religion of Christians is idolatrous. We must learn, finally, that separation from the Church of Rome, in her present continuance in the profession of persecuting cruelty and the practice of idolatry, is a duty not merely in England, where there is a pure apostolic Church, but in every part of the world,—that communion with her under existing circumstances is sinful everywhere, and continued and earnest protest as needful and as obligatory as it was when our sainted martyrs protested even unto death. In the present day, there is much more danger of compromise than of ultraism on any subject; and we know that at all times lukewarmness is more odious in the sight of God than an exuberance of zeal. Christ never said to any of his disciples, 'Thou art zealous over much.' But to a Church of listless lukewarm

Christians he did say, ‘I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. So then, because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth. As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten: be zealous, therefore, and repent.’ ”



THE

MESSIAHSHIP OF JESUS.



THE  
MESSIAHSHIP OF JESUS:  
THE CONCLUDING SERIES  
OF THE  
TWELVE LECTURES ON THE PROPHECIES,

DELIVERED IN THE  
CHAPEL OF THE HON. SOCIETY OF LINCOLN'S INN,  
IN THE YEARS 1837, 1838, 1839, & 1840,  
ON THE FOUNDATION OF THE LATE BISHOP WARBURTON.

BY  
ALEXANDER M<sup>c</sup>CAUL, D.D.

PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON;  
RECTOR OF THE UNITED PARISHES OF ST. MAGNUS, ST. MARGARET, AND ST. MICHAEL;  
AND PREBENDARY OF ST. PAUL'S.

---

LONDON:  
JOHN W. PARKER AND SON, WEST STRAND.

MDCCCLII.

LONDON:  
SAVILL AND EDWARDS, PRINTERS, CHANDOS STREET,  
COVENT GARDEN.



## ADVERTISEMENT TO THE READER.

THE concluding Six Lectures, delivered on the foundation of the late Bishop Warburton, are now presented to the Public. They have been delayed with the intention of discussing more fully the interpretation of the prophetic passages: manifold interruptions and occupation have made the realization of this intention improbable. The rapid flow of years and of life suggested the prudence of publication. A condensed view of the interpretation of some important passages is added by way of Appendix. The discussion of others is found in the author's Translation of Kimchi's Commentary on Zechariah.

ERRATUM.

Page 11, line 19, *for* *ἑώρακαν* *read* *ἑώρακα*.

# CONTENTS.

---

## LECTURE I.

	PAGE
The Testimony of St. Paul a sufficient Answer to Strauss's Objections to the Gospel-history . . . . .	1

## LECTURE II.

The Fundamental Principles of Strauss's Objections false : Internal evidence of the early composition of the Gospel-narrative . . . . .	23
---	----

## LECTURE III.

Comparison of the Gospel-narrative with Prophecy . . . .	49
--	----

## LECTURE IV.

Insufficiency of the usual Answers to the Jewish Objection from Unfulfilled Prophecy . . . . .	7
---	---

## LECTURE V.

Two Advents distinguished; Kingdom of Christ upon Earth . . . . .	95
--	----

## LECTURE VI.

Recapitulation, and Practical Importance of the Study of Unfulfilled Prophecy . . . . .	117
--	-----

## APPENDIX OF INTERPRETATION.

	PAGE		PAGE
Genesis iii. 14, 15 . . . . .	139	Psalm lxix. . . . .	165
„ xlix. 10 . . . . .	142	„ lxxii. . . . .	167
Deut. xviii. 15—19 . . . . .	145	„ lxxxix. . . . .	167
Psalm ii. . . . .	150	„ xciii.—c. . . . .	168
„ xvi. . . . .	154	„ cix. . . . .	169
„ xviii. . . . .	157	„ cx. . . . .	170
„ xxii. 16 (17) . . . . .	158	Isaiah vii. 14 . . . . .	175
„ xl. 7, 8 (6, 7) . . . . .	161	„ viii. 1—ix. 6 . . . . .	183
„ lxviii. 19 (18) . . . . .	164	„ lii. 13—liii. . . . .	186

# LECTURES.

---

## LECTURE I.

LUKE XXIV. 46.

*Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day.*

THE universal Church has set apart this season of the year to remember the first advent, and to look forward to the second. An effort has, however, been lately made to rob us of the ground of our rejoicing. A foreign critic has recently attempted to show that the gospel narratives, as being mere legends arising out of the circumstances, the religious opinions, and mistaken piety of the early Christians, are devoid of all historic value. He pretends that the conclusion at which he has arrived is the result of scientific investigation. But his principal argument—which is, that an allusion to miracle or supernatural interposition necessarily stamps the record in which it occurs as fabulous—shows that his conclusion was attained, not only before the termination but before the commencement of the inquiry, and is founded in hostility to

the idea of all revealed religion.\* He is, however, mistaken, if he thinks that the rejection of the gospels would necessarily involve the overthrow of Christianity. The history of the world, as open to our own daily inspection, compared with predictions which certainly existed before the beginning of the Christian era, is quite sufficient to prove the truth of its main facts and doctrines, and the certainty of divine revelation. It is a fact of which the most sceptical cannot doubt, that many, and those the most civilized, nations of the world worship and acknowledge as their Lord and their God an individual of the Jewish nation, who has been and still is despised and rejected by his own people, and further, that His doctrine has been the means of dispelling from amongst those nations the darkness of heathenism, and bringing them to faith in the Creator of heaven and earth. It has been shown in the preceding lectures that a series of predictions, beginning at least 2600 years ago, have announced this state of things, and have led the world to expect a descendant of the tribe of Judah, who should thus deliver the nations from idolatry, and be himself acknowledged as the Mighty God and the Everlasting Father. The inevitable consequence is, that these predictions are themselves divine revelations, and that Christianity is true. If, therefore, there were no gospels in existence, the common tradition of the Christian Church and

\* Strauss, Vol. I. pp. 30, 31, p. 75 especially.

the Jewish nation respecting Jesus of Nazareth, and the range of facts within the compass of our daily experience, are sufficient to prove that our faith is well founded, and that the fact of miraculous interposition cannot be denied. The knowledge of futurity is as much an exception to the laws of nature as the power to stay the sun in the firmament, or to raise the dead. An additional argument for the confirmation of our faith was offered in the fulfilment of a prophecy of the New Testament also. It was shown that a disciple of Jesus of Nazareth also possessed the gift of prescience, which enabled him to foretel the destinies of Imperial Rome, and that history and our own observation pronounce him to have been a true prophet. If, however, we could fill up the bold and striking outline traced in the few predictions already considered, and show that all, even the minutest features of the picture, had been exactly portrayed, every succeeding particular would furnish an additional argument for the confirmation of our faith in Christ and in Christianity. The gospels supply these particulars, and this should lead us to-day to the second class of prophecies proposed for consideration—those, namely, the fulfilment of which is related in the gospels.

We desire, however, first to show the security of the Christian faith, and the utter futility of attempting to overthrow the gospel-narrative. We have proved already that if there were no gospels in the

world, the religious history of Christendom at this present moment, as compared with the prophecies of the Old Testament, is sufficient to command the belief of every man who acknowledges that prescience is the prerogative of Deity. We assert now, that if there were no gospels, the particulars of our Lord's history to be collected from the undisputed epistles of St. Paul, furnish such additional proof of the fulfilment of prophecy, as, when added to that derived from our own cognizance of passing events, constitutes a defence of Christianity impossible to be shaken. The most strenuous effort of modern infidel criticism has never been able to affix a doubt upon the genuineness of thirteen of these epistles—even that author who pronounces the gospels to be a complication of legends, asserts that these epistles were written by St. Paul. This one concession is sufficient to prove the truth of Christianity. St. Paul is an unexceptionable witness, and he furnishes particulars of our Lord's history by which to test his claims to be considered the deliverer announced by the Hebrew prophets. St. Paul, in the first place a cotemporary, and, secondly, an inhabitant of Jerusalem about the time of our Lord's crucifixion; and, besides, a pupil of Gamaliel, who was Nasi or Prince of the Sanhedrin which condemned our Lord, had every opportunity of knowing the truth which he relates. Possessed of learning and acuteness, and having been once a bitter enemy, he was not likely to be deceived, nor lightly to be per-



suaded. Gaining nothing, but suffering loss of all things for his testimony, it is utterly improbable that he would deviate from that which he believed to be true. The sceptic to whom we have referred, casts no imputation upon his integrity or his ability, but simply supposes that Paul was deluded by a phantom of the imagination, when he thought that he saw the Lord Jesus Christ. If therefore we can show that here there was no possibility of mistake, we remove the only objection made to his testimony. To answer our opponent's arguments is impossible, simply because there are none to be answered. Excepting that sweeping one, which, by denying any possibility of miracle, takes for granted the matter in dispute, he has absolutely nothing to offer but a string of suppositions. He does not attempt to prove that Paul was mistaken, but only endeavours to assign natural causes which might have led the apostle to believe that he had seen the Lord, and to change the persecutor into the Apostle. 'The momenta, which were sufficient in a natural way to produce this revolution in the man's mind (were these): The favourable impressions, which he had at various times received concerning Christianity, concerning the doctrine, the life and conversation of those who professed it, especially by Stephen's martyr-death, which must have produced in his mind a state of doubt and struggle, which he might for awhile suppress even by double zeal in persecuting the new sect, but which was sure to end

at last in a decisive mental crisis, concerning which we are not to be astonished, if it assumed in an oriental mind the form of a Christophany.\* Now, without referring to the blindness, and the scales which fell from the apostle's eyes as related in the Acts of the Apostles, it is possible to show from the epistles that the solution here offered is altogether inadequate to explain the facts. It is true that in one place St. Paul speaks of visions, and expresses his uncertainty as to whether they had been apprehended by his bodily eyes, as when he says, 'I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord. I knew a man in Christ about fourteen years ago (whether in the body I cannot tell, or out of the body I cannot tell: God knoweth;) such an one caught up to the third heaven.' But even this cannot be accounted for by an illusion of the imagination—a physical infirmity inflicted in consequence of the visions proves their reality, as he goes on to say, 'And lest I should be exalted above measure through the abundance of the revelations, there was given to me a thorn in the flesh, the messenger of Satan to buffet me, lest I should be exalted above measure. For this thing I besought the Lord thrice, that it might depart from me. And he said unto me, my grace is sufficient for thee: for my strength is made perfect in weakness.' To think of a mere mental crisis here is absurd. But further: St. Paul, speaking of the appearance of Christ to

\* Strauss, Vol. II. p. 659.

the other apostles, says, 'Last of all he was seen of me as of one born out of due time.' Here some stress is laid upon the indefiniteness of the account, and it is insinuated that St. Paul himself by the word which he uses, *ἄφθην*, does not mean to imply more than a prophetic vision; but this supposition is contrary to, nay, subversive of, the object which the apostle had in view in citing these appearances, which was to prove the resurrection of the body. 'The dead,' says he, 'rise, for Christ is risen,' that is, his body is risen, and I have seen it. A mere prophetic vision would be here altogether out of place; neither can any objection be fairly grounded on the omission of the circumstances of each of these appearances. The apostle was alluding to an account which he had already communicated to the Corinthians, it was therefore unnecessary to repeat the details. Nay, the citing of these appearances at all, in writing to persons who doubted the possibility of the body's resurrection, proves that they were of such a nature as could stand the test of the most sceptical inquiry. The Corinthians, and the apostle too, were as sagacious as any modern disputant. The former therefore would never have received, nor the latter have offered, mere general assertions of Christ's appearing to the apostles. The reference in a controversy is sufficient to prove that the facts were such as could safely be proposed for examination. This passage proves that St. Paul and those other persons whom he mentions, all believed that

they had with their bodily eyes seen the Lord Jesus after his resurrection. Were they then all deluded, all the victims of an oriental imagination? In the apostles and the five hundred brethren, most of whom were alive when St. Paul wrote, there had been no internal struggle between prejudice and conviction — their conscience was free from the reproach of murder and cruelty, which brought on the supposed mental crisis in the persecutor. The only thoughts that could agitate their minds were a keen sense of hopes disappointed, and of danger incurred by having followed an impostor or a fanatic; a train of thought not at all tending to beget the belief in his resurrection from the dead. Our objector felt this difficulty, and propounds a solution, which is worth citation as a specimen of those arguments which the rejecter of the gospels considers sufficient to justify his unbelief. ‘To judge aright of this matter,’ says he, ‘we must place ourselves in the circumstances of the apostles, and realize their state of mind after the death of Jesus. He had, during a converse with them of many years, added continually and decidedly to the impression which he had already produced in them of his Messiahship; his death, however, which they could not harmonize with their ideas of the Messiah, had for the moment annihilated the impression. But when, after the first terror was over, the former impression began to revive, there arose, as a matter of course, the

psychological craving to be able to account for the contradiction existing between the final destiny of Jesus and their former views of his character, and to be able to include suffering and death in their idea of the Messiah. But as amongst the Jews of that time, to conceive meant only to deduce something from the Scriptures, they naturally betook themselves to them, to see whether they could not find there some intimations of a suffering and dying Messiah. And such intimations, however contrary the idea of such a Messiah is to the Old Testament, to those who wished for them, would naturally present themselves in all those poetical and prophetic passages, which, like Isaiah liii. and Psalm xxii., described the men of God as sore plagued and bowed down to death. . . . When they had once adopted reproach, suffering, and death into their idea of Messiah's character, it followed that the crucified Jesus was not lost to them, but only had entered into his glory; and that if alive he would necessarily exhibit himself to his people. From this the disciples went on to imagine that they had seen him; and Scripture passages, such as the promise not to leave his soul in hell (Psalm xvi.), and that he should prolong his days (Isaiah liii. 10), naturally furnished the confirmation.' This series of conjectures is all that this objector can offer to account for the supernatural zeal, courage, devotedness, and constancy with which the disciples proclaimed their faith in Him whose

ignominious death had blighted all their hopes. Consider, then, the suppositions which he here offers in the place of historic evidence or solid argument. He supposes, in the first place, that the Lord Jesus Christ, in the depth of his poverty, and without working a single miracle, had produced in the apostles an impression of his Messiahship, though he confesses that the Old Testament, the only source of their ideas on the subject, promised a glorious Messiah; that is, that by being in every particular the reverse of what they expected, he produced faith in his Messiahship. He grants that these impressions were annihilated by his death, and then supposes that without any adequate cause, or rather without any cause at all, they began to revive; that the longer Jesus lay in the grave, and therefore the more certain and intense their disappointment, the more they were inclined to recur to their faith in him as the glorious deliverer of Israel. He supposes, further, that they began to search the Scriptures, and that the prejudices excited by disappointment, far from leading them to see that their former thoughts concerning the Messiahship of the despised Nazarene were opposed to the glories of the prophetic testimony, actually led them to reject their own and the universal belief amongst their nation concerning Messiah's character, and to infer that the highest possible degree of calamity and ignominy was the beginning of that royal splendour which they had so fondly expected. He

supposes that this new doctrine led them to believe, not that Christ should rise from the dead, or come again, but that he had actually risen; and without any reason whatever, in prophecy or elsewhere, to fix upon a particular day, the third day, as the day of the resurrection. He supposes that all this occurred, not to one individual, but in the minds of the eleven apostles and hundreds of disciples, and that neither they nor their enemies ever thought of going to the grave and looking for the body; and he expects us to believe that this delicate web of absurdities, devoid of all foundation, and contrary to all experience, spun out of the bowels of criticism nearly eighteen hundred years after the event happened, is more agreeable to reason than the testimony of a cotemporary, who enumerates five distinct appearances, and names the persons to whom they happened; who says that he himself saw *ἑώρακον*, the Lord Jesus, and that the sight converted him from his enmity, and stopped his persecution;\* who considers this sight as the principal argument of his apostleship, that which rendered him not a whit inferior to the other apostles who had attended on the Lord during the whole course of his ministry; who asserts in almost all his epistles that he is 'an apostle (not of men, neither by men, but by Jesus Christ)' immediately; who asserts that he had such continued intercourse with the risen Jesus, as to have received from him the gospel which

\* 1 Cor. ix. 1.

he preached, saying, ' I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it but by revelation of Jesus Christ'—and who refers those to whom he writes to the supernatural gifts which he had displayed and even communicated in proof that his appointment to the apostleship was immediate. Just hear St. Paul appealing to the contentious Corinthians, and saying, ' Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in signs and wonders and mighty deeds.' Listen how fearlessly he reminds the Galatians of the miracles which confirmed his doctrine, and of the absence of miracles in those who opposed him, ' This only I would learn of you; received ye the Spirit by the works of the law or the hearing of faith? He therefore that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, doeth he it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?' Hear him in another place enumerating the gifts of the Spirit: ' Apostles, prophets, teachers, miracles, gifts of healing, diversity of tongues.' Hear him again giving directions as to the manner in which those miraculous gifts were to be exercised, and thanking God that he spoke with tongues more than all those to whom he wrote, and the supposition of any illusion of the imagination becomes utterly impossible. Either St. Paul did really see the Lord Jesus Christ—and really receive those miraculous gifts himself—and really exercise them



before the Corinthian and Galatian churches where he had enemies—and really communicate those gifts to others—which others not only practised but abused—or we must conclude that St. Paul was mad—that his judaizing enemies were mad—that all the churches of Corinth and Galatia were mad—and that madness on one hand and folly on the other were the causes which ensured the triumph of the gospel—which led Greeks and Romans to renounce the lying vanities of heathenism, and to embrace the rational religion of Christianity—which actuated men soberly and resolutely to persevere for many years in preaching and practising the purest morality, and enabled them at last deliberately and cheerfully to die as martyrs to the truth. No man possessed of the ordinary powers of human reason, and unblinded by determinate prejudice, can long hesitate as to which side of the alternative he ought to choose. The direct and unequivocal statements of the cotemporary, supported as they are by the circumstances of the case, and confirmed by the vastness of the effects produced, must necessarily be preferred to the fanciful suppositions of the critic living eighteen hundred years afterwards—suppositions resting on no evidence, and strengthened by no argument, excepting the also supposed impossibility of miracles. St. Paul is therefore a credible witness—all men must perceive his ability—his enemies acknowledge his epistles to be genuine—his moral character unimpeachable—his statements to

be the simple expression of his convictions. Fair and legitimate arguments prove that he could not be the victim of an unbridled imagination. So long, therefore, as the epistles of St. Paul remain—whatever becomes of the gospels—the great facts of Christianity remain just where they were. These epistles alone furnish the most satisfactory warrant for faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and so long as we possess them and our reason unimpaired, we may say, as St. Paul did, ‘I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day.’ The particulars of our Lord’s history, however, which may be gathered from these epistles, furnish the means of a further examination into the claims of Jesus of Nazareth to be considered as the Saviour whom the prophets predicted. From them we learn, in the first place, the time of Christ’s advent; not only can we infer that he appeared towards the latter end of the second temple, but are told distinctly that it was when Pilate was Governor of Judea. 1 Tim. vi. 13. ‘I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things, and before Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession.’ We learn further that Christ was of the family of David. In Rom. i. 3, Paul says, ‘which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh; and in 2 Tim. ii. 8, he says, ‘Remember Jesus Christ of the seed of David.’ In 1 Cor. xi. 23, we read that Christ was betrayed,

but that before the betrayal took place, he instituted a memorial of his death, declaring that his blood was the blood of the New Covenant: 'I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread: and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.' In almost every epistle we are told that Christ died a violent death. The princes of this world, he says, were ignorant of the hidden wisdom, for 'had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of life and glory.' From Philip. ii. 5, we learn that his death was voluntary, 'Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.' From numerous passages we learn that the object of this voluntary death was to die the just for the unjust, to save us from wrath. From 1 Cor. xv. 3, &c., that he was buried, and rose again, and appeared unto many. 'For I delivered unto you that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins

according to the scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day, according to the scriptures: and that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve: after that he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once,' &c. From Ephes. iv. 8, we learn that Christ after his resurrection ascended up on high, from whence he sent down gifts; and from Col. iii. 1, that he sitteth on the right hand of God. If, then, it should appear that these particulars were all previously foretold, as marks whereby to recognise the promised deliverer, then we have additional proof that He whose name is now great amongst the Gentiles is the Messiah, and that the predictions announcing results so improbable and particulars so minute are from God. But that the history does in some points exactly agree with prophecy is admitted by our adversary, when he says, that the disciples in their distress searched the prophecies to see whether there was anything that could warrant their belief in a Messiah who had suffered a violent death, and when he assigns the particular passages which led to their belief in the resurrection. He says, however, that the interpretation which they seized upon was false, and merely forced upon them by the circumstances, and that the doctrine of a suffering Messiah is contrary to the representations of the Old Testament. This assertion might have some weight, if the apostles and their followers, the Christians, had been the only persons adopting this interpretation,

but how is it, as can be shown and has been shown, that the doctrine of a suffering Messiah has been in every age the doctrine of the synagogue—that it is the doctrine of their public liturgy—of their commentaries—of the Targum—yea, of the Septuagint version made before our Lord's appearance? and that this doctrine is based upon the same passages referred to by Christians? There was no such necessity resting upon the Jews as upon the apostles, and therefore that they have adopted a similar interpretation is a strong proof that it is not so opposed to the representations of the Old Testament, and that the supposition of the critic is devoid even of plausibility. A mere inspection and collation of a few passages is sufficient to show that this doctrine is not far-fetched or developed by ingenious deduction, but to be found lying on the very surface of Scripture. Daniel says, 'Messiah shall be cut off;' Zechariah, that the Shepherd of Israel shall be smitten—'Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts: smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered.' And again, 'They shall look upon me whom they have pierced.' Isaiah says, 'He was cut off out of the land of the living, for the iniquity of my people was he stricken.' David, 'They pierced my hands and my feet.' So far from doing force to the text by explaining them of a suffering Messiah, it appears to me that this doctrine cannot be excluded from these passages

except by violence the most palpable. The violent death, therefore, which our Lord died, serves as another mark, whereby to identify him as the subject of prophecy. The time of his appearance equally coincides with the prophetic announcement. Jacob declared that at the time of his coming the supreme power should depart from the Jews, saying, 'The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come.' Haggai and Malachi, that he should come during the continuance of the second temple. The one declaring that 'the desire of all nations should come, and thereby the glory of the second temple be greater than the first;' the other, 'That the Lord should suddenly come to his temple.' Daniel limited the time of his appearance and the following events to 490 years from the time of his prophecy. Jesus of Nazareth appeared, therefore, at the time predicted. His descent from David is also noted by the prophets. Isaiah says, '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;' thus connecting his descent with that other mark, which is still fulfilling before our eyes. The prophets have, however, not only noted the circumstances of Messiah's life and his violent death, but his burial. David implies it when he says, 'My flesh also shall rest in hope.' Isaiah says expressly that his grave was appointed with the wicked, but that he was to rest with the rich in his death.

David and Isaiah predicted his resurrection from the dead, and even if they had not done so expressly, it is necessarily implied in their doctrine, that Messiah is to suffer a violent death, and yet to be the deliverer of Israel, and the universal and eternal King. To be so it is not possible that he should be holden of the bands of death. The annunciation of Messiah's exaltation to heaven is equally plain. David says, 'Thou hast ascended up on high; Thou hast led captivity captive.' And, again, 'Sit Thou on my right hand until I make thy foes thy footstool,' which is also implied in the prediction of Daniel that he should come as the Son of man in the clouds of heaven. If he is to come, as the Jews to this day expect, from heaven, and yet is to be born upon earth of the family of David, it plainly follows that some period after his birth he must ascend into heaven, there to abide until the time comes that he should receive the kingdom. Not only, therefore, has Jesus of Nazareth fulfilled the prediction that a descendant of Judah should be a light to lighten the Gentiles, as our eyes are privileged to see, but in his birth, the time and place of his appearance, his descent from David, his death, burial, resurrection, ascension, and continuance at the right hand of God, he has fulfilled a series of predictions beginning with the patriarch Jacob, and continued to Malachi, he must therefore be the true Messiah, and those prophets who announced all these particulars must have been inspired of God.

This evidence, then, without the gospels,—nay, one particular of it, the resurrection of Jesus from the dead,—is sufficient warrant for our faith. He who overcame death must necessarily be the Messiah, even though many particulars marked out by the prophets should not be noted in the New Testament. The assemblage, therefore, of so many particulars as may be gathered from St. Paul's epistles, together with the exhibition before our eyes of the predicted effects of his appearance, place his Messiahship and our faith beyond the possibility of a doubt. There is, however, one note of Messiah's identity supplied by the gospels, which is not explicitly stated in the epistles, and that is, his miraculous conception and birth. It may be well, therefore, to conclude this subject to-day by briefly exhibiting St. Paul's faith on this subject. We observe, in the first place, that St. Paul believed in the pre-existence of Christ as very God, and in the appearance of Christ upon earth as an incarnation of Deity. Thus when he says, 'Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor,' he implies that his coming into this world was not like that of ordinary children, involuntary, but a voluntary act. This is expressed still more strongly when he says, that 'Being in the form of God, and thinking it no robbery to be equal with God, he made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant.' There he tells us that his pre-existence



was as God, and consequently describes his coming into the world as of 'God manifested in the flesh.' Could he then, holding this doctrine, believe that Christ was born of a human father according to the course of nature? This would be difficult to believe. His doctrine concerning the sinless nature of Christ's humanity and the transmission of sin makes it impossible. Respecting the former, he says, 'He made him to be sin for us who knew no sin;'—and concerning the latter, he tells us that by 'one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin—that the carnal mind is enmity against God, and that by nature we are the children of wrath.' If, therefore, Christ had come into the world as other men, he would have been exposed to the same consequences, and could not be said to know no sin, and still less could he have been a lamb without spot and without blemish. But if, as St. Paul testifies, he was free from the effects, he must also have been free from the cause, that is, his birth as man must have been supernatural. St. Paul's doctrines, therefore, intimate necessarily that he believed in the supernatural conception of Christ, and this faith is plainly expressed in the epistle to the Hebrews, when it is said of Melchisedec that he was 'Without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but made like unto the Son of God.' The Son of God could only be without father as man, without mother as God, so that in the epistles we find also that Christ's birth

answered to the prediction of Jeremiah—‘The Lord hath created a new thing in the earth, a woman hath compassed a man.’—Jer. xxxi. 22. In vain, therefore, are the efforts of short-sighted men to disparage the gospel-narrative. All the essential outlines of the gospel-history are contained in those epistles which they acknowledge as genuine, and the attacks only serve to remind us of the impregnableness of the fortress of our faith. If there were no New Testament at all, the prophecies of the Old Testament, illustrated by the present religious condition of the world, would teach us to believe in Jesus as him in whom these prophecies are fulfilled. The epistles acknowledged as genuine by our adversaries furnish us with details which make mistake impossible—if then the epistles be genuine, we can prove, in spite of our adversaries, that the gospels must be so too, and have thus additional reason for believing that Christ is the Saviour of the world. Time, however, does not permit us to enter upon this to-day.

## LECTURE II.

LUKE XXIV. 46.

*Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day.*

IN preceding lectures an attempt has been made to show that the certainty of our hope, and the reasonableness of our faith, as Christians, do not depend upon the genuineness and authenticity of the gospels as their only warrant. A thoughtful man would not lightly reject the evidence furnished by the constant and universal tradition of the Church: and in the agreement of Hebrew prophecy with the state of the world he would find an irresistible argument for the truth of Christianity. But by comparing tradition and prophecy with the epistles of St. Paul, he might advance even to certainty, so far as it is attainable in matters depending upon the laws of credibility. The verity of the gospel-history is, however, of the greatest importance, for, if true, we acquire two additional arguments, either in itself sufficient to silence every doubt. The doctrine, the miracles, and the resurrection of Christ, if faithfully narrated, prove incontestably that He is as he claimed to be, the Messiah, the Saviour of the

world, whilst at the same time the minute fulfilment of prophecy in the time, manner, and place of his birth, life, and death, testifies that he it is of whom the prophets wrote, and that their predictions were not the effusions of fanaticism or imposture, but the words of those who wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. Many have been the attempts made to deprive us of this evidence by questioning either the genuineness of the gospels or the authenticity of the history which they profess to relate. But recently, as stated in the last lecture, an attack has been made possessing some degree of novelty from the manner in which it applies old objections. This new assailant rejects the gospel-history not as the work of wilful deceivers, but as a collection of legends gradually arising out of the previous opinions and actual circumstances of the early Christians, until at last insensibly and without design, it was moulded into its present form. The limits of these lectures do not permit us to show the impossibility and absurdity of this hypothesis, nor to discuss all the details of his criticism; but we propose this day to show the unsoundness of the principles on which his reasoning proceeds, and the invalidity of the conclusions at which he arrives.

His first reason for rejecting the historic value of the gospel-narrative is, that the evangelists relate not only what is improbable, but what, in his view, is impossible. 'A relation,' he says, 'cannot be matter of history; a narrative cannot be authentic

when it is irreconcilable with the known and universal laws of contingency. Now, according to all sound philosophical principles, as well as all sufficiently attested experience, the very first of these laws is, that the great First Cause never breaks through the chain of finite causes by an immediate exertion of power, but, on the contrary, manifests himself only in the production of the whole complex of finite causalities, and their reciprocal action and reaction. Whenever, therefore, a narrative mentions a phenomenon or fact, with the expressed or implied assurance that it was produced immediately by God himself (as heavenly voices, theophanies, and such like things), or by human individuals in consequence of supernatural assistance from him (as miracles, prophecies): in so far we are not to receive it as an historical relation.' In other words this writer tells us, that a direct interposition of the Almighty, as implying a suspension or interruption of the laws of nature, is contrary both to philosophy and experience, and that therefore any narrative including any such interposition either in the way of miracle or revelation, is at the least a legend. Such is the basis of that higher species of criticism, now so highly celebrated on the continent, and regarded as the triumph of the intellectual faculty—a basis that makes all inquiry unnecessary, and all study of the gospels a mere mockery—that pronounces all evidence to be useless. Infidelity sometimes pleads in its defence the insufficiency of the evidence adduced,

the inconclusiveness of the arguments in favour of Christianity, the want of learning in its advocates; but this author fairly lays aside every pretence of the kind, and tells us that no evidence, no learning, and no power of reasoning, will ever be sufficient to convince him, inasmuch as his first principle is, that the alleged facts of Christianity are matters of impossibility. He does not pretend that his unbelief is the result of long and painful investigation, but admits that his rejection of the gospel is the result of his previous unbelief,—a confession that will help us to appreciate the impartiality with which his inquiry was conducted. His argument from the principle that miracles are contrary to experience has, in part, been advanced and answered long since, but as the application of it is somewhat novel, and as it is, in fact, the great essential difference between unbelief and faith, and the true source of all objections against revealed religion, it may be well to show that in its new application also it is false. The first great and obvious objection to it is, that, when fully carried out, it puts an end to all religion, natural as well as revealed, deprives even the Almighty of free agency, and represents all creation as under the control of a blind and irresistible fate. When this author says that immediate divine interposition is contrary to philosophy and experience, he means to say that it is impossible, for if he admit the possibility his argument is inconclusive. What the Creator can do he may do,

and it is only a revelation that can assure us that he will not do it. It is only an impossibility, therefore, which must be necessarily fabulous. But if it be admitted that it is impossible for God himself to interrupt or suspend the chain of cause and effect, then is that chain necessary, and God himself is subordinate to that necessity, and if the Creator himself, how much more the weak and fleeting beings of an hour which inhabit this earth. If Omnipotence cannot burst the chain of fate, nor assert its liberty, it is certain that man must be a mere machine, whose thoughts and actions, love and hatred, hopes and fears, are altogether involuntary, the necessary effects of invincible and immutable causes, and consequently neither good nor bad, entitled to no reward, and exposed to no retribution. If whatsoever is contrary to experience is to be regarded as impossible, then a life after death and a judgment to come are amongst the things to be rejected by all living, and thus whether we look to the supposed adamant chain of cause and effect, or to the given limits of experience, every system of religion that includes a hope of God's approbation, or a fear of his displeasure, is a fiction. The philosophy which this author professes teaches us that there is nothing to hope and nothing to fear, or that if there be, all attempt to avoid the one or to attain the other is useless, for that the whole creation, and the individuals of which it is composed, whether rational or irrational, animate

or inanimate, are hurried on by an irreversible destiny, which the Almighty himself cannot stay, control, nor resist. Consequences so terrific might induce us to hesitate before we adopt the system from which they naturally flow; a little reflection will serve to convince us that it is false, and ought therefore to be rejected. The principle laid down not only takes for granted the matter in dispute, but is manifestly untrue. It is not even necessary to show that its plausibility rests altogether upon the ambiguity of the word experience—that when it is asserted that divine interposition is contrary to experience, the proposition obtains assent in one sense, that is, as referring to a portion of human experience, and is argued upon in another, that is, as referring to the universal experience of all created things: it is no difficult matter to show that it contains a plain and palpable falsehood. All creation and every part of it testify that this world is the result of design. No sound philosopher will believe that the frame of man or the system of the universe is the effect of anything else but of infinite wisdom, deliberately designing and freely executing its designs—if so, then is creation itself an example of direct and immediate divine interposition. Either we must admit that the creation is eternal, or that once it had no existence—that its laws had no operation, and that the divine Being, by an act of stupendous and immediate interposition, called them into Being. If the world and the things in the



world had a beginning, then the experience of the world, authenticated by the testimony of every created thing in heaven and upon earth, teaches us that divine interposition is a matter of fact and of history. But it is not merely the creation, the history of this change which this our earth has undergone proves that the principle on which the gospel history is rejected is contrary to fact. If whatsoever is contrary to experience is to be rejected, then that the human race had a beginning is also to be considered as a legend. That individuals of the human race should be produced except according to fixed, and so far as we know, universal laws of nature, is contrary to experience; therefore that they ever were produced in any other way is a fable—that is, the race of man is eternal. Such is the inevitable consequence from the principle laid down, and yet the discoveries of modern science compel the sceptic who would reject the Bible doctrine of the origin of the human race to admit that man has necessarily had a beginning, for that the state of this earth was such a few thousand years ago as to render its habitation by man impossible. Individuals of the human race, therefore, were once produced in some way contrary to the uniform experience of all mankind, and therefore the principle that whatever is contrary to our experience is legendary, is necessarily false. The fact, however, of the origin of man a few thousand years ago, gives us also another instance of direct divine

interposition. Before his creation, the sceptic will admit that the world was once fit only for the dwelling-place of fierce and gigantic animals—the chain of finite causalities, therefore, at that time, necessarily tended to the continuance of that state of things, and the experience of the infidel, if he could have been numbered amongst the then inhabitants of the world, would have been, that man's habitation on and dominion over the earth was impossible. But the Almighty burst the chain. An act of immediate divine interposition terminated the operation of the then existing causes, and produced an entire new state of things—man was created not according to any laws of nature known then nor now, not according to any experience of the present or the past, but by an act of the Almighty. The revolutions, therefore, which this earth has undergone, directly contradict that principle which would make the experience of any one period of the earth's existence the rule whereby to judge either of the past or the future, and as directly testify that those sources of information which scientific men regard as authentic, demonstrate that the Almighty has more than once interrupted the chain of second causes, and directly interfered with the course of the world and the laws of nature, and that on a scale the most stupendous and magnificent;—and reason and philosophy conclude that what has once been may be again, and that therefore the principle on which the facts of revealed religion are rejected,

not only overthrow natural religion too, and establish in its place a dark and fearful fatalism, but is opposed both to the discoveries of modern science and the most obvious facts of the world's history—that it is as contrary to sound philosophy as to experience, and is therefore false. A narrative may contain accounts of direct divine interposition, and yet may be true and authentic history.

The next criterion of the unhistoric character of a relation, proposed by this author, is its inconsistency with itself or with other accounts. 'A narrative,' he says, 'that lays claim to historic value must not only agree with the laws of possibility, but must further be free from all disagreement with itself and other reports.' But to this assertion it has been replied long since, when brought forward in another form, that if true, it would invalidate all the history that we possess, either of the past or the present. There is scarcely any one fact of ancient or modern history treated by more than one writer, of which the accounts exactly agree. Even important events of our own times, as of the last great war, have been made matter of controversy, and that by persons too who were eye-witnesses and actively engaged in the transactions concerning which they dispute. Whether a critical posterity will reject both the particular events, and the war, of which they form a part, as fabulous, because the accounts of cotemporaries and eye-witnesses do not agree, we know not, but this we do know, that if they should,

their reasoning would be false, and their standard of authenticity altogether erroneous. Indeed, this principle is not merely opposed to fact—it is the very reverse of truth. Agreement in the general outline and variation of detail is the strongest proof of authenticity; the former, as proving that a fact is the basis of the narrative; the latter, as exhibiting the independence of the testimony. Take, for instance, the gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke. Both contain the history of Jesus of Nazareth. In the great outline they agree—in many of the details they differ. Now, there are two suppositions possible; either one evangelist saw the account written by the other, or he did not. If not, if each wrote independently of the other, then their agreement, not only as to the general course of the history, but as to the very words of the discourses uttered, and the identity of the characters described, can only be accounted for either by miraculous interposition or by the authenticity of that which they relate, and the minute fidelity of the sources from whence they drew their narratives. Here the acknowledged independence of the witnesses proves the truth of the history. But even if we adopt the other side of the alternative, and suppose, for instance, that St. Luke saw St. Matthew's gospel and made use of it in writing his own, the proof of independent sources is not materially altered, and the strength of the argument in favour of authenticity is increased. The differences are, then, not merely casual, but deli-

berate, and the nature of these deliberate differences proves that the later writer did not merely copy and embellish the earlier, but had another source with which he compared it, and which in many cases he preferred to follow. Thus, for instance, St. Luke gives a different genealogy from that of St. Matthew, and this difference is so great as to show that there must have been some deliberate reason for the variety. Again, both describe the preaching of John the Baptist in the wilderness. But St. Luke has an addition which shows that he had an independent source. He records the questions of the people, the publicans, and the soldiers, saying—‘Master, what shall we do?’ and the particular instructions which John gave to each class, which St. Matthew omits. Again St. Matthew gives a long discourse of our Lord, commonly called the Sermon on the Mount. St. Luke gives one very similar, and yet there are differences, which prove that one is not a mere copy or abridgment of the other. The former tells us, that ‘Jesus seeing the multitudes, went up into a mountain;’ the latter, that after continuing all night on a mountain in prayer, ‘he came down with his disciples, and stood in a plain,’ and that when the multitude came, he there addressed them. St. Luke also inserts what does not appear in the other, and omits much that is there—and in the twelfth chapter of his gospel inserts much of what he here omits. The circumstances, if we suppose both evangelists to refer to one and the same occasion,

are more fully related by St. Luke, and it is plain that he did not copy; and yet the exact agreement in the nature, sentiments, and even language of the two discourses proves beyond doubt that they are copies of a real original. Another striking proof of the independency of the testimony of these two evangelists is the account which each gives of the long discourse in reference to the destruction of the temple, and Christ's second advent. In the general outline and in many particulars they exactly agree, but one striking passage is omitted by St. Luke and given on a different occasion. In St. Matthew, after our Lord's declaration, that the day and hour of his advent are unknown, he is represented as referring to the days of Noah, and saying 'As the days of Noah were, so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. For as in the days that were before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and knew not until the flood came, and took them all away; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. Then shall two be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left. Two women shall be grinding at the mill; the one shall be taken, and the other left.' This striking passage is omitted by St. Luke in his account of the discourse, and yet evidently not merely for the sake of abbreviation, for he inserts it on another occasion, in the seventeenth chapter of his gospel. 'When he was demanded of the Pharisees, when the kingdom of

God should come, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation . . . . And he said unto the disciples, The days will come, when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of man, and ye shall not see it. And they shall say to you, See here; or, see there: go not after them, nor follow them. For as the lightning, that lighteneth out of the one part under heaven, shineth unto the other part under heaven; so shall also the Son of man be in his day . . . . and as it was in the days of Noah,' &c., and then follows what is omitted in the twenty-first chapter, with an addition, however, of a reference to the days of Lot and the destruction of Sodom. Here, then, granting that St. Luke had seen St. Matthew's gospel, it is plain that he had another and independent source from which he drew, and yet the difference does not prove any irreconcilable contradiction, but is easily accounted for by the supposition that our Lord repeated the chief part of his instructions on various occasions; and St. Luke having given this passage in the seventeenth chapter, thought it unnecessary to repeat it in the twenty-first. The exact agreement of our Lord's discourses in these gospels, the identity of mind and spirit in the two gospels, derived from independent sources, prove incontestably that there is neither legend nor wilful fabrication, but real and authentic history. If it be possible to suppose that theological opinions, prophetic expectations, and local circumstances,

might bring forth two legendary histories of an individual, agreeing in the great outlines, it is utterly impossible that they should produce a series of discourses and moral lessons in two independent recensions so exactly identical, notwithstanding all differences, as those found in the gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke. They have both been derived from one common and real original, and like two several portraits of one individual, the differences prove that each is an independent picture, the agreement shows that there was an original which was the common archetype. The identity of our Lord's character has justly been considered as in itself furnishing a strong evidence of the historic value of the gospel narratives, and has been admitted to be one of the greatest difficulties in the way of scepticism. Each of the evangelists has something peculiar to himself, either in the way of miracles, discourses, parables, difference of context, occasion, circumstances relating to a certain event or discourse, and yet in each the distinguishing features of our Lord's character and doctrine may be easily recognised, especially that originality which distinguishes him from all the Jewish rabbies of his own time, as well as the apostles and teachers of the primitive Christian Church. 'When we consider the nature and the value of Christ's doctrine,' says a neologian writer,\* 'a doctrine in every respect so far beyond the age in which it was

\* Münscher, I. 103.



taught, and the habits of thought of the people amongst whom it arose, it is impossible for the student of history not to desire to know the causes and the means by help of which Jesus so far outstepped his times, and to be acquainted with the circumstances which contributed to the formation of a religious teacher so exalted. Every attempt, however, which has hitherto been made to gratify this wish, by endeavouring to deduce it from the doctrines of the Essenes, or to represent it as a compound of Pharisaism and Sadduceism, rests not only upon arbitrary assumptions, but is negatived by arguments not few in number. There rests, therefore, to this day, upon the origin of Christianity, a sacred obscurity, which has often been urged by its friends as a proof of the divine authority of its founder.' Such is the confession of a neologian. He acknowledges that there is an inexplicable originality about the doctrine of Christ, that there was nothing in the teachers of the times at all like it. Pharisee and Sadducee had alike the stamp of national particularism. Christ, without denying his nationality, inculcated a religion universal in its obligation, and suited to the necessities of all mankind; and this great feature is the same in all the evangelists. Differences there are sufficient to prove independent witnesses; but a general agreement in the outlines of the narrative, an originality and identity in the character of Christ, his discourses and his religion, which stamp their

relation with authenticity, and prove that in the gospels we read not a gradually developed realization of an ideal existing in the minds of a nation or a religious community, but the narration of a real and substantive history. The differences, therefore, which exist between the relations of one evangelist and another, are so far from proving them to be unhistoric and legendary, that, by showing the independence of the sources from which each evangelist drew, they become one of the strongest confirmations of the historic value of the gospels.

The true answer, however, to the whole system which we are considering is, that the gospels were written too early to be a mere collection of gradually developed legends. It was not possible between the time of Christ's passion and the publication of the first three gospels, that the accounts given by the apostles to the churches should have been forgotten, and new and fabulous accounts received instead. This our objector felt to be a difficulty, and therefore endeavours to prove that there is no certain citation of these gospels by name, nor anything to identify them until after the middle of the second century, when he says, it appears from the writings of Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian, that they were known and acknowledged by the orthodox church as the canonic gospels. It is remarkable that this author, who professes to reject the gospel history because of its inability to stand the test of modern criticism, when he desires

to prove the lateness of its publication, avoids criticism altogether, and merely endeavours to shake the historic testimonies. His own admissions are, however, sufficient to show the falsehood of his hypothesis. He admits, what it is impossible to deny, that the four gospels, to the exclusion of others, were received as canonic in the time of Irenæus, at a period certainly not later than the year 170. What, then, was the cause of the reception? Why was it that the most learned and most distinguished leaders of the Christian church received these four, and ascribed them to the authors whose names they bear, whilst they rejected others; for that there were others he also admits, as that Papias, the hearer of St. John, distinctly refers to a gospel of St. Matthew, and that certain gospels bearing a resemblance to those which we possess, were cited by Celsus, and known to Justin Martyr? What was it, then, that recommended these gospels to the Church to the exclusion of others? Was it their novelty? Did Tertullian and Irenæus, those reverers of antiquity, reject the gospels which they had received from their predecessors because they were old, and adopt other gospels, come no one knows from whence, because they were new? Did Irenæus, in particular, reject the gospels received from Polycarp, his master, for the sake of four new gospels which he had never heard of before? This is, to use the author's own words, contrary to all the laws of possibility; and if incredible in the case

of this one individual, absolutely impossible in that of the whole Christian Church. The testimony of Irenæus alone is sufficient to establish the antiquity of the four gospels. Far from speaking of them as a new discovery—and he was about seventy years old when he wrote—his intimate acquaintance with, and numerous citations from, all the four, as well as the certainty with which he speaks of their authors, prove that they were the gospels which he had known and received in his youth; and this brings us to the time of Polycarp, and Polycarp again to that of St. John. The historic testimonies, therefore, admitted even by this critic, are amply sufficient to prove the ancient reception of the four gospels, and thus to invalidate his main argument for the possibility of the development of legendary compilations.

Besides, the omission of all attempt to apply his principles of criticism to prove the novelty of the gospels, is a tacit confession that in the gospels themselves the sharp eye of scepticism could perceive nothing that betokened the product of a later age than that of the apostles. An examination will show that there is much to prove that they could not possibly be written in an age later than the apostolic, else they would not have been received by the Gentile churches. A mere cursory inspection is sufficient to show that the materials of which the gospels are composed are the works of Jewish Christians, and that Palestine is their native land.

But early in the second century the separation between Christians of the circumcision and those of the uncircumcision had become so wide as to make the reception of new gospels composed by the former impossible. The gospels must therefore have been received, and if received, beyond all doubt written before this first great schism had been completed. An extension of this argument will prove that the materials of the gospels were composed before the writing of St. Paul's epistle to the Galatians. I say the materials, because it is evident that St. John's gospel was written long after, and St. Luke tells us that he was only an arranger of materials collected from those who were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word. When St. Paul wrote to the Galatians, the great controversy between the Judaizers and the Gentile churches had already commenced, and fearfully agitated the Christian community, and yet the gospels, evidently the work of Christians of the circumcision, contain no allusion to the controversy, and the evangelists seem not in any wise to have been influenced by controversial feelings in their selection of the materials. St. Matthew, for instance, appears, on the one hand, to take the side of the Judaizers by the passage, 'Think not I am come to destroy the law and the prophets,' and by comparing the Jews to children and the Gentiles to dogs—and on the other, to favour the Gentiles by the doctrine, that 'Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man, but that which cometh out of the

mouth;’ and by the declaration, that ‘The kingdom of God should be taken from the Jews and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.’ The first three evangelists all recount the command to preach the gospel amongst the Gentiles without any allusion to the controverted point about the continuance of circumcision and the Mosaic law. Indeed it is especially to be noted that the technical use of the terms circumcision and uncircumcision is unknown to the gospels. The term ‘uncircumcision’ does not occur to all; and circumcision is alluded to only in relating the circumcision of John the Baptist and our Lord, and in one passage of St. John’s gospel. And it is equally remarkable that not one of the gospels contains an allusion to idols nor idolaters, nor any precept concerning intercourse with them, a plain proof that the materials were composed before such a state of the Church as is described in the Acts and the epistles of St. Paul made any such precepts necessary. These and many similar observations, for which there is not time at present, show, that if, as infidels suppose, the gospels are the work of uninspired men, the original materials were composed before the controversy with the Judaizers had commenced, that is, before St. Paul’s epistle to the Galatians was written.

A comparison with the epistles furnishes many other similar arguments in favour of the early origin of the gospels. As they contain no allusion to the earliest controversy that disturbed the Christian

Church, so they are free from all notice of the existence of a Church separate from the commonwealth of Israel, of Church rulers peculiar to Christians, or of the names and relations of believers as members of a separate community. In the Acts of the Apostles, we meet at once a church even in Jerusalem, which does not mean the Jewish community. In ii. 47, it is said, 'The Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved.' And throughout Judea and Samaria and the countries visited by the apostles, Churches with bishops, presbyters, and deacons. The epistles of St. Paul are full of such allusions. The idea of the Church as distinct from the national Jewish community is fully developed, and rules given for its rulers and their ordination as well as for the conduct of the ruled. The members of the Churches are known as saints and brethren, and the duty of brotherly love arising out of that relation is frequently and earnestly inculcated. In the gospels there is nothing of the kind—in only two passages does the word 'Church' occur. The only elders spoken of are the elders of the Jews, and deacon occurs in its common signification. The evangelists never speak of believers in Christ as 'saints.' In the conclusion of St. John's gospel alone are they designated as 'the brethren.\*' The gospels throughout treat the believers in Christ as Jews—a part of the Jewish community—and ignore altogether any peculiar religious bond of fellowship

\* *φιλadelphία* not in gospels.

which distinguished them from their fellow-countrymen. Is this possible if the materials were gradually collected, and some of them added nearly a century after the state of the Church described by St. Paul had existed? Most certainly not. It was possible for those who had been eye-witnesses and cotemporaries, even though writing long after the events, still to preserve the circumstances of the origin of Christianity, and to retain the habits of thought of their youth. But for those who became Christians after the full development both of the idea and the existence of the Divine Church as distinct from the Jews altogether impossible. No fraud could think of preserving this feature of consistency—no persons of a later generation could by any possibility divest themselves of the influence of the prevailing state of things. This difference, therefore, between the gospels and the epistles is a strong proof that the materials of the former were written before the latter.

Another argument of the same kind is furnished by the sparing use which the evangelists make of the word apostle and the word which they use instead. In the epistles of St. Paul, as well as in the Acts of the Apostles, the word apostle occurs in a definite technical use, to express the highest dignity in the Church, and it is confined to certain persons who had received their commission direct from Christ himself. Such was the natural course of things. The Lord had himself instituted the office, and given the name apostle, but as the word



'apostle,' messenger, or שליח, was one common amongst the Jews, and as during the lifetime of Christ they appeared only as his immediate followers, the word could not obtain its technical value, nor would the twelve be known as 'the apostles.' To the Jews, and even to the believers in Christ at first, Christ appeared as a rabbi, and the twelve as his disciples. Eye-witnesses and cotemporaries, therefore, even if writing afterwards, would not be likely to use the later title, but that which had been common amongst their cotemporaries, and this certainly undesigned propriety we perceive in the gospels. By the evangelists the twelve are, with the exception of St. Luke, called disciples, a word occurring on every page of the gospels. The word apostle, on the other hand, occurs only once in the gospel of St. Matthew, once in that of St. Mark, once in that of St. John, six times in that of St. Luke, who, as not having been an eye-witness, was more likely to use it. The prevailing word is disciple, whereas in the epistles the word 'disciple' does not occur once, neither of the chief rulers of the Church, nor generally of believers in Christ. When St. Paul wrote, Christ no longer appeared as a rabbi, nor believers as a rabbi's disciples, and therefore in the epistles the word is not once found. Must we not conclude, then, that the authors of the gospel materials were acquainted with a state of Christianity much younger than that known to St. Paul, yea, must we not infer that they were eye-witnesses or cotemporaries?

The field opened by a comparison of the gospels and epistles is too wide to be adequately cultivated in a lecture of this kind, and too minute a detail of particulars would perhaps be wearisome in this place, but there is one more chronological propriety which is of importance, and to which I would, in conclusion, direct your attention, that is, the manner in which our Lord Jesus Christ is spoken of in the gospels and in the epistles. Of the cotemporaries and companions of our Lord we should expect that they would speak of him as he was spoken of by his countrymen of his own age and time, that is, as Jesus of Nazareth, as a rabbi or teacher. Of subsequent writers it is natural to suppose that they would write of him according to the views and doctrines of the then existing Christian community, that is, as of the Lord, the Christ, the Son of God, the Saviour of the world. If therefore the evangelists were cotemporaries we should expect the former simple style of designation; if the epistles were subsequently written we should expect a more reverential mention of the Lord—and this expectation is fully realized by an examination of these two classes of sacred Scripture. In the gospel narrative, for instance, our Lord is commonly spoken of by his name Jesus without any addition either of Lord or of Christ—in the epistles almost never. The Apostle Paul usually speaks of him as the Lord Jesus, Jesus Christ, or our Lord Jesus Christ. In the gospels there is a variety in the use of expression ὁ Κύριος, the Lord. Thus, in the gospel of St. Matthew, it

is never used of Christ in the narrative part. In the gospel of Mark only twice, v. 19; xvi. 19, 20, whereas in the gospels of St. Luke and St. John, the evangelists, as might be expected, constantly speak of Christ as the Lord, and the same is observable in the epistles; and from the manner in which this formula is used of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, a strong argument may be deduced for his divinity. Only once in the gospels, and that the gospel according to St. Luke, one, therefore, not written by a cotemporary of our Lord, we find the words Lord and Jesus joined together, Luke xxiv. 3; where the evangelist speaks of the women at the sepulchre, he says, 'They entered in and found not the body of the Lord Jesus,' whereas in the epistles it is common. The expressions, 'the Lord Jesus Christ,' or 'our Lord Jesus Christ,' occur not in the gospels at all, whereas they are usual in all the epistles. St. Paul generally says 'our Lord Jesus Christ.' St. James calls himself 'a servant of God and the Lord Jesus Christ,' and elsewhere speaks of Christ as the Lord, as when he says, 'Be patient to the coming of the Lord.' St. Peter says, 'Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.' St. John also says, 'Grace be with you, mercy, and peace, from God the Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.' The reverential style occurs, therefore, just where we might expect to find it in those writings which were composed when the great doctrines of Christ's dignity and deity were fully established in the minds of the Church and of his

immediate disciples. The less reverential in those accounts of his life and ministry where the minds of eye-witnesses would be carried to the first impressions which they had received of Christ and of his character. These and such like chronological proprieties are sufficient to show that the gospel materials were either composed before the epistles were written, or had for their authors cotemporaries and companions of the Lord Jesus Christ, and satisfactorily demonstrate that they could not have been written when the cotemporaries of our Lord were all dead—when the first impressions of Christ's character and person were lost, and when Christians knew him only as represented in the doctrines of the apostles, that is, as their Lord and their God, their Saviour and their Judge. The external testimonies therefore admitted by the objector, and the internal evidence which, though otherwise forming the groundwork and substance of his whole book, he here prudently declines to examine, prove that the gospels were known to and received from the Apostolic Church—that the materials were composed before the writing of St. Paul's epistles—and that therefore the earliness of their origin makes it impossible that they can be anything else but faithful narrations of true and authentic history, and consequently, that when compared with the prophecies, they may be received as safe testimony to prove that the predictions, as having been accomplished, are true, and that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah.

## LECTURE III.

LUKE XXIV. 46.

*Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day.*

THE object of the present course of lectures has been to prove, by the fulfilment of certain prophecies, that their authors must have been divinely inspired, and that Jesus of Nazareth is the true Messiah. For this purpose the prophetic announcements were compared first with the existing state of things, and from the undeniable coincidence between prophecy and event, our faith both in the Old Testament and the New, was proved to be well-founded. The next step ought to have been to show the perfect agreement between the predictions and the narrative of the evangelists. We stopped, however, to consider some modern objections recently urged against the authenticity of the gospels; and to these objections replied that, even if well founded, they do not in the least degree weaken the Christian faith, because the events recorded by St. Paul in his epistles, are themselves sufficient to establish the authenticity of the gospel history, and the truth of prophecy; and, secondly,

that a comparison of the gospels with the epistles would prove that the materials of which the gospels are composed, must have been written by eye-witnesses, and before the epistles, and consequently that they must be both genuine and authentic.

If, therefore, we had no other proof, this would be sufficient to warrant our faith in Jesus of Nazareth. He who wrought such miracles, and performed such mighty deeds, gave the best possible proof of the justice of his claims. The authenticity of the gospel history, however, opens to us another and confirmatory line of argument. We can compare the circumstances of the life of Christ with the prophecies, and if they agree, the predictions themselves must be real, and he who fulfilled them the Messiah. To develop this argument is our purpose this day, so far as can be done without entering into critical disquisitions, unsuited for this place. In order to prove the truth of a prophecy by its fulfilment, it is necessary, in the first place, to show that the coincidence between the events and the predictions is real. Some of the more modern Jews deny that the hope of a Messiah is to be found in the Hebrew Scriptures, and cite as an authority a Talmudic passage, which says, 'Israel has no Messiah to expect, for they enjoyed him in the days of Hezekiah.' Modern gentile infidelity also asserts that the Old Testament contains only vague anticipations and general hopes of a redemption, but no definite predictions of a personal Mes-

siah; and, consequently, that the alleged agreement of the gospel history with prophecy is imaginary. Now it is true that some of the prophecies, if taken by themselves, are of very general import, and indefinite in their announcements. Thus, from the promise that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head, or that in Abraham's seed all the families of the earth should be blessed, it would be difficult to determine whether one individual or the whole human race is intended. But there are other and numerous passages, where a personal Messiah is unequivocally announced, and which no sophistry can explain away. Thus it is foretold by prophets living at different periods of time, that the expected Redeemer was to be a son of David. The promise to the son of Jesse himself, was not merely the general declaration, (Ps. lxxxix. 36,) 'His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me,' but a particular announcement concerning one of his posterity, 'in whose days the righteous were to flourish, and peace so long as the moon endureth, whose dominion was to extend from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth;' 'one who was to be fairer than the children of men, and anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows.' The promise of the eternal duration of peace and universal empire, and the express distinction asserted between this and all other kings, show that the author of these prophecies was not indulging merely in a general hope of redemption,

but describing the glory of one individual of David's posterity. The solemn address to him, 'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever; the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre,' makes the description not only definite, but incommunicable. Three hundred years later, Isaiah, the son of Amos, describes a king with attributes so similar, that it is impossible not to perceive the identity. In the eleventh chapter he says, 'There shall 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.' Here the family is the same; and the whole chapter shows that one particular individual is intended. A comparison with the ninth chapter proves that Isaiah's idea of a Deliverer is in all respects identical with that which we have found in the Psalms. Here the prophet says, '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. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and justice from henceforth even for ever.' Here we have all the same features again. First, the family—he is a son of David; secondly, the extent of his kingdom—no end to its increase; thirdly, its duration 'for ever;' fourthly, his tranquillity—the Prince of



Peace; lastly, the dignity of his person—the mighty God and the everlasting Father. Ignorance only, or wilful blindness, can assert that this description is vague, or be insensible to its perfect agreement with the character portrayed by the Psalmist. The hope expressed by the prophet Micah, Isaiah's cotemporary, is precisely similar, and equally definite, when he says to Bethlehem Ephratah, '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. . . . And he shall stand and feed in the strength of the Lord, in the majesty of the name of the Lord his God; . . . for now shall he be great unto the ends of the earth.' Here the place of origin in time, the existence in eternity, the possession of the divine name, and universal empire, again prove that the prophet had in view one particular individual. Nearly two centuries later, the same hope of a Redeemer to arise from the family of David, is expressed by Jeremiah, xxiii. 5, '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 in 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.' And in ch. xxxiii., where he repeats this prediction, he implies that this righteous branch is to abide for ever, by adding, 'For thus saith the Lord; David

shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel.' The family, the office of universal king, the dignity of his person, as manifested in the name, all identify him with the person announced by Micah, Isaiah, and David.

The prophet Ezekiel entertained the same hope, xxxiv. 23; after denouncing woes upon the shepherds of Israel, he says, 'I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David.' And 'I will raise up for them the plant of renown'—and, again, xxxvii. 25, 'My servant David shall be their prince for ever.' Here the characteristics of family, title, and the everlasting duration of his expected government, again identify him with the Deliverer described by previous prophets. Nearly 500 years after David, the prophet Zechariah still cherishes the same hope when speaking of redemption; he says, xii. 8, 'The house of David shall be as God, as the angel of the Lord before them.' Words which again imply that the Deliverer at the head of the Jewish people is to be of the family of David, and a person of divine dignity. It is evident, therefore, that David, Micah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Zechariah, not now to mention others, all looked for salvation in one particular family, and so identify the Redeemer by incommunicable attributes, as to prove, beyond all controversy, that their hope of redemption was not a mere vague and undefined imagination, natural to all in distress, but an idea well defined and fully

developed as to the family, character, and dignity of him by whom it was to be effected. The identity is, however, marked still more strongly by an apparent contradiction running through all the prophecies. On the one hand (as in the prophecies just quoted) they ascribe to him heavenly dignity, and universal and eternal empire;—yet, on the other, they represent him as reduced to the lowest state of humiliation, and exposed to persecution which terminates in death. In the twenty-second Psalm, David describes him, as saying, in the language of most bitter complaint, ‘I am a worm, and no man; a reproach of men, and despised of the people. My strength is dried up like a potsherd, and my tongue cleaveth to my jaws; and thou hast brought me into the dust of death.’ In the fortieth Psalm, he says, ‘I am poor and needy, yet the Lord thinketh upon me.’ In the forty-first, he says, ‘Mine enemies speak evil of me, when shall he die and his name perish—all that hate me whisper together against me: against me do they devise my hurt.’ In the 69th Psalm, his prayer is, ‘Deliver me out of the mire, and let me not sink: let me be delivered from them that hate me, and out of the deep waters . . . let not the pit shut her mouth upon me.’ Even in the 110th Psalm, in which his glory is described, he is represented as having enemies, and being in such a state of humiliation as to drink of the brook in his way; and, in the 118th, it is said, ‘The stone which the builders rejected is

become the head of the corner.' Similar is the representation of Isaiah. In the forty-ninth chapter of his prophecies, the Messiah is represented as he 'whom man despiseth, whom the nation abhorreth.' In that well-known chapter, fifty-third, 'as despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, as cut off out of the land of the living, bruised, put to grief, stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.' Daniel says, 'Messiah shall be cut off.' Zechariah describes the King of Zion as 'poor, and riding upon an ass'—sold for thirty pieces of silver—as one pierced with some deadly weapon—smitten with the sword of justice—so that in these and similar passages we have the identity of the character so strongly preserved as to prove the identity of the prophetic expectation. Their descriptions are not the offspring of the individual imagination of those who hoped for salvation, and therefore varied and discordant and undefined according to the peculiar constitution of each writer, but all portraits of one archetype—expressions of the same clear and definite idea. If, therefore, it can be shown that the history of Jesus agrees with the announcements of the prophets, the agreement cannot fairly be regarded as unreal or fanciful, or a mere accommodation of seemingly-applicable words, but a real and substantial accomplishment of distinct and determinate predictions. The whole tenor of prophecy looked forward to a son of David—Jesus of Nazareth was descended from that

family, both legally and really. Brought up by Joseph, the husband of his mother, the Jewish law recognised him as Joseph's son, and therefore of the family of David, inasmuch as Joseph was of that family as St. Matthew tells us in his genealogy—and, as being the son of Mary, whose genealogy is given by St. Luke, he was really descended from the son of Jesse. This modern Jews frequently deny, urging that genealogies must be reckoned after the father and not after the mother; and citing, as their authority, God's command to Moses, Numb. iii., 'Take ye the sum of all the congregation of the children of Israel after their families, by the house of their fathers.' From which they conclude, that even if Mary had been of the house of David, our Lord, as not having a human father, could not be reckoned as one of David's posterity. The answer, however, to this objection is easy and obvious. It may be said: First, that the verse adduced from the book of Numbers is nothing to the purpose. God is not speaking of genealogies generally, nor of the fathers of individuals, but of numbering the children of Israel according to the tribes descended from the twelve patriarchs. Secondly, that, according even to Rabbinic law, children born of a Jewish mother and a Gentile father, (and there must have been many such when Moses numbered the people,) are to be accounted not as Gentiles but as Jews, and must be circumcised, of which an instance occurs in the New Testament in

the case of Timothy, a plain proof that children are not always or necessarily reckoned after the father; —and, lastly, in the genealogies preserved in the First Book of Chronicles, even in those belonging to the royal tribe of Judah, we find several persons included, whose only claim to be children of Judah rests upon the fact that their mothers belonged to that tribe. Thus, in ii. 17, it is said, ‘And Abigail bare Amasa, and the father of Amasa was Jether the Ishmaelite;’ and, in the thirty-fourth verse, we read, ‘Now Sheshan had no sons but daughters: and Sheshan had a servant, an Egyptian, whose name was Jarha, and Sheshan gave his daughter to Jarha, his servant, to wife, and she bare him Attai,’ and then follow all the children of Attai, as descendants of Judah. The assertion, therefore, that to be the son of David it is necessary to have a father of the house of David, is altogether false. Rabbinic law and the word of God here both agree in showing that there are cases where children are reckoned after their mother. Our Lord’s descent from Mary, and education by Joseph, both make him the son of David, and as such he was acknowledged by the multitude, who, in their distress, continually addressed him in the words, ‘Thou son of David have mercy on us.’ And the correctness of the title does not appear ever to have been questioned, either by the Priests and Pharisees of the time, or by the compilers of the Talmud. Not knowing that he had been born at Bethlehem as the prophet

Micah predicted, they reproached him with his Galilean origin, but they never denied, what would have been much more to their purpose, that he was the son of David. Indeed, his descent from the family of David appears to have been universally known and acknowledged, for when Domitian, afraid of a great king to arise from that family, sought for his descendants to destroy them, the relations of our Lord were the persons brought before him. His family, therefore, answered the predictions of the prophets.

His humiliation, persecution, and violent death, are equally agreeable to their announcements. The gospel-history informs us of his poverty—of the contempt in which he was held by the great and the learned of his nation—and of his ignominious death. The Talmud confirms the account, and the Jews to this day make this fact one of their most popular objections against Christ's Messiahship. In these particulars, therefore, there is a real conformity between the prophecies concerning the Messiah and the history of Jesus.

It may, however, be said, that though the agreement is real, it is, nevertheless, only accidental: that the honour in which David's memory was held naturally led the prophets to expect a Messiah from that family: that the misfortunes of the nation, and the sufferings of the pious amongst them may have led them to think that Messiah must be a sufferer also: and that of the descendants of David there

may have been many more who lived in suffering and died by violence. But the reply is easy. National calamity is far from preparing men for the idea of a suffering Redeemer. The calamities of the Jewish people have been far greater since the last dispersion than ever they had been before, and yet the greater and the more enduring their suffering, the stronger their disinclination to think of Messiah as a sufferer. The ancient Jews looked to him as one doomed to sorrow because of the sins of the nation; but the Jews for the last 800 years have almost universally denied the possibility of his suffering and death, and expect only a mighty King and a triumphant conqueror. The supposition that the pressure of affliction makes men look first for spiritual deliverance, is one altogether opposed to the usual workings of the human heart. Deliverance from their worldly sorrows is that which fills the mind of most sufferers, as general experience and the history of the Jews both testify. Besides, if we admit that national calamity led the prophets, in portraying the character of the Messiah, to make his exaltation, glory, and triumph consequent upon humiliation and suffering, it is utterly improbable that they should have imagined that this humiliation was to be carried even to death, and that his glory was to follow his resurrection. For this there was no precedent in the national history, and nothing inviting to the human imagination. The sufferer desires help— instant, adequate, and complete deliverance. His



mind hurries forward to the moment of relief, joy, and triumph, and does not affect the long process of a life of suffering and a death of ignominy as the means; but the number and minuteness of the circumstances predicted and fulfilled by the history of our Lord, make an accidental agreement between the prophecy and the event altogether impossible. Micah declared that he should be born in Bethlehem. To Bethlehem the mother of Jesus was called most unexpectedly, and there the child was born. The prophets Haggai and Malachi declared that he should appear in the second temple. In that house Jesus asserted his claims, and vindicated his authority by driving forth those who profaned it. Isaiah promised that upon the inhabitants of Galilee the light of the Messiah should arise. Jesus, though born in Bethlehem, was brought up in Galilee, and there especially he made known his doctrines and wrought many of his miracles. But it is in reference to the death of the Messiah that the prophets are particularly circumstantial. David announced that he should be betrayed by one of his familiar friends: Christ was thus betrayed. Zechariah that the traitor should sell him for thirty pieces of silver, and that the money should be cast to the potter: our Lord was thus sold, and the money thus applied. Isaiah introduces him with the words, 'I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair: I hid not my face from shame and spitting.' The evangelist tells us how Pilate

scourged him, and how the Jews did spit in his face, and buffeted him, and smote him with the palms of their hands. David announced that 'his hands and feet should be pierced.' The un-Jewish death inflicted by the Romans fulfilled the prophecy. Zechariah declared that they should look upon him whom they had pierced: a heathen soldier violated his sacred side with a spear. Isaiah said that Messiah should be numbered with transgressors: Jesus was crucified between two thieves. He said, again, that his grave should be appointed with the wicked, but with the rich should be his tomb: the Jewish council fulfilled the first, Joseph of Arimathea the second part of the prediction. David said—'All they that see me laugh me to scorn: they shoot out the lip, they shake the head, saying, He trusted in the Lord that he would deliver him, let him deliver him, seeing he delighted in him.' The gospel relates that such was the conduct of the Jews to Jesus as he hung upon the cross. The Psalmist represents Messiah as complaining, 'Reproach hath broken my heart . . . I looked for some to take pity, but there was none: and for comforters, but I found none. They gave me also gall for my meat: and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink.' The evangelists tell us that when Jesus was come to Golgotha, they gave him vinegar to drink, mingled with gall. David declared that Messiah's garments should be parted, and lots cast upon his vesture. St. John tells us that the soldiers, when

they had crucified Jesus, took his garments, and made four parts, to every soldier a part; but that upon his coat, because they would not rend it, they said, 'Let us cast lots for it, whose it shall be.' To suppose that accident would have conjectured or fulfilled such a number of circumstances is perfectly impossible. If any one of the prophets had conceived the whole idea of Messiah's character, and all the circumstances of his birth, passion, and death, although improbable, it might perhaps have been possible to sketch an outline so like real life in its ordinary phases, as to find a fulfilment in some individual of the people amongst whom he lived. Sagacity, combined with study of the national character and circumstances, might enable an acute observer to conjecture the rise of some illustrious individual, and his influence upon the world. But no skill in poetic portraiture, no acuteness of observation, or power of human forecast, can enter into the details of family, birthplace, place of education, and all the unusual circumstances of a strange and violent death and burial, such as we see in the history of Jesus, nor even offer a conjecture concerning them. But that many individuals, living at different periods of time, all professing to be prophets, should offer conjectures as to the life of one and the same individual who was to appear hundreds of years after their decease, and should succeed by a number of independent conjectures in forming a prophetic portrait of that individual's

history—each giving some circumstance that the other omits, is totally beyond the limits of possibility. The ordinary course of events might fulfil some of the conditions of the prophecy, but a complete agreement in so many and unlooked-for particulars proves design as certainly as a perfect similitude between a picture and a human being would prove that the one was the original of the other. And here it is particularly to be remarked that the fulfilment is not mystical. It is not by a doubtful interpretation of dark enigmas, or a skilful adaptation of symbolic imagery, that the likeness is obtained. The coincidence between the prophecies of a Messiah and the history of Jesus of Nazareth is obvious to the view of the most careless, and rests altogether upon the plain grammatical sense of the prophecies, so that in some cases it can be evaded only by a departure from the simple meaning, and a mystification of the prophetic declarations. Thus Christians take the twenty-second Psalm in its plain literal sense, and thus without any effort or violence the most perfect resemblance is obtained—even to the parting of the garments, and the casting lots for the vesture. The Jewish rabbi and the modern infidel are both compelled to turn the whole Psalm into an allegory, representing the calamities of the Jewish people in captivity, and to explain away that precise and definite feature concerning the parting of the garments as meaning merely the

spoliation of their property.\* Similar is the case with the thirty-third chapter of Isaiah. The Christian receives it as it stands—the Jew allegorizes to get away from the obvious agreement with Christian doctrine. It is not, therefore, an agreement forced out of the words, but one that lies on the very surface as perceptible to the sober as the imaginative, and as easily comprehended by the simple as the sagacious; in fact, one that requires the exercise of ingenuity not to find it out, but to hide it from men's view.

It may, however, be said that the predictions wrought their own accomplishment, or were such as a pretender to the Messianic character could fulfil. Thus it is possible that an impostor, acquainted with the prophetic Scriptures, might commence his attempt in Galilee, or ride into Jerusalem upon an ass, but some of the most striking prophecies are such as an enthusiast could not—an impostor would not accomplish. In the first place, the prophetic promise that Messiah was to arise from the family of David, if not at the same time the promise of the Almighty, could never effect the continuance of that family until the coming of him who laid claim to Messiah's office. Very soon after the appearance of our Lord, that family became extinct, and is now utterly unknown. Indeed, the preservation of the Jewish people, and the continued

\* See Kimchi, in loc.

existence of Bethlehem and Jerusalem, when in the meanwhile other and mightier nations and cities had been completely annihilated, can be ascribed only to an act of Providence. The prophet Isaiah announced Messiah's miraculous conception and birth, but omnipotence alone could effect its accomplishment. David predicted that Messiah's soul should not be left in hell, and that his flesh should not see corruption; and Isaiah, that though he should be cut off out of the land of the living, yet that he should live long, and see his seed, and that the pleasure of the Lord should prosper in his hand; but what human power could bring about the accomplishment by raising Jesus from the dead? These are predictions which, it is evident, could not effect their own fulfilment, and could not be realized by an effort either of fraud or enthusiasm, and yet without the accomplishment of which no person can pretend to be the Messiah of the Hebrew prophecies. Unthinking multitudes, such as followed Bar Chochba and others of the Jewish pretenders to Messiahship, might require nothing more than a victorious leader, who could gratify their desire for revenge, or their appetite for plunder. But no one who quietly reflects upon the unequivocal declarations of the prophets, can be satisfied with any claims to Messiahship which do not rest upon the death and resurrection of him who makes them. The expressions are far too strong and too numerous to admit of any other interpretation. It is

not merely that one prophet says, 'They shall look upon me whom they have pierced,' from which even the rabbinic opposers of Christianity infer the death of the person spoken of—nor that God calls upon his sword to smite the shepherd of Israel—nor that David and Isaiah both speak of him as a voluntary offering for sin, which necessarily implies his death. It is distinctly stated that he should be cut off out of the land of the living—that he should pour out his soul unto death—that he should be led as a lamb to the slaughter—yea, Daniel, when he says, Messiah shall be cut off, uses the very strongest word that the Hebrew language affords to express extermination; and if there were no prophecy of his return to life, it must be necessarily inferred that such was the prophetic expectation, if ever their announcements of glory and blessedness were to be realized. Here, then, is a feature of prophecy which no enthusiast could fulfil, and no impostor would attempt. To expect glory from God alone, and for the joy set before him to endure the cross and despise the shame—to live a patient life of poverty and suffering, looking forward to a violent death at its termination, is what no impostor would affect, and none of the false Messiahs ever pretended to. Their aim was worldly grandeur and wealth—their means for attaining it, force of arms. It is true that a violent death proved the fallacy of their pretensions, but that death was not voluntary, and from its bands there has been no

release. Jesus of Nazareth is the only claimant of such high dignity who sought it in the way of voluntary suffering and death, and whose claims have been satisfied by his resurrection from the dead. He had the will to die and the power to return to life, and as such self-denying love is foreign to the heart of a deceiver, and such power beyond the range of all human ability, the fulfilment of these essential conditions of Messiahship is to be accounted for only by an interposition of omnipotence.

The facts of the case, then, stand thus. It is certain that a number of persons professing to be prophets, the very latest of whom, as is admitted by all the most learned opposers of Christianity, lived 500 years before the alleged fulfilment, announced the future arrival of a great deliverer—described the manner, place, and time of his birth, the family from which he should descend, the nature of his life, the circumstances of his death, resurrection, and ascension into heaven, and the nature of the work which he should accomplish. Suddenly, the pretension to the gift of prophecy ceased. Century after century rolled away, and their predictions seemed to be the mere effusions of poetic patriotism. The true meaning of the prophetic records was forgotten by the multitude, and an erroneous idea of the Redeemer and his work became universal, when suddenly, an illiterate man, in the most despised part of the country, laid claim to the character of



the deliverer, opposed the prevailing opinions, disappointed the general expectations, and was therefore by the Jews condemned as an impostor; and yet subsequent examination proves, that in the circumstances of his history the announcements of the prophets are fulfilled. The prophecies are too minute and circumstantial to be ascribed to sagacity: the accomplishment too accurate to be the result of chance—too simple to be rejected as the effort of ingenuity—too difficult to be resolved into the results of the human will. There is but one other solution possible. The prophecies must be the dictates of the Divine prescience, and the fulfilment the effort of the Almighty power. Jesus of Nazareth must therefore be the Messiah.

The Jews object, however, that many prophecies, and those such as especially concern themselves, have not been fulfilled by Jesus of Nazareth, and that, therefore, he cannot be the deliverer announced by the prophets. To this many Christian writers have replied, that such declarations are figurative, and that under earthly emblems heavenly blessings are intended—that the Jews are never to be restored to their land, nor Messiah to have a kingdom over Israel—that the only blessings which they have to expect are adoption into the Christian family here, and admission into the heavenly Canaan hereafter. But to this the Jew objects, that a mode of interpretation which is based upon two contradictory principles is necessarily false. You prove that

Jesus is the Messiah, he says, by the grammatical principle—you evade difficulties by the adoption of the figurative. Choose one of the two. Carry through the figurative exposition, and then there is no suffering Messiah—carry through the literal, and a large portion of the prophecies are not yet fulfilled. The Jew's demand is reasonable, and his objection to this expository inconsistency valid. If the promises of national glory and prosperity to Israel stood detached, and were entirely separated from those that speak of Messiah's suffering humiliation, such a mode of interpretation might perhaps be defended with an air of plausibility, but they are frequently so blended as to make separation impossible. Thus, the beginning of the 49th chapter of Isaiah is cited by Christians to prove that Messiah's labours were to be apparently fruitless amongst the Jews, and that he was to be a blessing to the Gentiles, and the cogency of the Christian proof depends upon taking the words in their plain sense. Messiah is represented as complaining, 'I have laboured in vain, I have spent my strength for nought, and in vain: yet surely my judgment is with the Lord. And now, saith the Lord that formed me from the womb to be his servant, to bring Jacob again to him, and that to him Israel may be gathered, I shall 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 shouldst 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.' Here it is impossible to separate one part from the other. If the predictions of Messiah's apparent want of success, and his sending light to the Gentiles is to be taken literally, so must also the 'raising up of the tribes of Jacob, and the restoration of the preserved of Israel.' To receive the one and deny the other is to place an insurmountable stumbling-block before every Jew of common sense, and to hold up prophecy to the scorn of the infidel. A similar instance is found in that remarkable passage of Zechariah, 'I will pour out upon the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem the spirit of grace and supplication, and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced.' In the preceding verses it is said, 'Jerusalem shall be inhabited again in her own place: and it shall come to pass in that day, that I will seek to destroy all the nations that come against Jerusalem.' If in this verse we interpret the pouring out of the spirit, and the piercing, and Jerusalem, literally, we cannot in reason deny that in the preceding verse Jerusalem also means the metropolis of Judea, nor the immediate consequence, that the Jews are to be restored to their land, and enjoy great national glory. The answer, therefore, to the Jew's objection, which denies these events and mystifies the prophecies, cannot be admitted without entirely renouncing the testimony from prophecy. The basis of this argu-

ment is the simplicity of our interpretation, and its entire freedom from violence, perversion, or ingenious mystification. The moment that recourse is had to double-dealing, departure from the grammatical sense, and allegory, the whole force of the proof is at an end, and the cause is lost, for in the eyes of all honest men artifice in interpretation plainly betokens that the obvious sense of scripture is against us.

This mode of reply is, however, as unnecessary as it is injurious. When the Jew says that many prophecies are still unfulfilled, we grant it; but when he infers, therefore Jesus cannot be the Messiah, we deny his conclusion. First, because if Jesus be not the Messiah, then, as none of his contemporaries can pretend to that character, the time is past, and the prophecies are proved to be false. Jacob on his death-bed declared that until his advent neither sceptre nor lawgiver should depart from Judah. The Talmud itself tells us that they were lost before the destruction of the second temple. Malachi and Haggai announced his appearance in that house. If, therefore, Messiah did not then appear, Jacob, and Malachi, and Haggai are false prophets. If not, then Messiah, whether Jesus be the Messiah or not, must have appeared, and if so, then the non-fulfilment of some prophecies does not prove that that person is not the Messiah, and therefore cannot prove that Jesus is not the Messiah. We say, secondly, that the non-fulfilment of these

prophecies concerning the national glory is so far from forming an objection against the claims of our Lord, that it is one of the proofs of his Messiahship. When Moses promised the Messiah as the prophet like unto himself, he adds—‘ And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him.’ National unbelief required, therefore, national punishment. The infliction of it so soon after the crucifixion of our Lord, and the continuance of it ever since, though the Jews were then and still are free from idolatry, is one of the most signal proofs that he is the prophet promised by Moses. Besides, Daniel declared that after the coming of the Messiah the city and the temple should be destroyed. David teaches that Messiah is not to have his kingdom upon earth until he first ascend to the right hand of God, there to wait until his enemies be made his footstool; and Daniel fixes the time of his kingdom to his return in the clouds of heaven for the destruction of the fourth monarchy, all three predictions utterly incompatible with the Jewish assumption, that all the prophecies must be fulfilled at his first advent. The two states of glory and humiliation, as well as express prophetic declarations, necessarily imply that there were to be two advents—one to suffer, the other to reign, and that a long season was to intervene between the two. The non-fulfilment, therefore, of certain prophecies

is so far from being a difficulty, that it is a proof that Jesus was the Messiah, and another argument for the divine origin of the prophecies.

What has been said is sufficient to remove the force of the Jewish objection; what remains must be reserved for another occasion.

## LECTURE IV.

LUKE XXIV. 25, 26.

*Then said he unto them, O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?*

THE stone at which the Jewish nation in general, and our Lord's disciples in particular, stumbled in the time of the first advent, was the absence of all that glory, peace, and piety which, from Moses to Malachi, formed the theme of Jewish prophets. It was not that they entirely rejected the divine word, but only that they overlooked one portion of it. It was not that they erred in that which they received. Their sin was that they did not receive enough; and hence it is that our Lord does not blame them for their expectations of glory, but gently reproves them for not believing also the predictions of humiliation, 'O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to have entered into his glory?' The same stumbling-block still remains. Is it not our highest wisdom to follow our Lord's method for its removal.

In the lectures already delivered, two arguments have been offered in proof that the predictions of

the Old Testament are of divine origin, and that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah. The first taken from those prophecies, the fulfilment of which we see with our own eyes—the second, from those the accomplishment of which is recorded in the gospels. There remains one class more of prophecies to be considered, those, namely, which still continue unfulfilled, and upon this class the unbelieving Jew of every age and nation has based his most powerful objection to the truth of Christianity. The prophets, say they, announce the kingdom of Messiah as a kingdom of glory contemporaneous with the prosperity of Israel and the peace of the world. The kingdom of Jesus has, however, been a kingdom of humiliation and patience. The Jews are still a dispersed and suffering people—and to this hour the world groans under the sway of ignorance and violence. To this effect was the objection of the Jew of Ephesus, when, speaking of the seventh chapter of Daniel, he said, ‘These and similar passages of Scripture give us reason to expect some great and glorious person, who, like the Son of man, is to receive from the ancient of days an everlasting kingdom. But this Messiah of yours, who is called Christ, was so inglorious, mean, and despicable, as to fall under the greatest curse in the law of God: for he was crucified:’\* and again, ‘Because Elias is not yet come, we do not believe that he is the Christ.’† To the same effect, after a lapse of thirteen centuries, the

\* Brown, Dialog. with Tryph., I. 135.

† Ibid., p. 197.



rabbinic polemic\* of Poland collects a multitude of prophetic declarations, and specifics particularly ten promises of God relating to the Messiah's kingdom, but not yet accomplished in the history of Christianity. The first, announcing the restoration and union of the twelve tribes, as predicted by Ezekiel; the second, the invasion and fall of Gog and Magog on the mountains of Israel; the third, the cleaving asunder of the Mount of Olives, as announced by Zechariah; the fourth, the drying up of the Nile and the Euphrates, agreeably to the words of Isaiah; the fifth, the flowing of living waters from the sanctuary in Jerusalem, as foretold by Ezekiel and Zechariah; the sixth, the adhesion of ten Gentiles to one Jew; the seventh, the ascent of all nations to Jerusalem to keep the feast of tabernacles, both promises found in Zechariah; the eighth, the similar declaration of Isaiah that the Gentiles shall go up from new moon to new moon, and from sabbath to sabbath, to worship the Lord of Hosts; the ninth, the total cessation of idolatry; and the tenth, the universal dominion of the one true religion. These promises, he says, have never yet been fulfilled, and hence infers that Jesus is not the Messiah. In the same spirit, the more modern controversialist of Amsterdam† says, 'No Christian divine has yet proved that any of these startling promises were fulfilled by the advent of Jesus, that any one of these signs and prophecies has been accomplished,

\* R. Isaac, דרוש אמתה in Wagenseil's *Tula Ignea Satanæ*.

† Orobio's *Israel Vengé*, and Limborech's *Amica Collatio*.

or that the children of Israel are released from the painful slavery to which the just wrath of God condemned us for the expiation of our sins; and while this is the case, while we have no evidence to prove that this happy day, when we shall enjoy in peace all the blessings promised us on earth, combined with beatitude on high, has yet arrived, we must still trust in the mercy, and wait for the time, of the Lord.' Such objections founded upon the plain word of God, re-echoed for eighteen centuries, and still the shield and the sword of Jewish unbelief, demand attention, and whether we desire to maintain the integrity of our own faith, or to remove the stumbling-block that stands in the way of their salvation, require a full and sufficient answer. To point out that answer is the object of the present lecture. It is found in the words of the text. But the blindness or the perversity of man has overlooked the answer given by inspiration, and turned aside to his own inventions. To show the insufficiency of these inventions is our first duty.

Some Christian writers have thought it sufficient to meet several of these Jewish objections by proving that the predictions referred to promise that which is either useless or absolutely impossible. Thus a Dutch divine asserts that the cleaving asunder of the Mount of Olives, predicted by Zechariah, must be understood figuratively, because the actual separation into two parts would be useless, and maintains that the ascent of the Gentiles to Jerusalem

to keep the feast of tabernacles foretold by the same prophet, cannot possibly be understood literally, because, in his opinion, the length of the way for those who dwell at the antipodes, and the difficulty of procuring ships for such multitudes as the prophecy includes, prove the impossibility of its accomplishment. But this reply, far from being satisfactory, is as objectionable as it is prejudicial to the cause of Christianity. It is founded in unbelief, and leads directly to infidelity. To affirm that the promises contained in the prophets are useless or impossible, is to deny at once that they have God for their author. To assert that they must be understood in another sense than the words imply, is to charge the Divine Being with equivocation in the solemn language of promise, or inability to select language expressive of his will. It is to shake the unwavering stability of the divine affirmation, and, by changing immutable into mutable, to take away that strong consolation which God intended for the heirs of salvation. If the plea of impossibility is a sufficient reason for departing from the plain sense of prophecy, the infidel is justified in rejecting the predictions of a miraculous conception of the Saviour, and the future resurrection of the body. These events he pronounces to be impossible, and concludes that they are false; and the Christian who adopts the same principle of interpretation must, if he has sufficient understanding and honesty to trace consequences, arrive at the

same result. This mode of reply is, in fact, to concede the indefensibility of Christianity. If the Jew be told that his first step to the Christian religion must be the renunciation of his faith in God's power to fulfil his promises, or in his wisdom in making them, he has good reason for preferring his rabbinism to such Christianity. This reply, therefore, cannot possibly be received as a solution of the difficulty. Another method of meeting this Jewish objection is to deny that the Scriptures referred to by the Jews contain any prediction of the future, and therefore to interpret them of the return from the Babylonish captivity. But to this the Jew justly objects, that the language of the prophets announces a degree of glory, of happiness, and of piety, and an entireness of national restoration to which the return from Babylon does not present the feeblest outline of resemblance. Isaiah says, 'I will restore thy judges as at the first, and thy counsellors as at the beginning: afterward thou shalt be called the city of righteousness, the faithful city.'\* But after the return from Babylon, the theocracy was never restored—the city was never called faithful nor righteous, but was permitted to fill up the measure of her iniquity by crucifying the Son of God. In that remarkable passage to which the Church called our attention last Sunday, Jeremiah announces a return of Judah and Israel in the days of Messiah: after announcing the Lord our

\* Isaiah i. 26.

Righteousness as the righteous branch of David, he adds, 'In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely . . . . Therefore, behold the days come, saith the Lord, that they shall no more say, The Lord liveth, which brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; But, the Lord liveth, which brought up and which led the seed of the house of Israel out of the north country, and from all countries whither I had driven them; and they shall dwell in their own land.'\* Here are three great features impossible to be mistaken, not one of which is to be discerned in the deliverance from Babylon. The first, a general return of the two houses of Judah and Israel—the second, an universal restoration from all countries—the third, the fulfilment of all this at a definite time, the days of Messiah. Whereas the fugitives who came from Babylon were almost exclusively of the house of Judah—they returned from that region only, and the time of this partial restoration preceded by five hundred years the advent of Messiah. The prophet Ezekiel is equally definite in prediction of the final settlement of the Jewish people in the land of their fathers, and the prediction to which I refer, contained in the thirty-seventh chapter, beginning at the fifteenth verse, is particularly remarkable, from its containing, first, a symbolic representation, and then a divine interpretation of the symbols. The word of the Lord came to Ezekiel first with this

\* Jeremiah, xxiii. 6, 7.

command, 'Son of man, take unto thee one stick, and write upon it, for Judah, and for the children of Israel his companions: then take another stick, and write upon it, for Joseph, the stick of Ephraim, and for all the house of Israel his companions: and join them one to another into one stick; and they shall become one in thine hand.' This is the symbolic action. How men might have interpreted it we know not; and it is now of little import, for God himself has in the following verses explained the meaning of the symbol. 'When the children of thy people shall speak unto thee, saying, Wilt thou not show us what thou meanest by these? Say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God; Behold, I will take the stick of Joseph, which is in the hand of Ephraim, and the tribes of Israel his fellows, and will put them with him, even with the stick of Judah, and make them one stick, and they shall be one in my hand . . . . And say unto them, thus saith the Lord God; Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land: and I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king to them all: and they shall no more be two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all. Neither shall they defile themselves any more with their idols, nor with their detestable things, nor with any of their transgressions . . . . And David my ser-

vant shall be king over them; and they all shall have one shepherd: they also shall walk in my judgments, and observe my statutes. And they shall dwell in the land that I have given unto Jacob my servant, wherein your fathers dwelt; and they shall dwell therein, even they, and their children, and their children's children for ever.' Here are promises as different from the state of things which followed the return from Babylon as health is from sickness, or the vigour of manhood from the feebleness of infancy. It is promised, not only that the two tribes and the ten tribes should be restored, but united for ever into one kingdom—not only that they should have a king, but that this king should be the Messiah—not only that they should inherit the land, but possess it, they and their children for ever and ever in peace and piety. The most careless reader of the prophecy will perceive that the history of the Jewish commonwealth, from the going forth of the decree of Cyrus to its termination in the days of Titus and Adrian, contains nothing like a fulfilment of these predictions. It is notorious that from the days of Shalmaneser no such united kingdom of the twelve tribes has ever existed—no such king has ever been the shepherd of Israel—and no such piety has been known amongst the sons of Jacob. The dispersion of the Jews in the midst of us, and the continued occupation of their land by strangers, attest to the most superficial observer, that the promise of an eternal

possession of the Holy Land has not yet found its accomplishment. The Jew, therefore, is right in asserting that some of the most remarkable of the prophecies remain still unfulfilled, and consequently some other answer must be sought which may invalidate the force of his objection.

The principle of allegoric interpretation is generally considered to supply the true and universal solution. For many centuries, and with few exceptions, controversialists have endeavoured to evade the difficulty by insinuating to the Jew that his faith in the words of the living God is an effect of national blindness—and that the divine promises are to be fulfilled, not according to the expressed sense, but mystically. Now, however arbitrary, insufficient, and dishonouring to God's veracity this answer may appear to the Jew, and to every other man of common integrity, its early adoption by a portion of the Christian Church, and the extent of its subsequent diffusion, give it a claim upon our attentive consideration. The allegoric principle implied in it appears in the earliest Christian writers, and after the time of Origen attained to an almost universal empire. Its antiquity, its diffusion, and the lengthened term of its continuance, seem to demand an unconditional assent, and he who starts at some of the monstrous productions to which it has given birth, must also hesitate, lest, in rejecting it, he renounce a sacred deposit once committed to the saints. Examination will, however,



show him the needlessness of his scruples, and convince him that this principle, though general, was never universal. On certain points, the literal interpretation of the prophecies was maintained by apologists and martyrs of the first and purest ages of the Christian Church. The allegoric principle has therefore no catholicity which could compel its adoption. It appears merely as a matter of opinion, and as a matter of opinion must be examined, and then received or rejected according to its intrinsic value. The most venerable name can claim for a private opinion nothing more than an attentive consideration. In such a case the question is not, Who held it, but, Why it was holden? In matters of interpretation, not only the piety and devotedness of a commentator, but his learning and judgment, and general qualifications for this office, must be taken into the account—and, after all, however high these may be, his opinion must still be received as that of a being limited in understanding—liable to the warping influence of prejudice, and born to error.

With reference to the fathers, it must be confessed, that however venerable for zeal and devotedness, however respectable for piety, and authoritative when they appear as the bearers of a genuine catholic tradition, yet as private interpreters of Scripture, especially of the Old Testament, their qualifications are far from commanding our assent. Ignorant of the language of Moses and the pro-

phets, they were dependent altogether upon a defective translation; just emerging from Paganism, their minds were far from being fully emancipated from the dogmas and ideal associations of heathen philosophy; occupied by the arduous duties of their station, or distracted by the calumnies and dangers to which their Christian profession exposed them; and led astray by erroneous systems, when they sought help of the Jews, it is not to be wondered at if their progress in the interpretation of the Scriptures was slow, and their labours in this department of questionable authority. To practise what they heard, faithfully to transmit the faith once delivered to the saints, and to seal their testimony with their blood, was the glory of the fathers. As interpreters of the Old Testament, some of the greatest of them have stumbled at the very first elements of revelation. We find a defender of the Christian faith unable to interpret the word Israel—one most learned bishop giving a most unfounded etymology of the word Abraham—and another departing as widely from truth as from common sense, when he attempts to explain the original names of the Deity. Their interpretations are sometimes the offspring of an exuberant fancy, not unfrequently the result of an incorrect translation. There is nothing, therefore, to induce us to adopt their interpretation of the Old Testament, or the principle from which it flowed. There is no such thing as a catholic exposition of the Scriptures, nor even a catholic prin-

ciple of interpretation. The fathers differ from one another as freely as we may differ from them, and sometimes draw from sources of more than doubtful authority. The mysticism of an Egyptian Jew, the dreams of the Cabbalists, and even the extravagant and fictitious spirituality of the Gnostics, had no small influence in the production of that allegoric principle which, notwithstanding the condemnation of some of the errors flowing from it, became generally dominant in the Church. The perpetuation of this false principle in after ages can therefore add nothing to its authority, nor impose any limit to the freeness of our search into the true meaning of the word of God. He who of all the fathers was the best qualified as an interpreter, frankly acknowledges that his exposition of the prophets has no intrinsic authority. 'Thus,' he says in one place, 'Thus have I delivered unto you my sense in brief: but if any one produce that which is more exact and true, take his exposition rather than mine.' And in another place he gives similar advice, saying, 'We have now done our utmost endeavour in giving an allegorical exposition of the text; but if any other can bring that which is more probable and more agreeable to reason, than that which we have delivered, let the reader be swayed by his authority rather than by ours.' The opinions of the fathers, therefore, concerning the interpretation of Scripture, are not to be received as authoritative, but examined according to the dictates of reason,

revelation, and the analogy of the faith; and this examination necessarily terminates in a rejection of the allegorical interpretation, as subversive of some articles of the primitive faith, and contradictory to the express declarations of the Almighty, both in the Old Testament and the New. There is testimony that cannot be doubted to prove that the primitive Christians believed in the rebuilding and future glory of the city of Jerusalem, in the millennial reign of Christ, and the advent of the prophet Elijah before the great and dreadful day of the Lord. Indeed, the doctrine of the coming of Elijah was never banished, even by the allegoric ascendancy, but constituted a part of the catholic faith for the first fifteen centuries. Those who allegorized the other prophets without scruple, maintained unanimously the literal interpretation of the prediction of Malachi. But if the allegoric principle be admitted, these articles of the faith must be rejected, as they uniformly have been wherever it has fully prevailed. The two cannot exist together. In such an alternative, every considerate Christian, as well as every sober reverer of ancient catholic doctrine, will reject that which is mere matter of uncertain opinion, and retain that which rests upon certain and universal testimony, that is, he will reject the allegoric principle of interpretation, and retain the catholic doctrine contained in the plain and obvious meaning of the word of God.

There is, however, another testimony of more

authority still than even that of the whole united Church of every age and nation, if such could be obtained, and that is the testimony of God himself. He who has given the Scriptures of truth has, in some instances, condescended also to give a written and inspired interpretation, which necessarily precludes all controversy, and admits no appeal. What God has interpreted is fixed and settled for ever, and no man can, without the most extraordinary forgetfulness, or the most daring impiety, presume to offer a different interpretation. An instance of such inspired comment is found in one of the passages of the prophet Ezekiel already alluded to. In the vision of the two sticks, which were to become one in the hand of the prophet, we have noticed that there is first a prophecy, and then subsequently the divine explanation. The prophecy itself was symbolie, and consequently obscure. The people who beheld Ezekiel take one stick, and write on it, 'For Judah and the tribes of Israel, his companions,' and then take another stick with an inscription for Joseph, and the tribes his companions, and unite them into one stick in his hand, could not easily understand the purposes of God thus symbolized. The Lord foresaw that they would not understand, and therefore, in the eighteenth verse, he prepared the prophet for the people's inquiries, saying, 'And when the children of thy people shall speak unto thee, saying, Wilt thou not show us what thou meanest by these? Say unto them, Thus saith the

Lord,' and then follows the explanation promising the restoration and reunion of the two kingdoms of Judah and Israel under the Messiah, and their eternal possession of the land of their fathers in the covenant of the gospel. This explanation therefore is final, it does not require another. It was intended for the instruction of Ezekiel's contemporaries as a help to the understanding of the vision. The words in which it was conceived were dictated by Infinite Wisdom, and consequently the best possible that could be adopted for the purpose. No man therefore can, without impiety, give another explanation, or interpret that given in any other sense than that which the words would have had in the minds of Ezekiel's countrymen. In what sense they understood the words is evident beyond all dispute. The men of that generation certainly did not understand by the promised reunion of Judah and Israel, the admission of the Gentiles to the privileges of God's people, nor did the words, 'The land given unto Jacob where their fathers dwelt,' convey an idea of the true Sion the Christian Church. The men for whom the explanation was given took all these terms literally, and thus must they be taken by all who believe that the Divine Being is able as well as willing to explain to men the mysteries of his will. If the divine interpretation require another interpretation to make it intelligible, and that it certainly does if the ten tribes mean Gentile believers, and the land of Israel stands

for the Christian Church,—for of such signification neither Ezekiel nor his hearers had any conception, —then must it be pronounced insufficient, and this insufficiency must be ascribed either to want of power or will, that is, an allegorical interpretation of this passage cannot be adopted without an implication of blasphemy.

But God has not only vouchsafed an occasional explanation in the Old Testament; in the New he has pointed out so many prophecies fulfilled, as to enable us to recognise the divine principle of interpretation. Messiah's miraculous conception and birth of a virgin, his triumphal entry into Jerusalem, his betrayal for thirty pieces of silver, the casting lots for his raiment, the piercing of his hands and feet, and many other particulars which we have not time to enumerate, all formed the subject of prophecy, and certain predictions are referred to by the New-Testament writers as fulfilled by these events. The simple question therefore is, on what principle are these prophecies expounded in the New Testament? Is the allegorical or the literal principle the rule of interpretation? Is Israel in these prophecies made to stand for Gentile, or Jerusalem for the Christian Church? These prophecies are all interpreted as the Jews would themselves understand them. They are taken in their most simple and obvious sense. If therefore we are to follow the example of the New Testament, the allegoric principle must be rejected.

Yea, if we would not be accounted as deceivers—if we have any regard for consistency—if we would place our own faith above suspicion, or preserve a single hope of ever communicating it to the Jewish people—if we would follow the footsteps of our Lord, we must adhere to the old Biblical method of interpretation. We endeavour by an appeal to the prophecies to prove that the Scriptures are the word of God, and our Lord Jesus Christ the Saviour of the world? Upon what is this appeal founded? What is presupposed as a first principle in the whole investigation? What is the corner-stone of the whole fabric of our argument? Beyond all doubt, the turning-point—the root and foundation of our proof—is, first, the supposition that the prophecies are simple in their enunciation—unambiguous in their language, and of easy understanding, and secondly, that the fulfilment has taken place according to their unsophisticated grammatical meaning. Without these indispensable conditions, a proof of the Christian religion from prophecy is impossible. Introduce allegory and mystery—change the meaning of words—tell the unbeliever, that to prove Christianity it is necessary to affix an unusual meaning to the names of men, and to the geographical designation of cities and countries, he will laugh you and your argument to scorn; he will regard you, and that with good reason, as one of those two characters with which mankind is least in love. The whole force of our argument, when we



refer to prophecies fulfilled before our eyes, or to those whose accomplishment is recorded in the New Testament, depends upon the unambiguity of the prediction, and the exactness of its accomplishment. When, therefore, the Jew comes with objections founded on unfulfilled prophecy, we must not resign the sword with which we have hitherto conquered, and grasp at a shadow, but with full confidence in the heavenly temper of our weapons, and in all good faith towards even an opponent, we must allow the force of his objection, and the legitimacy of his hopes founded on the word of God, and see whether a closer examination will not turn this objection into an argument for the truth. Such was the method pursued by an early apologist of the Christian faith. When Tryphon the Jew argued that Jesus could not be the Messiah, because the promises of glory and the mission of Elijah had not been accomplished, Justin Martyr did not meet him by a spiritual interpretation, or an hypocritical reproof for the carnality of his expectations, but by distinguishing between times and seasons; and such is the course pointed out in the text by the Lord Jesus Christ himself. When the Jew objects, we must say in reply, The prophecies which you cite are equally sacred in our eyes with those which we have ourselves adduced in proof of our faith. The hopes built on them are equally well founded—the blessings promised equally secure of accomplishment. We have no desire to shake your faith in these

unfulfilled predictions. We blame you, not for believing too much, but too little. We think that your mistake is that of Christ's disciples, when he said to them, 'O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken.' Those holy men of old who foretold Messiah's glory have also announced his humiliation. The God of your fathers has made known a twofold advent of Messiah, one to suffer, the other, after a long interval, to reign. The absence, therefore, of the glory is not only not an objection to, it is a negative proof in favour of Christianity. Time does not, however, permit us to enter into the further discussion of this argument at present—it must be reserved for another occasion.

## LECTURE V.

LUKE XXIV. 25, 26.

*Then he said unto them, O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?*

IN the last lecture, it was stated that the non-fulfilment of certain prophecies relating to the times of Messiah is the chief objection which the Jews urge against the truth of Christianity. It was shown that the usual answers to this objection are insufficient, or even prejudicial to the Christian cause—and it was suggested that the argument used by our Lord to remove the doubts of his disciples, furnishes the true reply. Partial faith and partial consideration of the prophetic Scriptures appear as the cause of their common malady. Both fixed their eyes upon the promises of glory, and totally overlooked the predicted humiliation which was to precede. Our Lord endeavoured to remove the unbelief of his followers by directing their attention to all that the prophets have spoken, and by teaching them to distinguish between the suffering and the glory. The same distinction, if valid, will solve the difficulties propounded by the Jew. To prove its validity is the object of the present lecture.

The Jew, appealing to the prophets, says, The tribes of Israel have not been gathered—the kingdom of David not restored—the reign of universal peace and holiness not begun. Appealing to the same prophecies, we reply, You are mistaken in the time. The prophets announce two advents: one to suffer—the other to reign in the manner you expect; and we thus make good our assertion.

If it can be shown that the predictions concerning Messiah's advent differ with regard to place, time, and circumstance, and of each give a twofold description, it will necessarily follow that there must be two distinct advents. But that this is the fact cannot be denied, even by the adversaries of Christianity. The prophet Daniel (vii. 13, 14) declares that Messiah is to come from heaven. 'I saw,' says he, '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.' The prophet Micah, on the contrary, declares that he should come forth from Bethlehem, of Judah; and the numerous promises that he should be born of the family of David, as necessarily determine that this earth must be the scene of his entrance into his office. If the Son of David is to come from heaven, as in that holy place none are born of women, he must previously have been born upon earth, and thence ascended up thither; that is, before the advent here described by Daniel, he must have come once already in order

to be born, and therefore his advent to receive the kingdom promised him must be the second. The Jews, therefore, must either admit two advents, or believe that Messiah is a merely celestial being; and then deny that he is that which Daniel declares him to be, 'The Son of man,' and that which the prophets announced he should be, 'The son of David.' The very same doctrine follows inevitably from Jewish tradition. The Jerusalem Talmud says expressly, that Messiah was born long since in Bethlehem of Judah, and gives the name of a Jew who went and saw him.\* The Babylonian Talmud† and the book of Zohar also imply that in the times in which they were written, Messiah had been born and already grown up to man's estate, and was then in Paradise interceding for Israel. The former book says that he was seen by a celebrated rabbi, and asked concerning the time of his advent. The popular faith, therefore, of the Jewish people, founded upon the prophetic writings, proves that those writings contain intimations of two distinct advents, one for the purpose of being born in Bethlehem of Judah, the other a return from Paradise, where for centuries he has tarried.

A consideration of the times marked out by the prophets will lead to the same conclusion. Jacob, by declaring that 'the sceptre should not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet

\* Berachoth, fol. 5, col. i. Old Paths, No. 50.

† Sanhedrin, 98, col. i. Old Paths, *ibid.*

until Shiloh come,' fixed the time of the advent to a period before the destruction of the Jewish polity. Haggai, by predicting that the glory of that temple at whose building he assisted, should be greater than the glory of the first temple; and Malachi, by promising that the Lord should suddenly come to his temple and execute judgment upon the sons of Levi, both determine that Messiah was to come before the desolation of the temple and the dispersion of the people; and yet other predictions imply that Messiah was to come after a period of long and total dispersion of the people, and desolation of the temple and city. Thus Isaiah, lix. 20, says, that 'the Redeemer shall come to Zion, and to them that turn from transgression in Jacob;' and then follows the promise, 'Thy sons shall come from far, and thy daughters shall be nursed at thy side . . . the isles shall wait for me, the ships of Tarshish first, to bring thy sons from far, their silver and their gold with them, unto the name of the Lord thy God,' which implies dispersion; and that other promise, 'The glory of Lebanon shall come unto thee, the fir-tree, the pine-tree, and the box together, to beautify the place of my sanctuary; and I will make the place of my feet glorious . . . whereas thou hast been forsaken and hated, so that no man went through thee, I will make thee an eternal excellency, a joy of many generations,' necessarily implies a previous desolation both of the temple and the city. The prophet Micah describes the time of Messiah's glory

also as consequent upon the desolation of the temple. He announces that 'in the last days the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains,' which the Jews universally apply to the days of the Messiah; but the preceding verse says, 'Therefore shall Zion for your sake be ploughed as a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps, and the mountain of the Lord's house as the high places of the forest.' Daniel declares, 'that when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished,' thus expressly fixing that great deliverance by Messiah to the end of their present dispersion. Here, then, are two periods of time fixed for the advent of Messiah, which yet are separated by the long interval beginning with the desolation of the holy city, and extending to the time of the restoration of the Jews. As the prophets assert that in each period Messiah is to come, and the periods are not identical, it follows that there must be two advents.

The difference between heaven and earth, between the time before the destruction of the temple and after its destruction, is, however, not more clear than the distinction of circumstances under which the advent of the Messiah is to take place. In one class of prophecies he is described as in a state of the most profound humiliation; in another, as exalted to the highest degree of glory, and the throne of universal empire. The very same prophet presents

Messiah in shapes the most opposite. David in one place describes him 'as a worm and no man: a reproach of men and despised of the people;' and in another place speaks of him as universal king, having dominion from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth, before whom all kings shall bow down, and whom all nations shall serve.' Isaiah describes him in similar language, as 'exalted and extolled, and very high,' and yet 'as despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief.' In one place, as an example of meekness, saying 'He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the streets. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench;' and in another, as the merciless destroyer of his enemies, exclaiming, 'I will tread them in my anger, and trample them in my fury; and their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments, and I will stain all my raiment.' The most careless peruser of the prophecies must know that antithetic passages of this nature are so frequent that to adduce proof at all is almost superfluous, and the wayfaring man, though a fool, must perceive that the two states here described can be neither identical nor synchronous. How then are they to be disposed of? Are they two different states of the same person, or are there two Messiahs, to one of whom belongs the humiliation, and to the other the glory? And here be it remarked, that this apparent contrariety is not the mere offspring



of Christian prepossession. The Jews themselves have perceived it, and have endeavoured to account for it. It is mentioned in the Babylonian Talmud, that one of the rabbis was staggered by the conflicting statements of the prophets Zechariah and Daniel, one of whom says that Messiah is to come 'poor and riding upon an ass;' the other, that he is to come in heavenly majesty in the clouds. An attempt is, however, made to reconcile them, by asserting that these predictions are conditional; and that the humiliation or the glory of Messiah's advent depends upon the piety or impiety of the Jewish people. If they deserve it, says the rabbi, Messiah will come in the clouds of heaven; if they do not deserve it, he will come poor, and riding upon an ass. A reference to the words of the prophets is, however, sufficient to show that this solution is altogether unwarranted. The predictions are free from all appearance of condition. Daniel positively predicts that Messiah shall come in the clouds of heaven, and Zechariah as unequivocally asserts that he shall come to Zion, poor, and riding upon an ass; and therefore the more modern Jewish interpreters have given up the idea of a condition. The attempted solution has, however, this advantage, that it testifies to the existence of the difficulty, and to the fact that it was long since felt by the Jews themselves. Its insufficiency, even in their minds, appears from a second solution proposed in passages where the difficulty is still

greater. The prophet Zechariah not only announces an advent of humiliation, but declares that he shall be put to death, saying, 'They shall look upon me whom they have pierced;' and again, 'Smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered.' These passages were deemed incapable of condition, and therefore the rabbies, unable, on their principles, to resist the Christian interpretation, or to reconcile the abject humiliation and the divine glory as co-existent in the same being, have had recourse to a diversity of person, and invented two Messiahs, one, whom they call the son of Joseph, of the tribe of Ephraim, who is to suffer death; the other, the son of David, who is to reign in glory. But to this it must be replied—1st. That even as a tradition, the idea of two Messiahs is very uncertain. The rabbies are neither consistent nor uniform in their interpretation of those passages where they say a Messiah of the tribe of Joseph is announced. In that passage of the Talmud where it explains Zechariah's words, it expressly admits that David is the father of the person spoken of, though he is called the son of Joseph. 'When,' says the Talmud, 'Messiah, the son of Joseph, saw that he was to be slain, he said unto God, O Lord of the world, I ask of thee nothing but life. God replied, Before thou spakest, long ago, thy father David prophesied concerning thee saying (Ps. xxi. 4), 'He asked life of thee, and thou gavest it him, even length of days for ever and ever.' Here is a strange confusion,

which either betrays the surreptitious insertion of the word Joseph, or proves that under the two names, the son of Joseph and the son of David, the more ancient rabbies understood one and the same person. But however explained, the confusion makes the tradition utterly uncertain, and the word of God proves that it is false. If there are two Messiahs, they must be contemporary, or one must come after the other. Their co-existence is however disproved by the prophet Ezekiel (xxxiv. 22, 23), who says, that when God saves his people, they shall have only one shepherd. The possibility of succession is taken away by Hosea, who says that until they seek Messiah, the son of David, they shall abide without a king and a prince.\* In no case, therefore, can there be two Messiahs; and consequently the original difficulty presented by the predicted humiliation and glory of Messiah still remains, and can only be solved by the adoption of two advents. Thus, the difference of place, the difference of time, and the difference of circumstance existing in the prophetic accounts of Messiah, all combine to prove that he must come twice: and this doctrine enables us to answer the Jewish objections to the Messiahship of our Lord. The Jew says, Before the coming of the Messiah, Elijah the prophet was to come, as Malachi says, 'Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord.' But

\* Kimchi on Zeeh., p. 160.

Elijah has not come, therefore Jesus of Nazareth cannot be the Messiah. We reply, in all sincerity, and without any of that allegorizing evasion which has given such offence to the Jewish nation—we reply as Justin Martyr answered Trypho, and as Justin's Lord answered his disciples—'Elias truly shall come and restore all things,' but you are mistaken as to the time. The prophet Malachi does not say that Elijah was to come before the advent of humiliation, but before 'the great and terrible day of the Lord.' His non-appearance, therefore, at the first coming of Christ is so far from being an objection, that it is a confirmation of his claims.

In like manner, when the Jew objects that Messiah was to possess the throne of David, as Isaiah says, and an universal empire as announced by Daniel, both which characteristics are wanting in Jesus of Nazareth, the answer is similar. Isaiah makes the glory consequent upon his humiliation, and Daniel declares that until his ascent to the Ancient of days, Messiah is not to receive that dominion, glory, and kingdom in which all people, nations, and languages shall serve him, and which shall never pass away.

II. This answer fully meets all the difficulties of the case, and preserves one uniform and consistent principle of interpretation for all the prophecies—it agrees with the primitive expectations of the Catholic Church, and maintains the purity of God's promises, and their freedom from everything like equivocation

or double-dealing. Its agreement with the principles of the gospel has, however, been denied, and grave objections urged against its correctness. It will be necessary, therefore, to show that the doctrine of the two advents is in strict accordance with the analogy of the Christian faith. It is said that this doctrine will lead to inconvenient consequences, that it is inconsistent with the spirituality of Christ's kingdom, that it savours of the spirit of the Judaizing corrupters of the gospel. To all this I would reply, in the first place, generally, that the words of the text necessarily imply the very system which has been advocated, as supplying the true answer to Jewish objections. When Christ says, 'O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken, ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?' he implies, that the disciples did believe some things that the prophets had spoken, and by abstaining from all reproof, that their faith in what they did believe was correct; and it follows further, as they did not believe what the prophets spake concerning Messiah's sufferings, that the part of the prophetic sayings which they did believe was that which related to Messiah's glory, and that their faith concerning this glory was correct. Their faith was, however, that of their nation. It was not a mere spiritual glory in heaven, but a national glory upon earth which they expected; the request of Zebedee's sons to sit, the one on his right hand and the other on his left: the declara-

tion of the two disciples, 'We trust that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel,' and the question of the Apostles, 'Lord, wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?' prove beyond doubt that they participated in the faith and the hopes of their nation. Our Lord's remonstrance with them implies that this hope was correct, and that the glory which was the object of it shall yet be manifested.

The words of the text, however, imply more than this. They teach that all things that the prophets have spoken are to be believed, and that faith which receives one portion of the prophecies and rejects another, is inconsistent with that wisdom which cometh down from above. 'O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken.' The disciples of our Lord, and the Jews of ancient and modern times believed the prophecies concerning Messiah's glory—they neglected or explained away all that related to his humiliation, and therefore the Lord condemned them both of folly and of sin. Is the Christian of the present day more wise or more pious who receives all that the prophets have said concerning his humiliation, and rejects that which even the foolish and unbelieving disciples believed? Our Lord's principle is faith in the glory as well as in the humiliation—an universal reception of all that the prophets have spoken, and with this the proposed doctrine of the two advents agrees; it

cannot therefore be inconsistent with the spirit of the gospel.

We do not, however, shun a more particular examination of the gospel, convinced that an accurate consideration of all that Christ and his apostles have spoken will silence every objection arising from a hasty view of particular passages. Thus, one of the main objections to the doctrine of Christ's kingdom upon earth is founded upon the words—'My kingdom is not of this world.' An examination of the particular expressions will show that it affords no fair foundation for the doctrine forced from it. The statement that Christ's kingdom is not of this world, is by no means opposed to the other statement, that the Messiah shall yet have a kingdom upon earth. In the world and of the world are two very different things. Christ's disciples, yea Christ himself was in the world, but not of the world. As is said in St. John, 'The world hath hated them, because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world. I pray not that thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that thou shouldest keep them from the evil.'\* As it was possible, therefore, for Christ himself and his disciples, so it is also possible for his kingdom to be in the world, though not of it. The concurrent testimonies of Christ and his apostles, the epistles, and the gospels, demonstrate that it is not only possible,

\* John, xvii. 14, 15.

but certain. In the parable of the tares, the Lord teaches that this world, purified from all contamination, is the place of his kingdom. 'The field,' he says, 'is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one; the enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the consummation of the age. As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire, so shall it be at the consummation of this age. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity.' The place whence the tares are gathered he calls his kingdom, but the place where they grew and remained until the harvest, and whence they are gathered, he also declares to be the world. The world, therefore, is the place of the kingdom which the Son of man is to possess at the consummation of the age. Similar was the annunciation of the angel, when he said—'The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever.' The throne of David and the house of Jacob are not to be sought in heaven. And to this agrees Christ's declaration concerning the meek, that 'they shall inherit the earth;' his promise to his disciples, that 'they should sit on twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel;' and his command to all to pray—'Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.' The meek do not inherit,



and never have in any sense inherited the earth, but have hitherto been only strangers and pilgrims. The apostles have never ruled over the twelve tribes of Israel. The will of God is still treated with scorn. These things remain, therefore, to be fulfilled when the kingdom of God shall come. When St. Peter preached to the Jews, he urged them to repent, that the Lord might come to them again in mercy, saying, 'Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out; when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord, and he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached to you, whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets, since the world began.' St. Paul's hope was, as expressed in the epistle to the Romans, that 'The creation itself shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God;' and, in the epistle to the Hebrews, he expounds the eighth Psalm of the future dominion of the Lord Jesus Christ over the world. 'For unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come, whereof we speak. But one testifieth in a certain place, saying, What is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man, that thou visitest him? Thou madest him a little lower than the angels; thou crownedst him with glory and honour, and didst set him over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things in

subjection under his feet. For in that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him. But now we see not yet all things put under him. But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour; that he by the grace of God might taste death for every man.' In this reasoning of the apostle we learn that the world of which David speaks is the world to come, and that the son of man who is to rule over it is the Lord Jesus Christ. With this interpretation in mind read the Psalm through. Continue the words which the apostle cites, 'Thou hast put all things under his feet: all sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field; the fowl of the air and the fish of the seas, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the seas,' and then say whether it is possible to imagine any other place but this earth as the scene of this dominion. The apostle St. John, in the Apocalypse, teaches the same doctrine. He tells us that the hope of the redeemed in heaven is, that they shall share Christ's kingdom upon earth. Their song to the Saviour is, 'Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation, and hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth.' Yea, the universal expectation is the fulfilment of those glorious words, 'The kingdoms of this world are become the king-

doms of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever.' That, therefore, Jesus of Nazareth is to have a kingdom upon earth can be doubted by none who receive the authority of the New Testament. Sin and sorrow are not to find here an eternal habitation—violence is not for ever to fill the earth—nor Satan to be always the god of this world. Christ and his apostles have taught us to believe, to pray, and to wait for that happy period when 'God shall wipe away all tears from the eyes of his people, when there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things shall have passed away, and he that sitteth upon the throne shall say, behold I make all things new.' How astonishing that any should be found in whose eyes a hope like this should appear inconsistent with the spirituality of the gospel, or unworthy of the Saviour of the world. Is it possible that any one, free from the taint of Gnostic delusion, can regard the restoration of this earth to its state of primitive blessedness, the exaltation of its inhabitants to their more than original purity, and the deliverance of all creation, animate and inanimate, from the taint and curse of sin, and the outpouring of the Spirit of God upon all flesh as a carnal expectation? Can the difference of locality cause a change so mighty as to make that unholy and unspiritual on earth which is holy and spiritual in heaven? What is it

that sanctifies the abodes of cherubim and seraphim and constitutes the glory of the courts of heaven? Is it not the manifestation of Christ's presence, and the blessed influences of God the Holy Ghost? And cannot the same presence and the same influence make earth a paradise, and this or any other world the blessed abode of holiness and joy? There is nothing in heaven's materiality to cause a difference. It possesses no intrinsic, no uncreated, no essential holiness. Considered as portions of creation all localities are alike. The will of God, or the perversity of his rational creatures alone can cause the diversity. In Christ's presence, wherever it be, there is fulness of joy, and at his right hand there are pleasures for evermore. The objection, therefore, that Christ's return to reign on earth is carnal or unworthy of the Holy One and Just, is devoid of all solid foundation, and can be plausible only to the unthinking. But it is far worse than invalid, it is based on the most presumptuous principle of infidelity, and leads directly to an entire rejection of Christianity. If the professed believer in Jesus of Nazareth rejects Christ's kingdom upon earth, as being unworthy of the now incarnate Son of God, how would he have answered the Gnostic or the Docete of old—yea, how is he to answer the Jew or the Deist of the present day, who makes the very same objection to the possibility of God's manifestation in the flesh? If his reason is able to judge of

the one, he cannot deny that the heretic's reason is competent to pronounce concerning the other; and thus we must proceed from the rejection of Christ's reign upon earth to the rejection of his incarnation, and thence to the rejection of the Old Testament, and rest at last in the mere ideal God of the deist, or the aeon of the early heretics.

That such were the expectations and the faith of the catholic Church in its purest times, I have already intimated in my last lecture. It is past all controversy that the early Christians looked for their consummation of bliss in Christ's kingdom upon earth; and it is equally certain that the first enemies of this doctrine were found amongst the Gnostics, and that its final overthrow was owing to the influence of one who, however admirable for his learning and piety, is not celebrated either for his judgment or his orthodoxy. The Platonizing Christianity of the school of Origen first created a distaste for the doctrines of the Bible and the faith of the early Church. The proud claims of Roman supremacy made their rejection indispensably necessary, and the lingering effects of Popish poison have continued the dominion of the opposite system long beyond the times of the Reformation. But the most judicious divines of our own Church have gradually been led by the study of the prophecies, to return to the faith of primitive antiquity. Newton, Lowth, Blayney, Newcome, Horsley, Van Mildert, may be mentioned

as holding the principles, or maintaining the views now contended for. And the great author of the *Analogy of Natural and Revealed Religion*, by giving his suffrage in their favour, may convince the most fearful that this answer to Jewish objection is agreeable to sobriety of judgment and to soundness of reason. In that celebrated work he says,—“As several of these events seem, in some degree expressly, to have verified the prophetic history already, so, likewise, they may be considered further as having a peculiar aspect towards the full completion of it; as affording some presumption that the whole of it shall, one time or other, be fulfilled. Thus, that the Jews have been so wonderfully preserved in their long and wide dispersion, which is, indeed, the direct fulfilling of some prophecies, but is now mentioned only as looking forward to somewhat yet to come: that natural religion came forth from Judea, and spread in the degree it has done over the world, before lost in idolatry; which, together with some other things, have distinguished that very place in like manner as the people of it are distinguished: that this great change of religion over the whole earth was brought about under the profession and acknowledgment that Jesus was the promised Messiah;—things of this kind naturally turn the thoughts of serious men towards the full completion of the prophetic history concerning the final restoration of

that people; concerning the establishment of the everlasting kingdom among them, the kingdom of the Messiah; and the future state of the world under this sacred government."

Thus far, Bishop Butler. In answering the Jew, then, by pointing to the second advent as the season when the promises of glory are to be accomplished, we are making no compromise of Christianity, and starting no novel or unheard-of tenets, but treading in the footsteps of some of the greatest ornaments of our own Church, returning to the doctrine of primitive antiquity, and, above all, following the uniform testimony of the New Testament. We are not devising a new scheme of interpretation to help us out of a difficulty. We advocate a great truth, which, if the voice of controversy were for ever hushed, it would still be our duty to maintain; but which, now, when the ignorance of it endangers the salvation of a great and numerous people, it would be treason against the majesty of heaven to withhold. Study the books of Jewish controversy, from the first age of the Church to the present day; or go and converse with the Jews in every country whither the wrath of an offended God hath scattered them. Inquire into their reasons for rejecting Christianity, and you will find in every age and every clime the same objection, the non-fulfilment of the promises of glory. An answer must, therefore, be had, and what other answer shall we choose

but that which solves the whole difficulty, without having recourse to force or evasion, maintains one consistent principle of interpretation, and has the sanction of the Lord Jesus Christ, when he says—  
‘O, fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory.’



## LECTURE VI.

ISAIAH XLIV. 26.

*That confirmeth the word of his servant, and performeth the counsel of his messengers.*

THE man who can make a direct appeal to the Almighty and draw forth an immediate display of Omnipotence, has an unanswerable argument for the truth of his religion. When the son of Amram divided the Red Sea, his followers believed in the Lord and in Moses his servant. And when Elijah cried to his God and obtained an answer by fire from heaven, the waverers in Israel were convinced, and cried out—‘The Lord he is the God. The Lord he is the God.’ Men feel that such mighty deeds necessarily exceed the mightiest efforts of impostors, and necessarily imply an exertion of divine power. An appeal to God’s attribute of foreknowledge is equally conclusive, inasmuch as it is equally the sole prerogative of God. It is just as impossible to counterfeit one attribute as the other. If, therefore, we can adduce a clear exertion of the Divine prescience in proof of our religion, we make as direct an appeal to Deity, and in the coincidence of prophecy and history have an argument for its

truth as valid in the eye of reason as the suspension or change of the laws of nature. Such were the remarks with which these lectures were commenced, and such the appeal which we proposed to make on behalf of Christianity. In the subsequent lectures the appeal was actually made, and it now only remains to recapitulate the particulars, draw the conclusion, and press upon you the practical result.

The first great point to which your attention was drawn, was the existence of certain prophecies known to have been uttered and written centuries before the occurrence of the events referred to as their accomplishment. It is a known truth, that the revelation of St. John, and the writings of David, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the other Hebrew prophets lay claim to the character of inspiration, and profess to know and to announce the future destinies of nations and of individuals. It is a fact which even the most ignorant sceptic would not deny, that the writings of St. John are at least 1600 years old, and that the very latest of the Hebrew prophecies was translated into Greek, and must therefore have existed at the least 180 years before the Christian æra. The sceptic will, however, if learned, admit his conviction that the youngest of the prophets of Israel lived 500 years before Christ, and some at least 500 years sooner. Your attention was directed, in the next place, to the coincidence between certain predictions and events which have since taken place, which coincidence in some most

remarkable instances is open to our daily observation. The Hebrew prophets announced that one individual of their nation should be acknowledged as God, even to the very ends of the earth. The light of noon-day is not more clear than the fact that Jesus of Nazareth is thus acknowledged. 'His hand is set in the sea, and his right hand in the rivers. They that dwell in the wilderness bow down before him. The kings of Tarshish, and of the isles bring presents.' The most notorious if not the most extraordinary fact in the history of our species is the divine worship paid by the most enlightened portion of the human race to the Son of Mary. The Hebrews, however, went farther, and announced faith in the Gentiles, and the unbelief of the Jewish people, and sixty generations of the children of men have witnessed the wonderful coincidence. We still see with our own eyes, that to Christ has been the gathering of the nations—that the isles wait for his law—that he has been found of them that sought him not; and that, whilst he is still despised and rejected by his own countrymen, and one whom the nation abhorreth, kings see and arise, princes also worship; he has been made the head of the heathen, and nations whom he had not known serve him. Yea, the predictions which we have considered not only announce the relative position of Jew and Gentile, but predict a remarkable phenomenon in the history of those Gentiles who were to embrace the faith of Christ. Some of them foretel the relapse of a great

and powerful Church into open and shameless idolatry, and not only particularize pseudo-catholicity and persecuting cruelty as the prominent features of her character, but describe her geographical position as seated upon seven hills; and lo, for six centuries and more the Church of Rome has been the mother and the mistress of all harlot-churches—drunk with the blood of the saints, and besotted with a senseless idolatry, ‘to be abhorred of all faithful Christians.’

Thus in all the great outlines of divine honour given to a Jew, faith in the Gentiles and unbelief in the Jews, and the subsequent defection of a powerful Christian church, there is an astonishing coincidence between the announcements of professed prophets and the events of history. The testimony of writers, contemporaries of that Jew whose influence has been so wonderful, points out coincidences still more striking and more minute. The prophets name the family, the time, the place of his nativity, the mode of his betrayal, the manner of his death, his resurrection and ascension. The epistles of St. Paul, the genuineness of which is conceded even by the infidel, assure us that in the most important of these particulars, the history of Jesus coincides with the declarations of the prophets. He was of the family of David; he came in the time of Pontius Pilate, *i. e.* during the second temple; he was betrayed; he died a violent and ignominious death; and Paul saw that he had risen and ascended

into heaven. The gospels, whose genuineness and authenticity remain unshaken, even by the latest efforts of infidelity, multiply particulars minutely coinciding with the announcements of the prophets. From them we learn that his hands and his feet were pierced; that he was sold for thirty pieces of silver; that lots were cast for his garment; that he was numbered with transgressors, and yet that his tomb was with the rich.

Such were the facts pressed upon your attention. There were prophecies containing hopes, or conjectures, or presentiments of individuals of the Hebrew race respecting one of their nation: and the testimony of contemporaries, the course of the world's history for one third portion of its whole existence—and the evidence of our senses up to this very hour, concur in making known to us the extraordinary coincidence of the reality of facts with the visions of prophetic anticipation; how, then, is this coincidence to be accounted for, or what the conclusion which we ought to draw from it? Shall we be satisfied with the answer of the infidel, that the coincidence is imaginary—that the prophecies could be brought to bear with equal cogency upon many other of the prominent characters in history? History and reason alike forbid us. Even a cursory perusal of the prophets proves beyond a doubt, that the Old-Testament writers expected one of their nation whose doctrine should have a wonderful influence upon the whole Gentile world. This is no

imagination, no violent perversion of the text—no mystical interpretation, but the plain, grammatical, unsophisticated meaning of the letter of Scripture, and the imagination has just as little to do with the fact that the influence of Jesus of Nazareth has produced the greatest moral revolution which the world has ever seen. Nothing can be more real than the coincidence—nothing further from a forced accommodation of prophetic hopes. The most ingenious rejecter of the gospel verity can find in the whole Jewish nation but one individual, whose name is great amongst the Gentiles, and honoured as the source of salvation to the ends of the earth. But when to this one great and astounding fact you come to add all the limitations of family, time, place of birth, manner of life and death, you reduce all chances of a second similar coincidence to an absolute impossibility. Shall we then ascribe the agreement of history and prophecy to chance? All right reason rejects the attempt as a mixture of profanity and folly. Every portion of creation bears witness to the wisdom of the Creator,—every work of his hands carries on it the stamp of design, counsel, deliberate arrangement; and shall we suppose that the moral world alone is left to chance—that the great God of nature makes bountiful provision for the wants, the circumstances, and the convenience of the plant or the reptile, and leaves the moral wants of his noblest work to the fortuitous fulfilment of the reveries of enthusiasts or impostors?

Science would reject with scorn any theory which explained the physical revolutions of the earth's surface by the fortuitous operation of unknown causes, and reason equally compels us to reject as absurd the assertion that men accidentally foreknew, or not foreknowing, accidentally foretold, the most beneficial occurrence in the history of mankind. The most unscientific of men will scarcely be persuaded that the correct calculation of eclipses, or of the return of comets, has been the result of chance; and how can we believe that the foreknowledge of the mode, the time, the instrument of man's deliverance from the errors and vices of idolatry was accidental? Had one prophet alone drawn the general outline, fortuitous coincidences would have been in the highest degree improbable; but when we remember that one prophet foretold the family, a second the place of his birth, a third the time, and a fourth some other particular, and that it is by putting all these particulars together, that the complete prophetic portrait is made up, the difficulty of fortuitous agreement is infinitely increased, and must at last be pronounced impossible.

Shall we assert, then, that the prophecies are the dictates of ripened experience, or a penetrating sagacity in observing the affairs of men and in calculating the effects of existing causes? This supposition is as untenable as the last. In the days of the prophets, the most improbable of all events was the continued existence of the Jewish nation and

religion, and its final triumph over the various forms of idolatry. From the days of Moses to the last of the prophets the tendency of the Jewish people was to approximate to the surrounding nations both in manners and religion, and as time rolled on, the total extinction of the Mosaic religion, and the absorption of Israel into the common vortex of universal heathenism, became more probable. Scarcely had the monarchy been firmly established in the family of David, and the possession of the land secured by the final conquest, before ten out of the twelve tribes openly declared for idolatry, and in a little time were finally lost amongst the nations. The small remnant of the house of Judah, both kings and people, with few exceptions, showed the same decided aversion to monotheism, and in their political relations became every day less able to resist the advances of invading hosts, so that the sagacious observer, far from predicting the final triumph of the religion of Moses, would rather have anticipated its final and total extinction in the destruction of the national existence—or even if he hoped the preservation of the true religion, how could he possibly be led to the idea that the nations would ultimately renounce the religion of their fathers in order to acknowledge one of the despised nation of the Jews as their God and their Saviour? All existing causes intimated results directly opposed to the prophetic anticipations, so as to make it absolutely necessary for mere worldly sagacity to re-



nounce all its accustomed modes of reasoning before it could indulge in hopes apparently so chimerical. Besides, the conjecture can only be admitted in the generality of idea, as soon as we come to the minuteness of detail respecting the person, the family, the time, the manner of an individual's death, into all which detail the prophets have entered, the possibility of solving the phenomena by sagacious conjecture ceases entirely and finally. If it were possible for a Hebrew prophet to entertain the hope that the Gentiles would ultimately worship his God, it was totally beyond his power to conjecture that the individual by whom this mighty change should be effected, should be descended from David, born at Bethlehem, appear in Galilee, be abhorred by his own people, and die a violent death, and purchase the glory of his triumph as the reward of the most profound humiliation. Who that does not follow the decisions of revelation, can declare the religious history of the world in futurity?—who can point to the individual who shall, a thousand years hence, like the Messiah of the prophets, influence the faith and practice of all the families of the earth for two millenniums after his death,—who can specify his nation, his family, and the time of his birth?—who is there that has so skilfully unravelled all the intricacies of national and individual destinies, obtained so clear an insight into the consequences, the disturbing forces, and the momenta of human contingencies, as to hazard a conjecture respecting the

continuance of any one existing family, or to particularize the history of that individual of its descendants who shall exercise the most influence upon his own and succeeding generations. None but the fool or the enthusiast will have temerity to enter on such speculations. The wise and the sagacious will readily confess that all such contingencies are far beyond the ken of human foresight, and cannot reasonably be made the subject of present conjecture.

To attempt to account for the agreement of history with prophecy on the supposition that the prophecies have wrought their own accomplishment, or have been forcibly fulfilled by impostors, is equally difficult. They were not written in a language known to the nations of the earth, and when translated there was nothing in themselves or the nation from which they emanated to command the acquiescence, much less the active co-operation, of men in effecting their accomplishment. To confess themselves to be in error, to acknowledge the falsehood of their religion, and mortify the dearest lusts of the human heart, and all this at the command of a Jew and at the risk of honour, property, and life, was what the prophets required of the heathen, and was certainly not alluring to the multitude, and must have been as unpalatable to the taste as it was beyond the power of any number of impostors. If some native of Bethlehem and descendant of

David had been found willing, for the sake of personating the Messiah, to offer himself to a violent death, yet to produce faith in the Gentiles, and unbelief in the Jews, and at the same time to effect the preservation of his own supposititious religion, and the continued existence of the Jewish nation for many centuries after his decease, was clearly impossible. It exceeded the power of man; and as a lie and an imposture could not have obtained the power and the co-operation of the Divine Being, there is, therefore, only one rational solution, and that is, that the coincidence between history and prophecy is the effect on the one hand of the Divine prescience, and on the other of the almighty power, of the Creator. Necessity drives us to the conclusion, and there is nothing in the Divine character or attributes by which it is opposed. Even had there been no prophecy going before, the beneficial results produced by the overthrow of polytheism, and the triumph of the religion of Christ, the salutary tendency of his doctrine would lead us to infer that this great moral revolution is the Lord's doing, and would therefore make it marvellous, *i. e.*, supernatural in our eyes. But when to all this is added that this change in its causes, its progress, and its results has been the subject of prophecy for above a thousand years before its commencement, we are compelled to conclude that it has God for its author—that the prophecies were the dictates of

his wisdom, and that Jesus of Nazareth, in whose history they have been fulfilled, is the true Messiah, the Saviour of the world.

However, in the popular sense, the age of miracles may be past, God hath not left himself without witness, nor us without a supernatural manifestation of his immediate superintendence of the affairs of men. The coincidence of history and prophecy is a perpetual miracle, ever new in every generation, and yet as certainly the operation of Divine power and wisdom as the dividing of the Red Sea by the staff of Moses, or the descent of fire from heaven, in answer to the prayers of Elijah; as palpable to the senses, and as far above the reach of fraud or imposture; and whenever asked for a reason of the hope that is in him, or perplexed by the cunning craftiness of those who lie in wait to deceive, the Christian can here point to the finger of God, and here find a sure warrant for his faith. There were prophecies going before. There is in the history of Jesus an accurate and wonderful fulfilment. The coincidence can be ascribed to nothing but the will and power of the Almighty. The prophecies, therefore, are divine, and Jesus is the Messiah.

Such was the result proposed to be established by these lectures. We cannot, however, dismiss the subject before us, without adverting to some other important results which flow from the past fulfilment of prophecy. The coincidence which we have just considered is of use, not only in con-

firming our faith, but in animating and regulating our hope, and guarding us against serious practical error. The literal and accurate accomplishment of so many prophecies leads us to expect with confidence the fulfilment of those which still remain, and thus fills the mind with bright prospects of hope concerning the future destinies of our fellow men and the world which we inhabit. It has pleased the Divine Being not only to give us a never-failing confirmation of our faith in the prophecies already accomplished, and an adequate view of our duty in the moral precepts, but to reveal in oracles reaching to the end of time the ultimate triumph of truth and holiness, the destruction of the wicked, and the final blessedness of this earth; and in the partial fulfilment which we behold, we have an earnest of their future and complete accomplishment. Thus St. Peter argued from the glory manifested at the transfiguration to the certainty of a full manifestation at the second advent. 'We have not followed cunningly devised fables,' said he, (2 Ep. i. 16,) 'when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of his majesty. For he received from God the Father honour and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount; and have the word of prophecy more

sure; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts.' And what the transfiguration was to St. Peter, the past and present fulfilment of prophecy is to us. It assures us that we are not following cunningly devised fables, and makes the word of prophecy concerning the future more sure. It enables us, amidst the cares and troubles of time, and the clouds which occasionally spread a gloom over the Church of God, to look forward to a brighter day, and to interpret with more certainty that which is said concerning it.

There is one lesson, however, suggested by the entire inquiry in which we have been engaged, which must not be overlooked, and that is, the great danger of ignorance of the prophecies. In explaining particular prophecies, and showing their fulfilment, the unbelief of the Jewish nation has been frequently noticed; but whence did this unbelief arise, and how has it been continued? No doubt, the depravity of the human heart, the love of the world, the force of prejudice, have all had their share in its formation, but it cannot be denied that the main cause was and is, ignorance of those prophecies which related to the humiliation and suffering of the Messiah. 'They were slow to believe all that the prophets had spoken. They knew not the time of their visitation.' They could not discern the signs of the times, and therefore recognised not

the Holy One and the Just when he appeared in the midst of them. They did not understand the prophecies respecting the call of the Gentiles, and therefore by opposing it filled up the measure of their iniquity, as St. Paul says, (1 Thess. ii. 15,) 'Who both killed the Lord Jesus and their own prophets, and have persecuted us; and they please not God, and are contrary to all men, forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles, that they might be saved, to fill up the measure of their wrath always.' From these evils, a knowledge of the prophecies would have delivered them. How carefully, then, ought we to study all that God has vouchsafed to reveal respecting the future destinies of the Jew and the Gentile, and the Church of God. A common prejudice prevailed largely in the Church, that to study unfulfilled prophecy is no part of a Christian's duty—that to compare what has been fulfilled with its accomplishment is the very utmost that can be required in reference to the prophetic Scriptures; but that the devotional, the historical, and the preceptive portions of the Bible should be the objects of our exclusive attention.

This prejudice has been common, but warranted by no declaration of the Almighty. St. Paul declares, generally, that 'Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we, through patience and comfort of the Scripture, might have hope.' St. Peter says particularly, 'That we do well to take heed to the word of

prophecy as unto a light that shineth in a dark place.' And concerning that which is considered most obscure of all the prophecies, the book of the Revelation to St. John, the Lord himself says— 'Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy and keep those things which are written therein, for the time is at hand.' How, then, is it possible for any one believing these declarations to consider himself exempted from the study of any portion of the prophetic writings—to think that he can walk safely without giving heed to that light that shineth in darkness, or that he can please God whilst wantonly rejecting that special blessing pronounced upon the study of prophecy? How can a Church be secure if such neglect were common, or faith in the divine promise generally regarded as fanaticism? Judging by the analogy of the Jews, a more certain presage of approaching destruction can hardly be imagined, in individual or church, than a wilful neglect or an infidel contempt of the voice of prophecy. It argues either a latent unbelief, or an unusual degree of spiritual pride, when men denounce as unprofitable that which God has revealed for their benefit; and who can be astonished, if by a just retribution they are visited with that judicial blindness which at last makes 'the vision of all as a sealed book.' It is true that injudicious men have, by vainly attempting to calculate times and determine the dates of particular events, excited an unjust prejudice against



prophetic study; but will the folly of some excuse the deliberate disobedience of others? He who does nothing in vain must, in making known the destinies of men to the end of time, have had some wise purpose to fulfil, and that purpose could certainly not have been, to have them passed by in neglect. One great use of prophecy is that for which we have just employed it, to confirm our faith by considering its accomplishment; but this is far from being the only or the primary object, for which it was given. St. Paul, we see, includes it in all Scripture given for consolation and hope; and St. Peter calls it a light. In the hour of the Church's trial it affords a distinct hope of deliverance, and in the days of her prosperity gives notice of the approaching sorrows, and warns her to prepare for the conflict. Nothing can be more false than the common maxim, that prophecy was not given to make us prophets—*i. e.*, to enable us to foreknow future events. On the contrary, for this purpose, principally, to exercise our faith and guide our practice, it has been intended in every age. To comfort the pious Jews in the hour of danger, Isaiah was sent to declare the birth of Immanuel, and Jeremiah to announce the seventy years' limit to the captivity. To enable his disciples to escape, Christ foretold the signs of Jerusalem's approaching desolation; and to arouse all men to constant watchfulness and earnest prayer, he has made known the signs preceding his second advent. He, therefore,

who neglects the study of prophecy must not flatter himself that he is merely escaping from a matter of little practical concernment, or doubtful interpretation, which may be studied or neglected with impunity: he is treating a large portion of divine revelation with contempt, depriving himself of the consolation and hope which it was designed to impart, shutting his ears against its warnings, making it impossible for him to perform its duties, losing a blessing, and drawing down upon himself that punishment which is sure to follow neglected duty. How has the whole Christian Church suffered and sinned already from the neglect of that one class of prophecies relating to the destinies of Jerusalem and the Jewish people. Had they been borne in mind, could Rome have ever attained her usurped supremacy, or intoxicated the nations with the wine of her fornication? The prophecies would have enabled men to see that the restored Jerusalem is the appointed mistress and mother of all Churches, and the only metropolis of the Church universal recognised in Scripture. Yea, had this portion of God's revelation been diligently studied, could our own Church have been guilty of that dereliction of duty now chargeable upon her in leaving the Jewish people to this hour uncared for, to perish in their unbelief? It is a melancholy and painful truth, but one which no faithful friend of the Church dare pass in silence, that whatever efforts have been made to bring the perishing Jews to the knowledge

of salvation, have been made by individuals or private societies. The great body of the Church has altogether ignored those efforts, or looked on in silence. But let me not be mistaken: allow me to correct a common error and justify the Church we love. That Church itself has done much more than any or all the Churches of Christendom. By appointing her daily and Sunday lessons from the unfulfilled prophecies, by devoting the Sundays of advent almost exclusively to the consideration of this subject, and by commanding prayer for the conversion of Israel to be offered up in the most solemn of all her services, she has left without excuse all those of her children, who, unlike the good Samaritan, look upon the wounded man, and pass by on the other side in apathetic silence.

The Church is altogether guiltless. She has set before us the Scriptures treating the subject. She has enjoined the duty of intercession. Her chief pastors, also, in times past, as well as now, have, by their expositions, testified their interest in the welfare of Israel, and the lectures now concluded are themselves a proof of the earnestness with which it is regarded. The Church's children only are to be blamed, who have been hearers of the word, and not doers; hypocritical supplicants for an event which they have never heartily endeavoured to accomplish. God grant that this state of neglect and disobedience may soon terminate, and that the judgments which it involves may be speedily,

averted. Be assured that it is no common measure of guilt and danger, which their continuance would accumulate upon us. Hear how the Lord reproaches the Chaldeans for similar conduct. 'I was wroth with my people; I have polluted mine inheritance, and given them into thine hand: thou didst show them no mercy.' (Isaiah xlvii. 6.) Hear how (Zech. i. 15) he threatens the heathen of old, saying—'I am sore displeased with the heathen that are at ease: for I was but a little displeased, and they helped forward the affliction.' And think you that he will overlook the heartless neglect of the Jewish people practised by those who have received a command to preach the gospel to every creature? If he punished the ignorant and idolatrous heathen, he will surely not suffer us to escape with impunity. If, therefore, we desire to avert God's wrath from ourselves, our Church, or our nation, let us faithfully fulfil our duty towards the Jewish people. It may soon be too late; our day of grace may soon be past; and our Church, the only Church whose reformers, by commanding the public reading of the prophets, has commended the subject scripturally to the attention of her children—whose prelates and divines, almost exclusively, have maintained the true interpretation of prophecy—may lose the blessing. The roll of Israel's destiny is now rapidly unfolding; the tide of political interest already rolls back upon the shores of Judea; the Jewish people itself awakes from the torpor of

centuries, and stretches forth its hands after the inheritance of its fathers; the Rabbinist shakes off his adamantine fetters; the Gentile nations look wistfully at the hastening consummation of the word of prophecy. Even the eye of the worldly statesman begins to recognise the work and hand of the Almighty, and to desire to co-operate. And shall the Church of England alone be blind to the signs of the times, and deaf to the voice of prophecy? Shall she alone refuse to lift up her voice with strength, to say to the cities of Judah, Behold thy God? We trust not. Some of her sons have already gone to seek the lost sheep of Israel in the lands of their dispersion. Her liturgy already exists in the sacred language of the Hebrews, the voice of her prayer and praise already ascends from the hill of Zion, and soon we hope that the whole Church, her prelates, her pastors, and her people, will all unite in the glorious work of bearing good tidings to Jerusalem.

Yea, brethren, let this be the practical inference, this our constant and earnest prayer—that the Spirit of God may enable us individuals, as a Church and nation, to know the day of our visitation, to understand the voice of prophecy, and to fulfil our duty.



## APPENDIX OF INTERPRETATION.

---

MANY of the preceding arguments rest on the interpretation of the Scripture passages cited. The interpretation sometimes requires remarks in justification. These remarks are now presented in the form of an Appendix, as briefly as possible, and in the order of the Biblical Books, as being the most convenient to the reader.

### I. GENESIS III. 14, 15.

These verses are generally regarded as containing the first promise of redemption, and are important as exhibiting the nature of the promised deliverance. The English translation gives the sense as received by the Jews. 'Bruise' is the very best word that can be chosen here to express the Hebrew שׁוּף. The original word occurs in the same sense in Chaldee, as is legitimately observed by Rashi in his Commentary, and by Fürst in his Concordance; and by Gesenius in his German Manual of 1823, where he also compares the Talmudic use of the word in the same sense. The Vulgate has 'conteret.' The Syriac gives the same sense. The Syriac gives the same sense, ܢܩܣܡ and ܢܥܣܘܠ. The LXX has here τμησῆσαι, as the Vulgate has the second time 'insidiaberis;' but in Job ix. 17, it gives the other sense, ἐκτρίψῃ. It is hardly necessary to say that the Vulgate 'ipsa' has no foundation in the Hebrew. The verb יִשׁוּף is masculine, so, therefore, must the הוּא be, as the

LXX and the Syriac render it. Not the woman, but the seed of the woman, is to bruise the serpent's head.

With respect to the interpretation, whether this third chapter of Genesis be regarded as an allegorical account of the fall of man and the introduction of evil, or a real history, these verses, 14, 15, must be interpreted as a promise of deliverance. In both points of view the serpent is a tempter—the yielding to temptation a sin followed by actual calamity. The promise of bruising the serpent's head must therefore signify deliverance, both from the moral and physical evil. I myself believe that the chapter contains a real history, narrated in all simplicity, as the facts appeared to our first parents, and probably handed down from themselves.

1. The book of Genesis is evidently a narrative of facts. The call of Abraham, the deluge, the wickedness of the Antediluvians, the birth of Seth, the murder of Abel, the birth of him and Cain, are all related as real history : these things are immediately connected with what precedes as part of the same narrative. There can, therefore, be no reason for making the preceding part an allegory.

2. The great majority of Jews and Jewish interpreters receive it and treat it as real history.

3. Our Lord, Matt. xix. 5, 6, refers to the creation of Eve as to real history. St. Paul, Rom. v. 12, 2 Cor. xi. 3, 1 Tim. ii. 13, 14, speaks of the temptation and fall in such a manner as to preclude the possibility of allegoric interpretation by any one who believes that St. Paul was inspired. The facts as related, then, are these. Eve was tempted by the serpent **הנחש**, Adam by Eve. Both transgressed the command of God, and incurred the penalty. They passed from the immortal state into the state of physical mortality, from innocence to a consciousness of guilt. Great and dreadful was the change both in body and mind. In this



state of suffering God mercifully entered into judgment, and promised that the head of the Tempter should be bruised by the seed of the woman. The promise was very general: perhaps obscure. As to the person of the Redeemer it may not have been as fully understood as by us (though of that we know nothing certain). As to the promise of future deliverance, I doubt not that it was better understood than it ever has been by any child of Adam. None of the human race but Adam and Eve were ever conscious of the happy state of innocence, immortality, and similitude to God. None, then, can comprehend as they did the awfulness of the fall into a state of guilt, sin, and physical mortality; and, therefore, none know the want of deliverance, or appreciate the particular nature of the deliverance required. Some writers are fond of talking of Adam and Eve as knowing nothing, and having only dim glimmerings of future salvation. I am persuaded that none of the readers of the New Testament ever understood the nature of ruin and redemption like that unhappy pair, who had actual experience of both states.

As to the person of the Tempter, we are not told whether they knew that it was Satan, and therefore can assert nothing about it. The narrative leads us to believe that he made use of the body of a serpent. The traditions of the Jews,\* and the plain declarations of the New Testament, assure us that the real Tempter was the devil.† We, therefore, can know that the promise of deliverance includes redemption from the powers of the devil, and all his works. The fact that it was given to Adam proves that the Old-Testament doctrine of redemption refers not to the national

\* See Eisenmenger's *entdecktes Judenthum*, I. p. 822; Breithaupt's *Rashi*, t. Gen. iii. 1, note 7; *Moreh Nevochim*, part ii. c. 30, in Buxtorf's translation, p. 280.

† John viii. 44; Rom. xv. 20; Rev. xii. 9.

restoration of the Jews, but to the deliverance of the human race from the evils of the fall. It becomes, therefore, the key to the promises which follow, and to the nature of Messiah's work; and at the very outset refutes all the rationalist assertions about the national particularism of the Jewish Scriptures.

## II. GENESIS XLIX. 10.

‘The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a law-giver from between his feet until Shiloh come.’

The English version gives the general sense correctly—**לא יסור** with **מ** following, signifies ‘to cease.’ Compare 1 Sam. vi. 3; 2 Sam. xii. 10, vii. 15; Zech. x. 11.

**שבט** ‘Sceptre’ might be more accurately rendered ‘Tribal Staff,’ significant of the government of the tribe. Thus, verse sixteen of this chapter, Judges v. 14, Ps. xlv. 7, Amos i. 5, 8, Isaiah xiv. 5. Some Jews would interpret it of ‘the rod of correction;’ but this is refuted, first, by the parallelism. **שבט** must have some meaning correlative to **מחקק** ‘Lawgiver:’ second, by the general consent of the Jews. Onkelos has **עֵבֶר שׁוֹלֵטָן**, LXX *ἄρχων*; and so Dr. Solomon of Hamburg, and Dr. Zunz, in their versions have ‘Scepter’ and ‘Herscherstab.’

**מחקק** ‘Lawgiver’ or ‘Judge.’ All are agreed as to the general meaning of this word. See Judges v. 14, Isaiah xxxiii. 22, Ps. lx. 9, Prov. viii. 15. The last passage seems to imply that **מחקק** signifies a subordinate magistrate. The meaning then would be, ‘Judah shall never want a chief or subordinate magistrates until, &c.’

‘From between his feet.’ See Deut. xxviii. 57, and Gen. xlv. 26. Abarbanel takes it in the sense of sitting at the feet of a Rabbi to learn; but the true sense is conveyed by the passages referred to. Instead of **רגליו** the Samaritan has **עד בי רגליו** ‘until.’ Some Jews separate these words,

and translate, 'Nor a lawgiver from between his feet for ever, for Shiloh shall come,' in order to get rid of the limitation of the time respecting Messiah's advent, and the consequence that the time is passed. It is true that Onkelos has **עד עלמא** 'for ever;' but he immediately adds **עד דייתי משיחא** 'until Messiah come.' We can, therefore, cite his authority for the English version, and, besides, that of Aben Ezra, Levi ben Gershom, Bechai, Lipman, Solomon, and Zunz. Secondly, we have the Bible authority for asserting that **כי עד** must be taken together, and signify 'until.' See Gen. xxvi. 13, xli. 49, and 2 Sam. xxiii. 10, and observe the accentuation. For Jethiv serving Zakeph Katon see Judges iv. 24 and 1 Sam. xxii. 3.

**שילה** 'Shiloh.' Some Jews take *Shiloh* as the name of the well-known locality, and translate 'until one come to Shiloh,' and understand the passage thus: 'Judah shall have the pre-eminence or lead until they come to Shiloh.' But this sense cannot be maintained, for, first, there was probably no such place in Jacob's time. It is not mentioned in the Pentateuch. It first occurs Josh. xviii. 1, and was probably only a place of rest or encampment for the ark and people at first, and hence the name Shiloh, *i. e.* 'Rest,' or 'peace.' Compare Ps. cxxxii. 8, and the account given in the passage of Joshua, 'The congregation of the children of Israel assembled together at Shiloh, and set up the tabernacle of the congregation there, and the land was subdued before them.' But even if there was such a place known to Jacob, the interpretation 'until they come to Shiloh' gives an insipidity to the whole, which shows that it is false—and, besides, it is contrary to fact. Judah was indeed foremost in fighting, but had not the chief command. Neither Moses nor Joshua was of the tribe of Judah.

2. Kimchi, Junius and Tremellius, take Shiloh as compounded of **שיל**, *son*, and the suffix **י**, *his*, and translate

‘ Until his son come.’ So the Pseudo-Jonathan says, ‘ Until the time that the King Messiah, the least of his sons shall come.’ They refer to **שליה**, Deut. xxviii. 57. But this feminine does not signify ‘ child ;’ and, further, **שיל** would not be the form of its masculine.

3. Others, as Onkelos, interpret **שילה** ‘ Whose it is,’ ‘ He to whom it belongs.’ This interpretation is ancient, finds favour amongst more modern Jews, and has some support from Ezek. xxi. 32. (English 27.) But this seems rather a happy allusion than an interpretation. The **י**, and the **ה** at the end, seem to give the correct reading here, and to mark it as a proper name.

4. The truth is, that Shiloh is a noun, of the form **שלה**, **כידור**, Isa. viii. 6, **קיטור**, **צינק**, and **גלה** ; the name of a place, Josh. xv. 51. It signifies ‘ peace,’ the abstract put for the concrete, as Gesenius takes the corresponding word, **שלום**, Gen. xliii. 27. **חשלום אביכם**, ‘ Is your father well?’ literally, ‘ Is your father peace?’ Compare 1 Sam. xxv. 6, and especially Micah v. 4. ‘ This man shall be our peace.’ The name ‘ Shiloh’ is similar, therefore, to Solomon, and signifies ‘ peace,’ or ‘ the peaceful one.’

‘ Gathering,’ **יקהת**, more properly ‘ obedience.’ See Proverbs xxx. 17.

‘ People,’ **עמים**, ‘ Nations,’ parallel with **לאמים**. Gen. xxvii. 29. Compare Exod. xv. 14, Deut. xxxii. 8, xxxiii. 17.

The sense of the whole verse, then, is, ‘ A chief tribal governor shall not cease from Judah, nor a subordinate magistrate from his posterity, until he who is PEACE shall come, and to him shall be the obedience of the nations ;’ *i. e.* that until the appearance of Shiloh, Judah should not lose its separate existence as a tribe, nor its independent government : that the heathen should obey Him. History tells us that the ten tribes lost both their tribal existence and their government seven hundred years before the Christian era :

that the tribe of Judah continued, and had an independent government until after the birth of Christ: that soon after the whole Jewish polity was brought to an end by the destruction of Jerusalem: that the obedience of the nations was to Jesus of Nazareth, and still continues: that Jesus taught the true principles of peace with God and with all the children of men. A society exists asserting that war is unlawful: calling upon all men to promote universal peace. They ground their chief arguments upon the precepts and example of Jesus, and the spirit of his religion: a striking proof of the tendency of his principles: a tendency nowhere else existing in any other religion or system of morals. Is not this the Shiloh? does not the fulfilment explain the prophecy, and at the same time prove that the prophecy is of God? To the Jews this argument ought to be more cogent still, as the great weight of Jewish tradition is in favour of the Messianic interpretation. The Targums of Onkelos and the Jerusalem: Zohar on Exod. fol. 49, col. 195. Yalkut Shimoni, i. fol. 49, 3. Bereshith Rabba, sec. 98, fol. 95, col. 1. Sanhedrin, fol. 90, 2; and Rabbi Bechai in loc., although Mauasseh ben Israel suppresses this testimony in his Conciliator, Question 68 on Genesis.

## DEUT. XVIII. 15—19.

With regard to the interpretation of this passage, the Rabbis are divided: and their differences show that they have no authoritative interpretation: that they utter only their own private opinion: and that, as Kimchi and Alshech differ from Aben Esra, and Bechai, and Abarbanel from all the others, they were in a difficulty: that they were unconvinced by their fellow Rabbis, and felt the necessity of some interpretation differing from that adopted by Christians.

1. Abarbanel suggests that Jeremiah was the prophet like unto Moses: and collects fourteen points of resemblance. Some of these might be applied to Isaiah and other prophets as well as to Jeremiah, as the seventh, 'that Moses often reprov'd Israel for their sins, and so did Jeremiah.' The eighth, 'Moses told Israel respecting their captivity, and their deliverance therefrom: so did Jeremiah.' The ninth, 'Moses reprov'd Israel for profaning the Sabbath: so did Jeremiah.' It is clear that not one of these is distinctive: and so it is with others. Indeed, Abarbanel was hard set to find a prophet like unto Moses, when he fix'd on Jeremiah. Moses was a deliverer, the beginner of Israel's national independence, the author of the song of triumph, and, under God, supreme governor. Jeremiah involved in the calamities of his people, a witness of national ruin, the author of the Lamentations, and the helpless victim of oppression. He is, therefore, not the prophet like unto Moses.

2. Aben Ezra and Bechai, and others, prefer Joshua. But he was not like Moses in those things in which Moses was peculiar. He was not a mediator. He was not the revealer of the will of God. He had no direct vision of the Almighty. Hengstenberg says that 'He had neither the name nor the characteristic of a prophet.' Joshua had the Spirit, and to have the Spirit as he had is to be a prophet. Compare Numbers xi. 29 with xxvii. 18, and Deut. xxxiv. 9. It is enough to say that he had not the essential features of the office and character of Moses.

3. Rashi, Kimchi, and Alshech, say that 'the prophet like unto Moses' implies a succession of prophets, one after the other. They acknowledge, therefore, that they could not find any individual to whom similarity to Moses could be ascribed: at the same time they have devised an interpretation partly agreeable to the context. But against this

interpretation, we have, first, the fact, that **נביא** prophet, is singular. God says, not ‘prophets,’ but ‘a prophet.’ Secondly, that this word **נביא** is never taken collectively, nor the prophets elsewhere spoken of collectively. Thirdly, that sacred history points out no such succession of one prophet; and, fourthly, this and the preceding interpretations are all contrary to two plain passages of Scripture. Numbers xii. 6-8 asserts distinctly that Moses was a prophet unlike the generality of prophets—and Deut. xxxiv. 10-12, a passage inserted probably by Esra, asserts that there arose no prophet like unto Moses. Both point out those things in which he was peculiar. Indeed, the Jews themselves, when not engaged in controversy with Christians, admit that Moses had peculiar privileges in which no other prophet was like him.\* Maimonides reckons four particulars in which Moses differed from all other prophets: first, ‘All other prophets prophesied in a dream or vision: Moses in a waking state, and standing.’ Second, ‘All other prophets prophesied by the intervention of an angel, and, therefore, what they saw was in a similitude or enigma; Moses, mouth to mouth, as it is said, ‘The Lord spake to Moses face to face,’ and ‘The similitude of the Lord shall he behold.’ Third, ‘All the other prophets were terrified, confounded, and fainting; but Moses ‘as a man speaketh with his friend,’ therefore without fear.’ Fourth, ‘The other prophets could not prophesy whenever they wished. But, whenever Moses desired, the Holy Spirit clothed him, and the prophetic power rested upon him; and he was not obliged to raise and prepare his mind, for he was always ready, like the ministering angels.’ This statement, generally received by the modern Jews, is sufficient to refute the three Jewish interpretations, and to show that neither Jeremiah nor Joshua,

\* Hilehoth Jesode Hattorah, c. vii.

nor any one of the prophets, was a prophet like unto Moses.

4. To be a prophet like unto Moses, the antitype must, in the first place, be a mediator between God and man. This the context absolutely requires. ‘The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him shall ye hearken; according to all that thou desiredst of the Lord thy God in Horeb in the day of the assembly, saying, Let me not hear again the voice of the Lord my God, neither let me see this great fire any more, that I die not. And the Lord said unto me, They have well spoken that which they have spoken. I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee,’ &c. Israel was afraid of the manifestation of majesty on Sinai, and asked for some one to stand between them and God; to hold converse with the Lord, and bring down the divine communications. The Lord promised one who should be like in this respect. He who fulfils the prophecy must, then, be a mediator, receiving communications in the same way.

Secondly,—Moses was a redeemer from slavery, which no other prophet was; his antitype must be a redeemer also.

Thirdly,—Moses alone of all the prophets, was supreme governor; he was ‘king in Jeshurun.’ The promised prophet must be invested with similar dignity. Prophet, Mediator, Redeemer, King of Israel! These particulars belong to none but Messiah. According even to Jewish interpretation, these characteristics belong to him. Messiah is promised as *prophet* with the Spirit ever *resting* on him, Isaiah xi. 2, xlii. 1, lxi. 1; as *mediator*, coming from God with a covenant, Isaiah xlii. 6, compared with Jer. xxxi. 31; ascending into the presence of God as Moses did, Ps. cx. 1, Isaiah liii. 12; as *redeemer*, Isaiah lix. 20, Jer. xxiii. 6; as



*king*, Ezek. xxxvii. 39, Zech. ix. 9. Messiah is, then, the only prophet resembling Moses.

That this was once the popular interpretation amongst the Jews, is evident from John i. 21, vi. 14, vii. 40. Even the Samaritan woman referred to the promise, iv. 25; ‘When he is come, he will tell us all things,’ compared with Deut. xviii. 18, ‘He shall speak all that I shall command him.’ That this is the true interpretation, appears not only from what is said above, but from the testimony of God, Matt. xvii. 5, and of Peter, Acts iii. 22, 23, and from the fulfilment.

1. The Lord Jesus Christ was a prophet. He revealed perfectly the will and law of God, in his various discourses. He made known the future destinies of the kingdom of God amongst Jews and Gentiles. He predicted his own resurrection, the preaching of the gospel, the destruction of Jerusalem. Matt. xxiv. 14, 34, 36. He bestowed the spirit of prophecy upon others. 1 Pet. i. 11; 1 Cor. xii.; Rev. xix. 10. His disciples have predicted that of which much has come to pass. Rom. xi.; 1 Tim. iv. 2; 2 Pet. ii. iii., the Book of Revelation. We might even take Maimonides’ account of the peculiar privileges of Moses, and show that the true antitype is found in our Lord. He prophesied in the waking state, on the Mount, walking with his disciples, or sitting with them contemplating the glory of the Temple. Did Moses speak face to face, as a man speaketh with his friend? St. John says, ‘No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared Him.’ (John i. 18.) Did Moses prophesy whenever he would, and did the power of prophecy always rest upon him? ‘He whom the Father hath sent, speaketh the words of God; for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him.’ (John iii. 34.) If we compare the Old Testament with the New, in his character are

found the peculiar features that distinguished Moses from all the prophets. He is the true Mediator, Redeemer, and King of Israel. And, lastly, God has fulfilled His threat of vengeance upon those who refused to hearken to that prophet. Judgment has descended upon the Jews to the uttermost. The concluding verse of the prophecy under consideration, says, ‘Whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I, even I, **אֲנֹכִי אֲדַרֵּשׁ**, will require it of him.’ So the LXX, *Ἐγὼ ἐκδικήσω ἐξ αὐτοῦ*. Vulgate, *Ego ultor existam*. The Syriac **ܫܠܝܢ ܐܢܝܢܐ ܕܝܗܘܐ**. Onkelos, **ממרי יתבע מניח**. All, except our English version, preserve the force of the repetition of the personal pronoun, implying that God himself will take vengeance; and therefore Aben Ezra says, **מיתתו בידי השמים**. ‘His death shall be by divine visitation.’ The verb **דרש**, to inquire, is frequently used in the sense of taking vengeance, as Gen. ix. 5; Ps. ix. 13, x. 13. Now that the Jews are suffering the wrath of God, they themselves admit; that the judgment began soon after their rejection of Christ, they cannot deny. The Jews, as a nation, refused to hearken to the words of Christ; divine vengeance soon overtook them, and is not yet removed. We abhor the cruelties and oppressions that have been inflicted on this people; but we cannot help recognising the hand of God in their history since the crucifixion of Jesus, and acknowledging that the providence of God has contributed its portion to the proof that Jesus of Nazareth is the Prophet like unto Moses.

#### PSALM II.

In interpreting this Psalm, it is satisfactory to notice—

I. The time of its composition. It is certainly a Psalm of David. Acts iv. 25, will satisfy on this point any one who believes the New Testament. Rashi and Kimchi

ascribe it to David himself: Aben Ezra to the time of David. Even modern criticism does not make it later than Solomon. Ewald says, 'This beautiful Psalm must necessarily have proceeded from the most glorious period of the monarchy,' and that the flourishing period of the monarchy is confined to the time of David, and the beginning of Solomon's reign. Venema gives three reasons for ascribing it to David. But it is enough to say, that, judged merely by internal evidence, it cannot be assigned to any time after that of Solomon, as no subsequent king had even the twelve tribes, much less all the ends of the earth, subject to him. This Psalm proclaims, therefore, the hope of the devout Israelite a thousand years before the coming of Christ.

II. It is necessary to notice the translations of some important words. In verse 12, the words נשקו בר (kiss the Son) are rendered by the LXX *ἀρᾶξασθε παιδείας*: by the Chaldee, in the same sense, קבילו אולפנא, and by the Vulgate, 'Apprehendite disciplinam.' Ewald gives a similar version, 'Nehmt Rath an' (*Receive advice*). Of this it is sufficient to say that it is a commentary, but not a translation: and that learned men are not even agreed as to how this explanation could have arisen from the words. The verb נשק, *to kiss*, is not employed metaphorically in the sense of *embracing, laying hold of*. בר does not ever signify *learning*. The rendering is, therefore, false.

Some modern Jews, anxious to get rid of this command to do homage to the Son of God, render the words, 'Arm yourselves with purity.' But the incorrectness of this is easily proved. 1st. The verb נשק, in Piel, as it is here, means only to kiss.—(See Gen. xxix. 13; xxxi. 28; xxxii. ; xlv. 15.) Gesenius, in his Thesaurus, shows that even in Kal it does not mean to 'arm.' 2ndly. בר does not mean 'purity.' If it be the adjective, then it is 'Kiss the pure one.' 3rdly. The overwhelming weight of authority, Jewish

and Gentile, is in favour of our English version, 'Kiss the Son.' Of ancients, the Syriac version, and the Midrash (which interprets 'Kiss the Son,' of appeasing the Son: **כַּיִסּוּ בֶן**)\*. Aben Ezra (who refers to Prov. xxxi. 2), Mendelssohn, Zunz, Dr. Solomon of Hamburg, Gesenius, De Wette, all interpret it of doing homage to the Son. The Son, The Anointed, is mentioned before as the Being against whom the king and nations rebel. Here they are warned against the consequences. The word **בֶּר** is used instead of **בֶּן**, because of **פֶּן** immediately following.

### III. The interpretation.

1. Ewald and others say that Solomon is the subject. But the rebellion of kings and Gentiles here spoken of does not agree with the perfect peace described 1 Kings iv. 20—25, and v. 4; (Heb. v. 1—5, and 18.)

2. Rashi and others interpret the Psalm of David, and refer it to the beginning of his kingdom, 2 Sam. v. 17.

But, first, the Philistines, as Kimchi remarks, had no kings, but princes, **סַרְנֵי הַפְּלִשְׁתִּים**. 2ndly. The expressions, **גּוֹיִם וְלְאֻמִּים**, 'heathen and nations,' and 'kings of the earth,' are too general for this. 3rdly. The Philistines were not in a state of servitude to Israel, so as to say, 'Let us break their bonds in sunder,' Similar reasons forbid a reference to 2 Sam. viii., and the mention of heathen and foreign nations shows that none of the domestic rebellions can be here intended. 4thly. David never had a kingdom so extensive as that here spoken of. 5thly. To David cannot be applied the words, 'I have begotten thee,' nor 'Blessed are all they that put their trust in him.'

3. Others interpret this Psalm of the Messiah. That this was the old Jewish interpretation is admitted by Rashi, and is testified by the Talmud, (c. g., Succah. fol. 52,

\* Jalkut Shimoni, in loc.

col. 1; Avodah Zarah, fol. 3, col. 2,) Zohar, (e. g., fol. 87, col. 318,) Jalkut Shimoni, which gives a most remarkable exposition; Saadiah Gaon, in his commentary on David. That this is the true interpretation appears from the internal evidence. 1st. He is called 'The Son of God,' and is said to be begotten. The title 'Son of God' is not one belonging to the kingly office in Israel, and therefore the comparison with the Homeric epithets, *διογενής*, *διοτρεφής*, &c., is quite out of place. The word *ילד*, *to beget*, is not applied anywhere but here to a king, and never signifies 'to adopt,' as De Wette himself admits. 2ndly. All kings are commanded to show their wisdom by 'kissing the Son,' that is, at the very least, by doing homage to him, lest, if he be angry, they perish from the way. 3rdly. All men who trust in Him are pronounced blessed, whilst those who trust in other men are pronounced cursed, Jer. xvii. 5; Isaiah ii. 22; Ps. cxviii. 9, cxlvi. 13. 4thly. A kingdom over the heathen to the very ends of the earth is promised to Him. The ends of the earth, *אפסי ארץ*, mean the extremities of the world. Compare 1 Sam. ii. 10; Ps. lix. 14, lxvii. 8. 5thly. Rebellion against him is rebellion against God. These five particulars can be found in none but the Messiah, the Lord Jesus Christ.

It is objected, first, that the Messiah of the New Testament is no conqueror of nations with a rod of iron. Augustine and Theodorit explain this of the triumph over sin. But this is not necessary. Christ is the Ruler of nations, and has already bruised many with his rod of iron. Compare Revelations ii. 27, xii. 5, xix. 15; and in the Old Testament, Isaiah xi. 4; Ps. cx. 6.

Further, it is objected that here nations are spoken of who had been already subdued, and now tried to cast off their allegiance: that this is not applicable to Christian nations. The latest history of the past, and the prophecy of

the future, teach us that formal apostasy is possible and probable, even on the part of nations once professing Christianity. In fact, the true commentary to this Psalm is found in the book of Revelations.

### PSALM XVI.

In the great diversity of opinions respecting the translation of this Psalm, it may be most convenient to give the version which appears to me the most probable, and then to give the reasons and authorities in short notes.

'1. Preserve me, O God, for in thee do I put my trust. 2. I<sup>a</sup> said unto Jehovah, Thou art the Lord:<sup>b</sup> Thou art my only<sup>c</sup> good. 3. As for the holy ones,<sup>d</sup> who are in the land, even the nobles,<sup>d</sup> in whom [was] all my delight. 4. Their provocations<sup>e</sup> are multiplied; they hasten<sup>f</sup> backwards; I will not accept<sup>g</sup> their drink-offerings more than blood. I will not take their names upon my lips.<sup>h</sup> 5. The Lord is the portion of mine inheritance and my cup. Thou shalt restore<sup>i</sup> my lot. 6. The lines are fallen to me in pleasant places; yea, I have a goodly heritage. 7. I bless the Lord, who gives me counsel; my reins also instruct me in the night season. 8. I have set the Lord always before me: because he is at my right hand, I shall not be moved. 9. Therefore my heart is glad, and my spirit<sup>k</sup> rejoiceth: my flesh also shall rest in hope. 10. For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One<sup>l</sup> to see corruption.<sup>m</sup> 11. Thou wilt show me the path of life; in thy presence is fulness of joy, at thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore.'

(a) The LXX  $\epsilon\iota\pi\alpha$ , the Vulgate *dixi*, the Syriac  $\text{ܠܝܗܘܐ}$ , all express the first person simply.

(b)  $\text{אֲדֹנָי}$ , the form peculiar as a name of God only.

(c) Von Meyer, Es ist kein Glück für mich ausser dir. Ewald, Du bist mein höchstes gut.

(d) The holy ones are the Jews. So Ewald, who refers to Exodus xix. 6; Deut. xxxiii. 6; Dan. viii. 54. They and their *honourables* are all rebellious.  $\text{אֲדֹרֵי}$  are the teachers and

leaders of the people. Compare the same word in Jer. xxv. 34, אֲדִירֵי הַצֹּאֵן. ‘Ye principal of the flock,’ parallel with ‘shepherds.’

(e) Some prefer ‘Their idols are multiplied.’ But עֲצַבַּת, the feminine form is not used elsewhere of *idols*. It signifies *sorrow, pain*. I have put *provocations*, because the verb signifies also, *To give pain, to grieve*; and the corresponding substantive עֲצַב is similarly used, Prov. xv. 1, ‘A word of provocation stirreth up strife.’

(e) אָחָר used as אָחָר, Isaiah i. 4, xlii. 17, l. 6. Symmachus, εἰς τὰ ἄπιστω; and so Schmurrer, as quoted by Rosenmüller Sch., in loc.

(g) So the Chaldee—

לֹא אֶקְבֵּל בְּרַעְוָא נְסוּכִיהוֹן

and similarly Paulus in Rosenmüller. Paulus מְדָם pro דָּם מְהִיּוֹת dictum occipit hoc sensu: *libamina iis offerri non sinam, vetabo, magis quam si sanguis esset*, i. e., in eos, qui illis libabunt, severius animadvertam, quam si sanguinem hominum occisorum efferrent: ac si Rex loquatur.

(h) Compare Isaiah lxv. 15. ‘Ye shall have your name for a curse to my chosen; for the Lord God shall slay them, and call his servants by another name.’

(i) I adhere to the old reception of תוּמִךְ as a participle. LXX, ὁ ἀπσταθιστῶν. Vulgate, *qui restitues*; and similar the Syriac. Hengstenberg, after Schultens, makes it a future of a verb יִמַּךְ, which does not occur in Hebrew. And Ewald makes it an abstract substantive, and translates *Besitzthum*, but without warrant. The connexion of this verse is, ‘The Jews, my own peculiar people, are rebellious, and reject me, but recompence is with thee;’ similar to Isaiah xlix. 4. ‘Then I said, I have laboured in vain, I

have spent my strength for nought, and in vain ; yet surely my judgment is with the Lord, and my reward with my God.'

(k) כבודי, 'my glory;' to express the spirit, in opposition to בשרי, 'my flesh.' See Ps. xxx. 13, lvii. 9, cviii. 2. So Ewald, *Mein Geist*.

(l) חסידך. Singular. 'Thy Holy One,' as the great majority of Jews and Christians, ancient and modern, testify. De Rossi says, 'Lectio ipsa communis puncta habet singularis numeri, multique codd. et edd. cum Hooghtiana notant ad marg. *reduntat jod*; alii vero quamplures, sive MSS., sive edd. habent Keri חסידך, *lege sanctum tuum*; paucissimi codices sistunt puncta lectionis pluralis.' See Rogers' beautiful and most instructive edition of the Psalms.

(m) שחת. 'Corruption,' not 'pit,' here. Compare Job xvii. 14, and the versions; and so Jewish tradition. *Jalkut Shimoni*, fol. 95, col. 2, commenting on this verse, has the tradition that the worms had no power over Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Aaron, Miriam, Benjamin, and some say David. So also D. Kimchi.

The subject of this Psalm, then, is one whose delight is in God, who is in trouble, and therefore asks help; is rejected by the Jews, whose worship he will not accept: whose soul is not left in Hades, and whose flesh sees no corruption. Even according to Jewish interpretation, this can only apply to the Messiah, whom the ancient Jews expected as a sufferer, and to rise from the dead. (*Schöttgen de Messia*, p. 564—568.) According to the reasoning of St. Peter, Acts ii. 29—31, and St. Paul, xiii. 35—37, it does refer to the Messiah, and was fulfilled in the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ. He who rejects their testimony may be a critic, or a philosopher, or many other things equally admirable, but he is not a Christian.



## PSALM XVIII.

It is universally admitted by ancients and moderns, down to De Wette and Ewald, that of this Psalm David is the author. It contains, therefore, indisputably, the religious sentiments and hopes of Israel, a thousand years before the coming of Christ. Rashi, Kimchi, Rosenmüller, and Ewald, think that it was written in the last years of his life, when the Lord had granted deliverance 'from all his enemies and from Saul,' who is mentioned because he was the chief adversary. It is not necessary here to consider the double recension, its differences or its origin, as the interpretation is not affected thereby.

Rashi, Aben Esra, Kimchi, De Wette, &c., interpret the Psalm of David personally and solely. But to this the words of the Psalm present great difficulties. Of David what is said, v. 20—24, especially 23, is not true. Verses 5—11 cannot, without great force, be applied to him. The destruction of enemies, 38—43, does not accord with anything related of David. The dominion over the heathen, 44—50, especially v. 49, is not fulfilled in David.

Christian commentators, as Theodorit, interpret it partly of David, partly of Christ: or, as Calvin, Bishop Horne, Scott, &c., primarily of David, typically of Christ. Neither mode of interpretation appears to me satisfactory or safe. To make two subjects of one Psalm, without any warrant or intimation from the author, seems to be very bold, and not very logical. And yet, though there is only one subject, some things, as we have seen, rise far above David and his history. The difficulty is removed by taking David, as a collective, including himself and his posterity, and therefore the Messiah: just as the prophecies addressed to Reuben, Levi, Simeon, Judah, and the other sons of Jacob, comprehended their posterity. So in this prophetic effusion

granted to David, the whole family of the Son of Jesse, especially Messiah, is included. In the prophecy, 2 Sam. vii. 12—16, we have a confirmation of the correctness of this view. The seed of David is spoken of as one person, and yet it evidently includes his whole family. That this 18th Psalm was believed by the Jews to contain predictions of the Messiah is certain. Jalkut Shimoni interprets 2 Sam. xxii. 5—7, of the Four Monarchies, and the deliverance which is to follow. The Jerusalem Talmud, fol. 5, col. 1, cites the last verse of this Psalm, to prove that David is the name of the Messiah. The Targum expounds verse 32 of the Messiah. The New-Testament writers, therefore, in applying this Psalm to Christ, Romans xv. 9, Heb. ii. 13, did not invent a new interpretation. They followed the Jewish Church in that which the words of the Psalm suggested, and numerous prophecies confirmed, respecting the person and kingdom of the Messiah.

PSALM XXII. 16. HEB. 17.

It is well known that modern Jews, in order to escape this remarkable prediction of what happened to our Lord, translate the words—

בְּאֵרֵי יָדַי וְרַגְלָי

‘As a lion, my hands and my feet,’ instead of ‘They pierced my hands and my feet.’ בְּאֵרֵי, in Isaiah xxxviii. 13, has the signification, *as a lion*, but cannot have it here, simply because it makes nonsense. If translated as the Jews wish, the word must be taken either as a nominative or an accusative. If the former, then the sentence stands thus: ‘The assembly of wicked doers, like a lion, have surrounded me, my hands and my feet!’ How can a lion surround a

man? If the latter, “The assembly of wicked doers have surrounded me, like a lion, my hands and my feet;” a sentence equally absurd; how can an assembly surround a man’s hands and feet? There is also Jewish evidence against this absurd version. The little Masora says, ‘that the word **כָּאֲרִי** occurs twice in the Bible, with Kametz under the **כ**, in different senses.’ The other place where it does occur is that already mentioned, Isaiah xxxviii. 13: and there it must mean ‘as a lion.’ Here, then, it must have a different sense. Further, the Masorah, on Numbers xxiv. 9, testifies that there was another reading, **כָּאֲרוּ**. The parallelism demands a verb. De Wette and Ewald both felt the absurdity of the Jewish version, and yet, unwilling to take the New-Testament interpretation, have followed older enemies of the faith, and assigned to **כָּאֲרִי** the meaning of the Arabic verb **كَوَّر**. ‘They have bound [Ewald, fettered] my hands and feet.’ But it is unnecessary to wander away from the Hebrew. Gesenius gives it as truly the participle of **כָּוַר** = **פָּרַח** to dig, to pierce, similar to **קָאֵם**, from **קוּם**, Hos. x. 14, and **שָׂאֲמִים**, from **שׂוּט**, Ezek. xxviii. 24—26. The former **כָּאֲרִי** is for **כָּאֲרִים**, as suggested by Pococke.\* Similar instances, given by Gesenius, **שְׁלִישִׁי**, 2 Sam. xxiii. 8; **כָּרִי**, 2 Kings xi. 4, 19; **עָמִי**, 2 Sam. xxii. 44; **מָנִי**, Ps. xlv. 9. The correct translation, therefore, is, ‘The assembly of evil doers surrounded me, digging or piercing my hands and my feet;’ and this is the sense expressed by the LXX, Syriac, and Vulgate. Hengstenberg mentions another difficulty, adopted by Paulus and others, that the feet of the crucified were not nailed to the cross, but only bound: he replies, first, that there is no ground for the assertion; secondly, that there are testimonies for the contrary, and refers to

\* Porta Mosis Works. London, 1740. Vol. i. p. 151.

Plautus, *Mostellaria*, Act ii. sc. 1, v. 13. Tertullian adv. Marcionem, iii. 19; Luke xxiv. 39, compared with John xx. 27.

Some of the rabbis have interpreted this Psalm of Esther, others of the congregation of Israel; both interpretations based on a wrong translation of the title, 'Concerning the hind of the morning.' That Esther is not here spoken of, does not require any proof. That the congregation of Israel personified is not the subject, is almost equally clear. The subject is **חַרְפַּת אָדָם וּבְזוּי עַם**. 'The reproach of mankind and despised of the people.' **עַם**, *people*, put here in opposition to **אָדָם**, *mankind*, must mean the Jewish people. The subject, therefore, is one despised by the Jewish people, and cannot be a personification of the people itself. And accordingly, verses 10 and 11 can only refer to an individual; and verse 23 says, 'I will declare thy name to my brethren, in the midst of the congregation,' and verse 26, 'Of thee is my praise in the great congregation.' He cannot therefore be the congregation—he must be an individual; further, he must be one despised by the Jews, persecuted, mocked, pierced in his hands and feet, brought down to the dust of death, whose garments were divided, and for whose vesture they cast lots, who nevertheless was delivered, and upon whose deliverance the ends of the world, and the families of the heathen remembered and turned to God. There is but one individual of the Jewish nation in whose history these particulars can be found. Jesus of Nazareth is he; and the continued contempt of the Jewish people and the faith of the Gentiles are the best testimonies to the correctness of the interpretation. To our Lord alone the title of the Psalm is appropriate; **עַל אֲצִילַת הַשֶּׁחֶר** which words the Targum explains, 'Concerning the power of the continual morning sacrifice. The LXX render them *ὕπερ τῆς ἀντιλήψεως τῆς ἑωθιῆς*, 'On account of

the morning help,' which Theodorit rightly interprets of 'The epiphany of our Saviour, which, like the dawn, shone upon them that sat in darkness.' The simple meaning of the Hebrew words, as given by Kimchi, after the more ancient rabbis, is, 'Concerning the morning star,' a title claimed by our Lord himself, Rev. xxii. 16.

## PSALM XL. 7, 8. [6, 7.]

In these verses there is an apparent difficulty, arising from the citation of certain words in the epistle to the Hebrews. The original text has **אזניִם כרית לי**, which our translators have rendered, 'Mine ears hast Thou opened.' The LXX; and epistle to the Hebrews, *σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι*, 'A body hast Thou prepared me,' a rendering, which sounds very different. The only fair way to compare them is to ascertain first the sense of each.

I. Then, with regard to the Hebrew. The literal sense of the words is, 'Ears hast thou digged or perforated for me.' Now, what would a Hebrew understand by digging or perforating the ears? To answer this question we have, 1st, similar expressions in the Bible. In Isaiah, l. 5, 'The Lord God hath opened the ear for me,' **פתח לי אזן**, 'and I was not rebellious,' from which it appears that *to open the ears is to make obedient*; and, again, another passage of the same prophet, xlvi. 8, where *the ear not being opened* is connected with *disobedience*. 'Yea, thou heardest not: yea, thou knewest not; yea, of old thy ear was not opened: truly, I knew thou didst deal very treacherously: even transgressor wast thou called from the womb.'

2ndly. We have the interpretations of the Jews. The Chaldee says, 'My ears, in order to listen to thy salvation, thou hast perforated for me.' Rashi says, '*Mine ears hast thou perforated*, saying, Hear ye my voice. *Perforated*

means, 'Ye have made holes that ye might hear.' Kimchi says, 'Ears hast thou opened for me that I might hear thy voice;' and so R. Isaac\* explains, by reference to Exod. xix. 5, Jer. vii. 22, and 1 Sam. xv. 22, that the opening of the ears signifies obedience. According, then, to Bible usage, and the interpretation of learned Jews speaking and writing Hebrew, the meaning of the words 'Mine ears hast thou digged or opened,' is, 'Thou hast rendered me obedient.'

3rdly. To confirm this interpretation, we have the parallelisms—

'Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire.

'Mine ears hast thou opened.

'Burnt offering and sin offering thou didst not require.

'Then I said, Lo I come . . . to do thy will, O my God, I did desire.'

The antithesis to *burnt offering and sin offering*, in the latter clause, is *obedience*. The anti-parallel to sacrifice and offering must be synonymous—*i. e.*, *perforating the ears* must mean *obedience*.

II. Now, then, let us examine what the Greek translators intended by *σῶμα κατηρτίσω μοι*, 'A body hast thou prepared me,' or, 'My body hast thou prepared.' It is clear that they did not mean it as a literal translation of the Hebrew words. The idiomatic meaning of 'digging or perforating the ears' was peculiarly Hebrew. They therefore gave what they considered an equivalent, 'The preparation of the body,' as more pleasing to God than sacrifice and offering. That by the *preparation of the body* they meant *obedience* is to be gathered from the context, and from the fact that they understood the Hebrew phrase, as appears from the parallel passage, Isaiah l. 5, where they have *ἡ παιδεία Κυρίου Κυρίου ἀνοίγει μου τὰ ὦτα*: ἐγὼ δὲ οὐκ ἀπειθῶ.

\* See Wagenseil *Tela Ignea*, part ii. p. 477.

That the words conveyed this meaning to a person accustomed to speak and write Greek, is seen from the commentary of Theodorit, who says, on the place, 'To these words agrees the apostolic admonition, 'I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service,' for, instead of the sacrifices of the Law, God has commanded us to consecrate our bodies.' He understood the words to signify *obedience*. The sense, therefore, of the Hebrew and of the Greek words is substantially the same. They both signify to render obedient.

Another verse supposed to present a difficulty is the twelfth [13], 'Mine iniquities have taken hold of me,' words which do not agree to the sinless character of Christ. But the original word, **עַוְוָה**, signifies, 1st, commonly, *iniquity*; 2nd, *punishment*, Gen. iv. 13, Levit. v. 1, xxvi. 41, as Aben Ezra takes it here, and as the English version has it, 1 Sam. xxviii. 10; 3rd, *calamity*, Ps. xxxi. 11, and probably in the passage of Samuel just referred to. In the verse of the Psalm under consideration, it is placed as parallel to **רָעוּת**, 'evils.'

Another objection to the application of this Psalm to our Lord is, that verses 14, 15 [15, 16], contain imprecations, supposed to be inconsistent with the character and spirit of Christ, as set forth in the New Testament. Some say, in reply, that the verbs here are not in the imperative, but the future, and ought to be so translated, being prophetic and not imprecatory. But this is only to transfer a difficulty. The similar passages, Ps. lxi. 23—28, and some of those in Ps. cix. 6, and following verses, are in the imperative. An answer must therefore be given that will apply

to all three; and the true answer is, that these passages in the Psalms find parallels in the words of our Lord, as recorded in the Gospels. Matt. xi. 21—24, our Lord pronounces a woe upon Chorazin, Bethsaida, Capernaum; v. 25, He thanks his heavenly Father that He had hidden the Gospel from the wise and prudent. Matt. xxiii. 13—33, contain denunciations as awful as any to be found in the Psalms just referred to, concluding with the fearful words, “Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers. Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?” Such denunciations and imprecations may be unsuitable for short-sighted mortals, but not to Him who knoweth what is in man. Christ is the Saviour of sinners, but He is also the Judge and the Destroyer of the impenitent. Isaiah lxiii. 3, Luke xix. 27, 2 Thess. i. 8. To pronounce sentence upon them prophetically is not more inconsistent with the character of our Lord, than to pass and execute judgment at last. It is, in truth, in perfect harmony with the character of God, as revealed in the Bible and in Providence. Deut. xxvii. calls upon the whole congregation to join in Amen to the curses denounced upon the wicked. Ps. cxxxvi. 15—20, celebrates God’s acts of vengeance as exhibitions of mercy. Rev. xviii. 20, calls on heaven and its inhabitants to rejoice over Babylon. Even the Deist must admit that certain evil consequences are inevitable attendants upon certain sins. It is not inconsistent for Him who wills these consequences and executes His will, to express it in words.

PSALM LXVIII. 19 [18].

Some find fault with the authorized version of this verse, but without reason. It expresses the meaning of the original. Rashi interprets the words of Moses; but with



this exception gives exactly the Christian sense. ‘Surely Thou hast ascended up thither, thou Prince of my people, Moses the son of Amram, up on high. Thou hast led captivity captive, *i. e.* the Law, and thou hast taken gifts from high places to give to the children of men. Yea, even *for the rebellious, that the Lord God might dwell.* Thou hast caused the Holy and Blessed God to dwell in the Tabernacle in the midst of the people that had been rebellious and guilty of provocation.’ The words cannot apply to Moses, for he did not ascend to heaven. ‘On high:’ למרום, both singular and plural, signifies ‘heaven.’ Ps. xviii. 17; Isaiah xxiv. 18, 21; Job xvi. 19. ‘Thou hast received gifts for man, or mankind, באדם,’ not for the Jewish people only, but for mankind in general. The preposition ב is rightly translated ‘for, on account of.’ Compare Gen. xviii. 28; Exod. x. 12; 2 Kings xiv. 6; Jon. i. 14. The whole context is Messianic. It announces— 1st, The time of the judgment of the wicked, and the joy of the righteous, 1—4; compare ver. 22—24. 2nd, The redemption of the Jews, ver. 7, 27—29. 3rd, The time of a great preaching of glad tidings, ver. 12. 4th, The time of the discomfiture of kings; compare Joel iii., Isaiah lxvi., Zech. xiv. 5th, The glorification of Zion after the ascension, ver. 17—19. 6th, The conversion of the heathen, ver. 30—33. 7th, The time of universal peace, ver. 30.

## PSALM LXIX.

The modern Jews, as D. Kimchi, Rashi, Aben Esra, interpret this Psalm of the Jews in captivity, as a personification of the whole nation, or, of each individual captive lamenting. Theodorit also refers it to the Jews in Babylon. But this interpretation is opposed to the internal evidence. Verse 7 [6] speaks of those who *wait* on the Lord and *seek* him.

If Israel be the subject, who are the faithful persons thus described? Verse 8 [7] says, 'For thy sake have I suffered reproach.' The Jewish nation suffers for its sins, as Moses foretold, Deut. xxviii. and Levit. xxvi. Verse 9. If the Jewish people be the subject, who are the mother and brothers? Verse 14. The subject of this Psalm prays in an acceptable time. The prayers of the Jews for restoration of all they lost have been repeated for eighteen centuries, but have not been answered. They are still in dispersion. Levit. xxvi. 40; Deut. xxx. 1, &c. Some, Christians, suppose that the Psalm refers primarily to David, fully to the Messiah. But this is inconsistent with history. The Psalm was written by David, for the apostle says so, Rom. xi. 9. The time of its composition must have been after the possession of Jerusalem and Zion. But, after that, David did not suffer for his piety, but because of his sin.

The true interpretation is that which makes the Messiah the subject. For this there is the authority of the New Testament, John ii. 7, xix. 28; Acts i. 20; Rom. xi. 9, 10, xv. 3. Further, the evidence of the Psalm itself. 1st. It is an individual. The first person, singular, is used throughout. Verse 9, 10, has a mother and brethren. 2nd. Is an Israelite and persecuted by Israelites. No mention of heathen or foreign nations. 'The zeal of God's house consumed him.' Verse 8—10. His sufferings are for the sake of God. 3rd. Verse 7. The subject is one whose rejection would have shamed all that hope in and seek for God. 4th. His enemies, the Jewish nation blinded. Compare verse 24 [23] with Deut. xxviii. 28; Isai. vi. 9, 10, xxix. 10, lix. 10. 5th. One whose deliverance makes all creation, heaven, and earth, and Zion, give glory to God. Verse 35—37, or 34—36.

## PSALM LXXII.

This Psalm is so unequivocally Messianic that it requires only a brief remark. Verse 15. In the Prayer-Book version we read, 'Prayer shall be made daily unto Him.' But this version cannot be sustained. התפלל with בעד cannot signify 'to pray to,' but 'to pray for;' as our Bible version has, 'Prayer shall be made for him continually, and daily shall he be praised:' and yet this is also objectionable. The Messiah is the subject of the 15th as well as the 14th verse. There is no change. The verses ought therefore to stand. 'He shall redeem their soul from deceit and violence: and precious shall their blood be in his sight. He shall live, and give him of the gold of Sheba. He shall pray for him always: All the day He shall *ble*ss him.' Both Prayer Book and Bible err in translating יברכנהו 'praise' instead of 'ble<sup>s</sup>s.' For a parallel see Ps. lxxvii. 6, 7.

## PSALM LXXXIX.

This Psalm must be interpreted as Psalm xviii. Not the personal David, but David's whole family as one person, including the Messiah, is the subject. Verses 38—45 prove this beyond doubt. None of the things here asserted could be predicated of David. His crown was not cast down to the ground. The days of David's youth were not shortened. The Psalm consists of two parts, 1—37: 1st. *A recital of all the glories promised to David in his posterity*, including, verse 4, eternal duration of his throne; verse 5, mercies so great as to call forth praises in heaven (compare Ephes. iii. 10); verse 18, the kingdom of God; 22—39, universal and eternal empires. 2nd. *A complaint implying an apparent contradiction in the termination of the Davidic kingdom*: the two containing an exact prediction

of the actual state of things. To the eyes of the unbelieving Jews the promises to David seem unfulfilled: history appears to contradict prophecy. To the Christian all is clear. Christ is God's firstborn, higher than the kings of the earth. His throne is as the sun—established for ever as the moon; so that the Jews must either accept Christ as the Messiah, or acknowledge that God's promises have failed.

PSALM XCIII.—C.

In the epistle to the Hebrews i. 6, the author applies the 7th verse of the 97th Psalm to prove Christ's superiority to angels. 'Again, when he bringeth in the first begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him.' In the Psalm itself our translators have 'Worship him, all ye gods.' The former rendering is justified by the LXX here and elsewhere, as Ps. viii. 6, cxxxviii. 1, by the Syriac; the Chaldee Ps. viii. 6, lxxxii. 6; and by the Rabbies, as Aben Esra, Ps. xcv. 3, xcvi. 3, and this passage Ps. xcvii. 7.

The correctness of the application to the Messiah is proved by the context in the Psalm, and by the whole series. The subject of the prophecy, for Ps. xciii.—c. is only one prophecy, is *the Kingdom of God*. 'The Lord is King,' xciii. 1, xcv. 3, xcvi. 10, xcvii. 1, xviii. 6, xcix. 1.

The 93rd is the opening of the subject, the promise of future good things, the reign of the Messiah. The 94th, a prayer reciting the distresses and infidelity of the latter times, v. 7—9. The 95th, a call to the still unbelieving Jews to come and worship Him, and a remonstrance with them because they harden their hearts. The 96th, a continuation of the call to the Jews to sing the New Song, and to make known to the Gentiles that the Lord is King. The 97th, a repetition of the subject, an account of the

Lord's advent and vengeance, and the delivery of his saints. The 98th, a call to the whole earth to join in the New Song. The 99th, the kingdom again announced, and the Lord recognised as the God of Moses, Aaron, and Samuel. The 100th, another call to the whole earth to worship Christ as the Creator, merciful and faithful. The Jews admit that the whole refers to the days of the Messiah. The universal King of Jews and Gentiles is here the Lord, יהוה. The universal King of Isaiah, ix., xxxii., xlix. ; Dan. vii. ; Zech. ix. ; of Psalms ii., xlv., lxxii., lxxxix., cx., is Messiah the Son of David.

## PSALM CIX.

The New Testament applies this Psalm to the treachery of Judas ; not in the way of accommodation, but of strict appropriation. Acts i. 16, the Apostle says, ἔδει πληρωθῆναι τὴν γραφὴν ταύτην. 'This scripture must *needs* have been fulfilled, which the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake before concerning Judas, which was guide to them that took Jesus.' This interpretation exactly agrees with the contents of the Psalm. The subject of the Psalm, v. 21, 22, 30, 31, is a righteous man suffering persecution, and trusting in God, v. 2—5. His persecutors are not heathen idolaters, who are not mentioned in the Psalm, but deceitful and wicked Jews, who return 'evil for good, and hatred for love,' v. 6—8. There is one of these particularly guilty. The victim, guided by the Spirit of God, beseeches the righteous Judge to execute just judgment. This language is not inconsistent with the character of Him who is Judge as well as Saviour, as has been shown in the observations on the 40th Psalm.\* The fulfilment shows the truth of the interpretation, as Theodorit says on the 9th verse, 'These things happened not to Judas only, but to all

\* Compare Matt. xviii. 17 ; xxvi. 24.

the unbelieving Jews also. For a few years only having elapsed after the crucifixion, the whole race was uprooted from its place. They were slain, and their wives and children made slaves; as the prophetic word prayed, 'Let his children be continually unsettled wanderers, and let them beg; let them seek [unto God? the verb is **דרש**] out of their desolate places.' And Jerome, 'Ex illo tempore ex quo Dominus crucifixus est, ex tunc semper moventur Judæi, non stant in suo loco;' and on account of the length of the captivity, even in his time he appeals to the Jews themselves 'Respondete mihi, O Judæi. Fuistis in Babylonia, habuistis ibi prophetas, Daniel, Ezechiël, et revera idololatræ eratis. Septuaginta annis fuistis in captivitate: et postea venistis in propria. Ecce nunc quadringenti anni, quare non est missus ad vos Propheta? In illo tempore idola colebatis, et miserebatur vestri Deus. Nunc autem non colitis idola, quare dereliquit vos Dominus? Ecce quadringenti anni sunt. Sed tunc dereliquistis Dominum et idola colebatis; nunc autem Dominum crucifixistis et interfecistis: et ideo non erit vobis adjutor.'

## PSALM CX.

In the consideration of this Psalm it is necessary, first of all, to notice the translation. The title is **לדרוד מומור**. In our English version, 'A Psalm of David.' LXX,  $\psi\alpha\lambda\mu\delta\varsigma$   $\tau\tilde{\omega}$   $\Delta\alpha\upsilon\iota\delta$ . Chaldee **על יד דוד**, 'By the hand of David.' In the time of our Lord, therefore, and before it, the Hebrew title was, by the Jews, understood in its ordinary sense, as signifying that the Psalm was composed by David. For dogmatic purposes, Aben Esra and Kimchi, followed by many moderns, have proposed to render the words, 'concerning David.' But this is opposed to the general usage

in the titles, where ל signifies the author, not the subject. See Psalms lxxiv., lxxix., lxxx., lxxxiii., lxxxviii., lxxxix., xc.

Verse 3 presents great difficulties, as may be seen from the great variety of versions proposed. The LXX have Μετὰ σοῦ ἡ ἀρχὴ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τῆς δυνάμεώς σου, ἐν ταῖς λαμπρότησι τῶν ἁγίων σου· ἐκ γαστρὸς πρὸ Ἐωσφόρου ἐγέννησά σε. They appear to have read נְדָבוֹת (like סְכָלוֹת), or עֲמֻד נְדִיבוֹת, instead of נְדָבוֹת, and עֲמֻד, כִּשְׁחַר instead of כִּשְׁחָר, and, like the Syriac, יְלֻדְתִּיךָ instead of יְלֻדְתֶּךָ. So the Vulgate: Tecum principium in die virtutis tue in splendoribus sanctorum; ex utero ante luciferum genui te. Rashi and Aben Ezra both give the sense expressed by the English version. The latter also proposes for נְדָבוֹת, 'גשם נְדָבוֹת,' a plentiful rain,' as Psalm lxviii. 9, which would make the sense, 'Thy people shall be numerous as the drops of a plentiful rain in the day of thy power.' Calvin has—'Populus tuus cum voluntariis oblationibus in die exercitus tui, in pulchritudine sanctitatis, ex utero ab aurora: tibi ros adolescentiæ tuæ.' Hengstenberg interprets, 'Thy people are free-will offerings (*i.e.* offer themselves as a living sacrifice) in the day of thy power; in holy apparel, from the bosom of the morning-heaven thou hast the dew of thy young men (*i.e.* thy young men like the morning dew). Ewald has, 'Thy people are all courage in the day of thy host: in holy apparel, out of the bosom of the morning thou hast the dew of thy youth.' Like the former, he takes 'youth' as collective for young men.

The Rev. G. Phillips, in his most useful commentary, seems to adopt partly the interpretation of Aben Ezra, and partly that of Mendelsohn: 'Thy people shall be as copious showers in the day of thy battle, in beautiful garments: Thy young men shall go forth as dew from the womb of the morning.'

With the present punctuation, I prefer to adhere as closely as possible to the sense given in the English version — ‘Thy people shall be all willingness in the day of thy power, in the beauties of holiness [or, in holy apparel:] before the conception of the morning light, thou hadst the dew of thy birth or youth. The usual meaning of **חַיִל** is ‘strength, power,’ not ‘host, or army, or military expedition.’ **מִרְחֹם**, ‘before’ or ‘earlier’ than the conception, taking the usage of **מִן** of comparison, as Gesenius says in his Thesaurus: ‘Tertium, quod vocant, comparationis omitti potest, ita ut simpliciter dicatur, aliquam rem super aliam eminere, non addita ratione, qua id fiat. Ies. x. 10; Job xi. 17; Mich. vii. 4; Ps. lxii. 10.’

**יְלֻדוֹת** occurs twice besides in the Bible, Ecces. xi. 9. 10, and there it signifies *state* or *time* of youth, and so the other nouns of this form (see Ewald, Grammatik § 344, and Gesenius, Lehrgebäude, p. 514.) To interpret it, therefore, of ‘young men’ is perfectly arbitrary, warranted neither by usage nor by form.\*

With regard to the interpretation there are almost as many opinions as with regard to the translation.

1. *Rashi* interprets the Psalm of Abraham. But Aben Esra objects that the words ‘out of Zion’ show that it cannot refer to the Father of the faithful.

2. Aben Esra, Kimchi, Mendelsohn, Ewald, refer it to David. The former say, that the words ‘Sit on my right

\* In a passage so variously interpreted, it may not be deemed rash to suggest another rendering, simply placing other vowels under some words, without changing a single consonant.

עָצָה נִבְרָאת בְּיוֹם הַלֵּךְ בַּחַדְוָה קִדְשׁ בְּרַחֲמֵם כִּשְׁחַר לֶךְ בַּל יִדְוָתְךָ;

‘With thee was the Principality in the day of thy being brought forth.

Before the conception of the morning light thou hadst the dew of thy birth.’

**חָל**, from **חָל** or **חָל**, to bear, in Isaiah xlv. 10. Ps. li. 10. Prov. viii. 24, 25.



hand,' refers to David, remaining in Jerusalem, 2. Sam. xxi 17, or 2 Sam. xi. xii., resting from the fatigues of war. But God's right hand cannot mean Jerusalem, nor sitting at the right hand, rest. To be placed at the right hand of the king, is in Scripture language to be treated with respect. It signifies neither *rest* nor *dominion*, as De Wette says, 'Be my viceroy upon earth, my co-regent.' There is no example of Solomon, or any other king's son, being placed at the right hand of the king, with whom he was associated in the government. Bathsheba is made to sit at the right hand of David, as an honour to his mother: and so the queen, Ps. xlv. 10 (9). Compare also Matt. xx. 21. 'Right hand, יְמִין,' when applied to God, means heaven. See Deut. xxxiii. 2; Ps. xvi. 11; 1 Kings xxii. 19. In the last cited verse, it is to be noticed that the angels are represented as *standing*, not *sitting*; and similarly, Daniel vii. 10; Isai. vi. 2. There is no parallel passage in the Bible where any created being is represented as *sitting* at the right hand of the Father. This Psalm, therefore, cannot be legitimately applied to David, or any mere man. Neither can it be retorted, that in Acts vii. 56, Christ is represented as *standing* at the right hand of God. As *priest*, he is represented as *standing*. The priest stood to minister. As having received all power in heaven and earth, he sits on the throne of His Father. Further, the subject of this Psalm is a priest, which David was not. Some of the Rabbis try to remove this objection by saying, that כֹּהֵן, *cohen*, may mean *prince* as well as priest. But if this assertion were well founded it is useless here: for the *cohen* here described is after the order of Melchisedec, who was a true priest of the Most High God.

Ewald, on the other hand, says that David was a priest, and sacrificed, and acted as such; that in him and Solomon the old union of the kingly and priestly office was renewed.

In proof, he refers 2 Sam. vi., where it is said, v. 13, עולות ליני יהוה, 'and he sacrificed;' and again, v. 17, ויעל, 'and David offered burnt offerings before the Lord,' and so, 1 Kings viii. 5, 62. But to this it is to be replied, that the expressions here used are not peculiar to priests, but are applied to the people. Thus, העלה, 'to offer up,' Deut. xii. 13, 14. This word and זבח, 'to sacrifice,' of Joshua and all the people, Josh. viii. 31; and ויעלו, of all the people, Judges xx. 26. There were, according to the traditions of the Jews, certain operations in the act of sacrifice performed by the laity, and others peculiar to the priest. The owner of the victim laid his hands on it, killed, flayed, cut it up, and washed the inwards. The priest received the blood and sprinkled it, put fire on the altar, arranged the wood on the fire, and the sacrifice on the wood. The expressions referred to do not prove that either David or Solomon was a priest.

3. The New Testament interprets this psalm of the true Messiah, the Lord Jesus Christ—Matt. xxii. 43; Mark xii. 36; Acts ii. 34; 1 Cor. xv. 25; Ephes. i. 20; Heb. i. 6, v. 6, vii. 21, x. 12, 13. This is decisive for every one who receives it; but for others it may be remarked, that the repeated reference to it in the New Testament, and the confident tone in which these references are made, prove that, in the time of our Lord, the Messianic interpretation was that commonly received by the Jews. The version given by the LXX shows that this interpretation was more ancient still: 'With thee the principality in the day of thy power, in the splendours of thy saints. From the womb, before the morning star, I begat thee,' are words which neither the authors of that version, nor any one else, could or can apply to a mere man. They evidently expected a king, begotten before creation, to whom belonged

the kingdom and the saints, and who was to be priest and king for ever. Rabbinic tradition tells us that this hope of the Jewish nation was the Messiah. The Midrash Tillim, one of the most ancient monuments of Jewish literature, interprets the Psalm of the Messiah, on Ps. xviii. 36; ii. 7; cx. i. The words of the Psalm, taken in their ordinary sense, admit of no other interpretation. The subject of the psalm is king in Zion, exalted to heaven, as Dan. vii. 13; waits for the conversion of his enemies, is eternal mediator; in verse 5 is called אֲדֹנָי, THE LORD, and is described as judge of kings and nations. The description can apply only to him who is David's son and David's Lord.

#### ISAIAH, VII. 14.

'Behold, a virgin shall conceive:' literally, 'Behold, The virgin, pregnant: and bearing a son.' The noun עלמה, *almah*, translated 'virgin,' has the article, The predestined virgin. The word *almah* signifies *virgin*, and is not equivalent to נערה, a young woman, for—

1st. It is translated παρθένης by the ancient Jews. Matthew so interprets it, in proof of the predicted miraculous birth of the Saviour, which he would not have ventured to do, if that sense had not been common when he wrote. It is so translated by the LXX, not only in this passage of Isaiah, but in Genesis xxiv. 43; that is, in that portion of the version which is acknowledged by all to have been made nearly 300 years before Matthew wrote.

2nd. It is so interpreted by the most celebrated of modern Jews, when not engaged in controversy. Rashi, in his commentary on the Song of Solomon, i. 3, 'Therefore the virgins, עלמות, love thee,' says בתולות עלמות, 'Alamoth,' *virgins*: the word בתולה, B'thulah, being acknowledged

by the Jews as the proper word for virgin. Even in his commentary on Isaiah vii. 14, he says—

ויש פותרים שזה האות שעלמה היתה ואינה ראויה להולד  
 ‘There are some who interpret that this is the sign that she was an *almah*, and not fit to bring forth a child.’ Here, *almah* can only mean *virgin*. Rashi, therefore, the great opponent of Christianity, considered עלמה as equivalent to בתולה, and as one not fit to bear.

3rdly. The word עלמה, *almah*, is, in Song vi. 8, opposed to those who are not virgins, and thus the meaning is explained in the most satisfactory manner, ‘Threescore queens, fourscore concubines, and alamoith without number.’ Three different classes of females are here distinguished—first, queens; second, concubines; the only class that can remain is virgins. Much light is thrown upon these three classes by Esther ii. In verse 3 it is said, ‘Let the king appoint officers in all the provinces of his kingdom, that they may gather together all the fair young virgins,’ בתולה כל נערה. Verses 12—14 show that they were first kept by themselves, but afterwards with the concubines. These two classes are distinguished from the queen; compare also Ps. xlv. 14, 15.

4th. The natural Hebrew etymology gives the same sense. Gesenius, and others, go to the Arabic to find a root, which will give the sense, *young woman*. But why go to the cognate dialects, when there is a derivation, close at hand, in the Hebrew? The root עלם is one of the commonest words of the language: it signifies, *to hide*—the noun *almah*, therefore, signifies, *a male hidden, unknown*. To this it is replied, that the masculine עלם, *elem*, means ‘young man,’ 1 Sam. xvii. 56; and xx. 22. This is admitted. In both passages a very young man is intended. The original idea is the same both in the masculine and the

feminine; so young as to be *hidden, unknown*. Then it is transferred to signify 'young person' generally. The very same thing is done with the word which the Jews say is the proper word for virgin: בתולה is used for 'young woman,' in a passage where it cannot possibly have its exclusive signification. In Joel i. 8, it is transferred to a married woman: 'Lament, like a בתולה, virgin, (or rather *young woman*) girded with sackcloth for the husband, בעל, of her youth.' The word בעל, husband, instead of חתן, *bridegroom*, puts it beyond doubt that the word is not taken in its exclusive sense. Now, *almah* is never transferred to a married woman. We have, therefore, the evidence of Jewish tradition, before and after Christ's coming—Bible usage and Hebrew etymology, to prove that עלמה, *almah*, means *virgin*.

The next word to be noticed is הַרְהָה, *haráh*, *pregnant*. Some modern Jews (and some German interpreters, followed by Dr. P. Smith), to get rid of the prophecy, say that this word ought not to be translated in the future, 'shall conceive;' but as the preterite, 'is with child.' To this it might be sufficient to reply, that our translators are fully justified by Rashi, who asserts that it means the future, and refers to Judges xvi. 5, in proof. But the fact is, הַרְהָה, as accented here and elsewhere, cannot be the preterite of the verb הוּר, even if there were such a verb. To be so it must be accented הִרְהָה. But no such verb does occur. The Hebrew verb masculine is הִרְהָה, of which the feminine is הִרְהָה. The word, as here written, is confessedly feminine; the accent shows that it is the feminine of the verbal adjective הִרְהָה, which does occur in both genders. The true translation is 'pregnant.' The prophet saw in vision the mother of Immanuel, and therefore exclaims, 'Behold the virgin;' then he adds, 'pregnant;' and then, 'bearing a son;'

the words expressing in the most forcible manner, his own astonishment and the greatness of the sign vouchsafed.

Having disposed of the translation, the interpretation of the whole must next be considered.

1. *Rashi*, without differing from the English version, supposes that the virgin is the wife of the prophet; that the child Immanuel is the same as Maher-shalal-hash-baz, and that the sign given was, that the spirit of prophecy should rest upon her. The sacred history nowhere relates that the spirit of prophecy rested upon the wife of Isaiah, nor that, guided by this spirit, she called any of her children Immanuel. Some special objections against this interpretation are given by,

2. *Kimchi*. He says, 'This almah is either the wife of the prophet or the wife of Ahaz. The latter is the right interpretation, for if the wife of the prophet were intended, he would have said *הנביאה*, *the prophetess*, as he says, viii. 3. 'I went unto the prophetess.' His words also, viii. 8, 'shall fill the breadth of thy land, O Immanuel,' prove that Immanuel was the son of the king.' This exposition, however, does not rest on a firmer foundation than the preceding. Kimchi not only invents a son, but finds for Ahaz a second wife, concerning whom sacred history is silent. Having proved that the child cannot be Hezekiah, he says, 'Neither can this young woman be the mother of Hezekiah.' As the Bible says nothing about this son of Ahaz, we cannot be surprised that it is altogether silent as to the fact of his eating butter and honey from the day of his birth, which Kimchi says was the sign given to Ahaz. An exposition that draws upon invention rather than history for the fulfilment of prophecy cannot be regarded as satisfactory.

*Aben Ezra* differs something from both *Rashi* and *Kimchi* as to the child. He supposes that Isaiah had three sons, Shear Jashub, Maher-shalal-hash-baz, and Immanuel, and that each of them was a sign to Israel. He nearly

agrees with Kimchi in supposing that the particular sign promised to Ahaz was, that the child should eat butter and honey, remarking, 'that it is not the custom of children to eat as soon as they are born.' Kimchi's reasons for rejecting Rashi's interpretation apply equally to this: and also the invocation of imagination instead of history to supply the facts of the fulfilment. It is worthy of special notice that each of these Rabbinic interpretations differs from the other two; the difference proving that the Jews have no certain tradition as to the accomplishment of this prophecy, but that each offers simply his own conjecture.

The interpretation given by St. Matthew is, that it is a prediction of the miraculous birth of the Messiah of a pure virgin. The believer in the New Testament accepts that interpretation as an article of the Christian faith: at the same time it commends itself to his judgment. First, it satisfies the simple meaning of the words. Isaiah predicts that a virgin shall bring forth—that he shall be called, *i. e.* that he shall be Immanuel, God with us—that he is a royal child, the owner of the land of Israel, (viii. 8.) Secondly, it agrees with the immediate context. The land of Judah had been invaded by the kings of Syria and Israel, and Jerusalem itself was in danger. The object of the invasion was to depose the family of David, and to set up a new dynasty. 'Let us go up against Judah, and vex it, and let us make a breach therein for us, and set a king in the midst of it, even the son of Tabeal.' When this 'was told to the house of David, his heart was moved, and the heart of his people, as the trees are moved with the wind.' The head of the house of David was at this time a wicked man; but his wickedness did not prevent the God of David from fulfilling the sure mercies, which he had sworn to him and his seed. He therefore sends the prophet Isaiah with a

message of mercy, and with a sign of mercy in Shear Jashub, whose name announced that 'a remnant should return.' It seems that Ahaz was not satisfied either with the prophecy or the sign; and the Lord, in great condescension, makes him the offer of choosing a sign that would be satisfactory. This offer was rejected by Ahaz, who had a scheme of his own. He intended to hire Tiglath-pileser, King of Assyria (2 Kings, xvi.), and therefore wished for no sign from the Lord, in whom he did not believe. This wilful rejection of God's mercy justly deserved, and was immediately followed by a denunciation of, sore punishment by the hand of the Assyrian in whom Ahaz trusted. But still in this denunciation of wrath he confirms the assurance of mercy to the house of David, to whom he gives a sign, which includes not merely the miraculous birth of Immanuel, but the invasion of the Assyrian. *The sign is the whole prophecy*, from verse 14—25, and includes, first, the mercy to the house of David; secondly, the punishment of the unbelief of Ahaz. The promise that Messiah should be born secured the continuance of the house of David. The Assyrian invasion would be an immediate sign of the sin and folly of trusting in man rather than God, and a guarantee to the generation then living of the ultimate accomplishment of the promise of mercy. Part of the sign might require the lapse of ages for its fulfilment; but part was immediately at hand. There is only one plausible objection which can be urged against this interpretation. It is founded on the translation of verse 16, adopted in our authorized version. 'Before the child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good, the land which thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings.' This translation seems to destroy all connexion with the prophecy of the Messiah: for to suppose that the child here spoken of is not the Messiah, but Shear Jashub, is harsh in the extreme. The translation is not accurate.



The most careless reader must here find a difficulty. Which is, the land that Ahaz abhorred, and which had two kings? The only sense which can be given to this version is that thus expressed by Scott. 'The land of Israel must, on this interpretation, be exclusively meant as the land which Ahaz dreaded and abhorred, for one land alone is spoken of; and *both her kings* must denote Pekah, and his ally, Rezin, King of Syria.' But Rezin could not in any sense be called the King of the land of Israel, and therefore this interpretation is necessarily false. Lowth and Gesenius adopt a somewhat different version. 'The land shall become desolate, by whose two kings thou art distressed.' But this does not remove the difficulty. The question still remains, which is the land that had two kings? Neither of these commentators furnishes a satisfactory answer. Lowth takes no notice of it. Gesenius, in his most elaborate, diffuse, and at the same *minutiose* commentary, says, 'Ehe aber der Knabe zu verstandiger Einsicht gekommen seyn wird (d. i., gegen das dritte Jahr) werden jene Reiche schon verödet seyn;' *i. e.*, 'But before the boy shall have attained to understanding (*i. e.*, towards the third year), those kingdoms shall be already desolate.' But the prophet has not got the word 'kingdoms,' nor yet spoken of two lands, but one land, definitely with the article **הָאֲדָמָה**, which had two kings. The only land which had two kings was the land of Canaan, which had a king of Israel and a king of Judah. This was suggested long since in the *Universal History*, in a passage cited in Scott's commentary: 'Before this child can know good from evil, this land—*which thou art so solicitous about*—shall be bereaved of both her kings; by which we think ought to be understood, not the kings of Syria and Israel: for the former could not be called her (Canaan's) king, and the latter had but a share in it at best: but the kings of Israel

and Judah; as it really was before the coming of the Messiah.' This author saw the true meaning of the passage: but the translation is better given by Dr. Henderson: 'But before the youth shall have knowledge to reject what is evil, and to choose what is good, the land, which thou destroyest, shall be forsaken by both its kings:' from whose commentary I add the following passage: 'By **הָאֲרָמָה** is meant *The land*, by way of eminence—The land of Canaan, called **אֲרַמַת יְהוָה**, *Jehovah's land*, xiv. 2; and Immanuel's land, viii. 8. Though divided into two kingdoms after the revolt of the ten tribes, it still formed the possession which God claimed as his peculiar inheritance. This interpretation is confirmed by the distinct reference made to the revolt, ver. 17. The two kings, therefore, were not those of Israel and Syria, but those of Israel and Judah. The punishment of the former had been predicted, ver. 8: that of the latter is explicitly denounced in this and the following verses. **מְפַנֵּי** is to be construed with **תַּעֲזֹב**, not with **קָץ**. The latter verb is followed, indeed, by this adverbial form, Exod. i. 12; Numb. xxii. 3; but it is also used after the verb **עָזַב**, Isaiah, xvii. 9, and appears, in such connexion, to have no more force than **מָן**, as in Lev. xxvi. 43, **הָאֲרָץ תַּעֲזֹב מֵהָם**. **קוֹץ** has here the sense of *cutting, breaking up, disturbing*, &c., just as Hiph. is used, ver. 6.' This interpretation is the only one that meets the condition of 'The land' having two kings: and not only removes the difficulty, but confirms the Messianic interpretation. Before the Virgin's Son shall arrive at the age when children distinguish between good and evil, the land of Israel shall cease to have any independent king or kingdom. In the second year after the birth of our Lord, Herod the Great died. The Messianic interpretation of Isaiah, vii. 10—25, is confirmed by the similar prophecy immediately following.

## ISAIAH VIII. 1—IX. 6.

VIII. 1—4. In the name Maher-shalal-hash-baz is announced the speedy beginning of the judgments already denounced, ch. vii. In verses 5—8, it is declared that Judah, which is especially the land of Immanuel, shall also be overrun, as vii. 17, &c.: but 9—11, that no human efforts can frustrate the divine purposes of mercy in Immanuel. Therefore, 11—22, the people are exhorted to fear only the Lord, because, by stumbling at that rock of offence, both houses of Israel, with the exception of a small remnant of disciples, shall be driven out into gloom and darkness.

VIII. 23.—‘ But darkness shall not continue to her [the land] that had affliction; as in the former time, he made contemptible the land of Zebulon, and the land of Naphthali: so in the latter time he shall make honourable the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles,’ ix. 1.—‘ The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light: as to them that were sitting in the land of the shadow of death, light shineth upon them. Thou hast made great the nation: thou hast increased his joy. They joy before thee according to the joy of the harvest, as when men exult in their dividing of the spoil. For the yoke of their burden, and the staff of their shoulder, the rod of their oppressor, thou hast broken in pieces, like the day of Midian. For every sandal of the warrior in battle, and the garment rolled in blood shall be for burning, food for the fire. 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, Mighty God, Father [that is, possessor] of Eternity, Prince of Peace. To the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it and to establish it in judgment and in righteousness

from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this.' The two prophecies are exactly parallel. Both contain the judgments of God on Israel and Judah by the hand of the Assyrian. Both announce the ultimate deliverance by God manifest in the flesh. To apply the titles Immanuel, Mighty God, Father of Eternity, to any mere man, is perfectly ridiculous. The Jewish controversialists,\* perceiving that these names can apply to no man, attempt another translation, equally opposed to Jewish tradition, the Hebrew text, and Hebrew idiom. They say, 'He whose name is Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Father of Eternity, shall call him [Hezekiah] the Prince of Peace.' 1st. The Talmud (Sanhedrin, 94, 1,) says that Hezekiah has here eight names. The number *eight* cannot be made out without referring all to him. Aben Esra also says plainly that all the names belong to the child promised. 2ndly. This division is contrary to the accents, according to which, Father of Eternity cannot be separated from Prince of Peace. Tiphcha coming so close to Silluk loses its distinctive power, as may be seen viii. 23, גָּלִיל הַגּוֹיִם. The Jews who placed the accents construed as we do. 3rdly. The new Jewish construction is contrary to the idiom of the Hebrew language, which requires that שְׁמוֹ, referring to the person named, should be placed between the namer and the thing or person named. See Gen. xvi. 15, xxi. 3, xxii. 14; Exod. ii. 22; Ruth, iv. 17; 1 Sam. i. 20; 2 Sam. xii. 25. The reference to Hezekiah is equally unhappy. Instead of peace and prosperity, Hezekiah's reign was one of great and continued trouble to Israel and himself. In his days the ten tribes were carried away; Sennacherib laid waste Judea; Hezekiah himself, afflicted with a deadly disease, was guilty of sin,

\* See Chizzuk Amunah on the passage, and Manassch ben Israel's conciliator, Lindo's edition, vol. ii. p. 141.

and received the prediction of coming calamities upon his children.

The assertion of these controversialists, that **וַיִּקְרָא** cannot be translated 'shall be called,' is equally futile. It is impersonal, 'one shall call,' like the German *man*, or the French *on*, as Kimchi remarks on **וַיִּשָּׂא**, Isaiah, viii. 4, which is also translated as the passive 'shall be taken away.' Kimchi says truly, that such cases are numerous, and refers to **וַיִּגַד**, Gen. xlviii. 2, and **וַיֵּאמֶר**, in the first verse of the same chapter.

Our English version is thus proved to be correct by Jews, ancient and modern, as well as by the idiom of the Hebrew language. The following prophecy, ix. 8—xii. 6, confirms the application to the Messiah of the two prophecies just considered. The subject is similar, and treated in the same way, ix. 8—x. 4. The overthrow of the kingdom of Israel. x. 5—34. The invasion of Judea by the Assyrian, and his overthrow. xi. The announcement of the Messiah's reign, as the branch, and yet verse 10, as the root of Jesse. Indeed, the subject of all the prophecies from i.—xii. is similar. Chapter i. Judgment and final restoration. ii—iv. Messiah's reign intervening judgments; Messiah's reign, iv. 2, &c., where He is described as the 'Branch of the Lord,' a title equivalent to 'Son of God,' as may be seen in the similar expression, 'Branch of David,' v. 1—vi. 13. Judgment and final deliverance. Then follow the chapters just considered. These prophecies are all placed together, because of the identity of subject, just as those contained in xiii.—xxiii. are placed together for the same reason, because they refer to the enemies of Israel. The Messianic interpretation has, therefore, the fullest confirmation of the context.

## ISAIAH LII. 13—LIII.

HAVING discussed the interpretation of this passage in a separate tract, and also in the first part of the answer to Orobio's *Israel Avenged*, it is only necessary here to give an outline of the arguments for the Messianic interpretation. The consideration of the various translations of some particular verses is of minor importance. The general sense of the whole prophecy is so clear and decided, that any translation, ancient or modern, Jewish or Christian, may be adopted, without altering the general interpretation. A suffering Messiah is depicted unmistakably in them all. The character of the Servant of the Lord may also be traced in the context from chap. xl.—lxvi. 1. Besides the Messianic interpretation, there are only two that deserve notice. Some modern Jews, from controversial considerations, say that the suffering people of Israel is here personified. This is utterly impossible, for—1st, the subject of the prophecy is a covenant to the nation, xlii. 6; xlix. 8; and therefore cannot be the nation: 2nd, distinguished from those who fear God, l. 10: 3rd, sent to comfort them that mourn in Zion, lxi. 3: 4th, an intercessor for Zion, lxii. 1: 5th, an unresisting sufferer, whereas for five centuries the Jews carried on sanguinary wars against their oppressors, and were rendered quiescent only by force, and the hopelessness of further resistance.

2. Some modern Gentile interpreters, as desirous as modern Jews to deny their Saviour, say that *the body of the prophets* is here personified. But to this it may be replied, 1st, that the subject is spoken of throughout in the singular, and that not only in the third, but in the first person, xlix. 1—6; l. 1—9: 2nd, the whole body of the prophets were not sufferers—and least of all, vicarious sufferers for the sins of others: 3rd, the prophets did not restore Israel, nor

convert the Gentiles: 4th, nor attain the exaltation described, xlix. 7; lii. 13—15.

3. The Messianic interpretation is adopted by the New-Testament writers, as Matt. viii. 17; Rom. x. 16, 17; xv. 20, 21; Heb. ix. 28; (comp. the Greek with the LXX. of Isaiah, liii. 12;) 1 Pet. ii. 24. Secondly. It is the *authorized* interpretation of the Synagogue, found in its Liturgy for the Passover, and for the Day of Atonement.\* Thirdly. It is the interpretation of the great majority of ancient Jewish writers. The famous Alshech says, 'Our Rabbies with one mouth have confirmed, and received by tradition, that King Messiah is here spoken of.' Abarbanel, though hostile, is obliged to make a similar confession. 'Jonathan ben Uzziel [in his Targum] has interpreted it of the Messiah, who is to come. And this is also the opinion of the wise men of blessed memory.' The Talmud, the Midrashim, the Zohar, all give the same interpretation. In the answer to Orobio, I have entered to show that this was probably the opinion of the translators of Isaiah in the LXX. Fourthly, It is the only interpretation that fully answers the character of 'the Servant of the Lord,' as depicted in chapters xl.—lxvi., universally acknowledged to be one prophecy, and to speak of one Servant of the Lord. 1st, He is the chosen and beloved of God, xlii. 1—6; xlix. 1, 2: 2nd, has the Spirit of God, xlii. 1; lxi. 1: 3rd, teaches religion to the Gentiles, xlii. 1, 4, 6; xlix. 1, 6: 4th, an unresisting sufferer, xlii. 2; liii. 7: 5th, a covenant to Israel, xlii. 6; xlix. 5, 6, 8: 6th, a deliverer from blindness and prison, xlii. 7: xlix. 10; lxi. 1: 7th, despised and treated ignominiously, xlix. 7; l. 6, 7: liii. 1—3: 8th, His sufferings and death vicarious and sacrificial, liii. 4—7, 10—12: 9th, exalted to great glory, worshipped by kings, xlix. 7; lii. 13, 15; liii. 10—12; lv. 4, 5.

\* See Answer to Orobio, part i. p. 33—37.

Lastly. This is the only interpretation that agrees with the subject of the whole prophecy, which is the revelation of God's glory to all flesh, Jew and Gentile. This is the subject at once proposed, xl. 1—11, and to which the author ever recurs. See xlii. 10—12; xlix. 18—23; lii. 10; lvi. 3—8; lxi. 11; lxv. 17—25; lxvi. 18—22. These promises of the conversion of all nations belong to the times of the Messiah, and find their parallels in other Messianic prophecies, their fulfilment only in Christianity.

THE END.



# Works published by John W. Parker & Son, West Strand, London.

---

---

By R. WHATELY, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin.

- The Kingdom of Christ. Fourth Edition. 8s.  
Sermons. Second Edition, with Additions. 12s.  
On Peculiarities of the Christian Religion. Sixth and Cheaper Edition. Octavo, 7s. 6d.  
On Difficulties in the Writings of the Apostle Paul. Sixth and Cheaper Edition. Octavo, 8s.  
On the Errors of Romanism having their Origin in Human Nature. Fourth and Cheaper Edition. Octavo, 7s. 6d.  
On Dangers to Christian Faith from the Teaching or the Conduct of its Professors. Second Edition. Octavo, 10s.  
Infant Baptism Considered, in a Charge delivered in 1850. 2s.  
Lectures on the Characters of Our Lord's Apostles. 3s. 6d.  
Lectures on the Scripture Revelations respecting Good and Evil Angels. 3s. 6d.  
View of the Scripture Revelations respecting a Future State. Sixth Edition, 5s.
- 

By T. VOWLER SHORT, D.D., Bishop of St. Asaph.

- History of the Church of England. Fifth Edition. Octavo, 16s.  
Parochialia. 4s.  
On the Management of a Parish, and of Sunday Schools, &c., 1s.  
What is Christianity? Third Edition, 1s. 6d.
- 

The Homilies, with various Readings, and the Quotations from the Fathers given at length in the Original Languages. Edited, for the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press, by Professor CORRIE, Master of Jesus College, and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Ely. Octavo, 10s. 6d.

---

Bishop Pearson's Exposition of the Creed. Edited by TEMPLE CHEVALLIER, B.D., for the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press. Octavo, 12s.

---

An Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles, Historical and Doctrinal. By HAROLD BROWNE, M.A., Prebendary of Exeter, formerly Vice-Principal at Lampeter. To be completed in Two Volumes, Octavo. The First Volume, 10s. 6d.

---

De Obligatione Conscientiæ Prælectiones Decem Oxonii in Schola Theologica Habitæ. A ROBERTO SANDERSON, S. Theologiæ Ibidem Professore Regio. Edited for the Syndics of Cambridge University Press. With English Notes, including an abridged Translation, by W. WHEWELL, D.D., Master of Trinity College. Octavo, 9s.

By J. C. HARE, M.A., Archdeacon of Lewes.

Mission of the Comforter. Second Edition. Octavo, 12s.

The Victory of Faith. Second Edition. 6s.

Parish Sermons. Two Series. Octavo. 12s. each.

By F. D. MAURICE, M.A., Professor of Divinity in King's College.

The Old Testament: Nineteen Sermons on First Lessons. 6s.

The Church a Family: Sermons on the Occasional Services of the Prayer-Book. 4s. 6d.

The Prayer Book; specially considered as a Protection against Romanism. Nineteen Sermons preached at Lincoln's Inn. 5s. 6d.

The Lord's Prayer. Nine Sermons preached at Lincoln's Inn. 2s. 6d.

The Religions of the World, and their Relations to Christianity. New and Cheaper Edition. 5s.

Lectures on the Epistle to the Hebrews; with a Review of Newman's Theory of Development. Octavo, 7s. 6d.

Christmas Day, and other Sermons. Octavo. 10s. 6d.

By R. C. TRENCH, B.D., Professor of Divinity in King's College, London.

Notes on the Parables. Fourth Edition, Revised. Octavo, 12s.

Notes on the Miracles. Third Edition, Revised. Octavo, 12s.

Star of the Wise Men; a Commentary on the Second Chapter of St. Matthew. 3s.

Sacred Latin Poetry; selected and arranged for use: with Notes and Introduction. 7s.; or 14s. bound in antique calf.

The Hulsean Lectures for 1845 and 1846. New Edition, in one Volume, Octavo, 7s. 6d.

St. Augustine's Exposition of the Sermon on the Mount. Second Edition, with an Introductory Essay on the Merits of St. Augustine as an Interpreter of Scripture, 7s. The Essay, separately, 3s. 6d.

By J. FORSTER, M.A., Her Majesty's Chaplain of the Savoy.

The Gospel-Narrative according to the Authorized Text, without Repetition or Omission. With a Continuous Exposition, Marginal Proofs in full, and Notes. Fourth Edition, 12s.; large paper, 16s.

The Churchman's Guide; an Index of Sermons, and other Works, arranged according to their subjects. Octavo, 7s.

By the Rev. J. E. RIDDLE, M.A.

A Manual of Christian Antiquities. Second Edition. 18s.

Luther and his Times. 5s.

The Churchman's Guide to the Use of the English Liturgy. 3s. 6d.

First Sundays at Church. Fifth Edition. 3s. 6d.

By H. SOAMES, M.A., Chancellor of St. Paul's.  
The Anglo-Saxon Church. Third Edition, 10s. 6d.  
Elizabethan Religious History. Octavo, 16s.

By W. BATES, B.D., Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge.  
College Lectures on Ecclesiastical History. Second Edition. 6s. 6d.  
College Lectures on Christian Antiquities, and the Ritual. 9s.

By W. K. CLAY, B.D., Minor Canon of Ely.

Historical Sketch of the Prayer-Book. 1s. 6d.

The Book of Common Prayer Illustrated, so as to show its Modifications, the Date of its several parts, and the Authority on which they rest. 7s. 6d.

Explanatory Notes on the Prayer-Book Version of the Psalms, with Copious Marginal References. 7s. 6d.

History of the Christian Church. By the late Prof. BURTON. Eighth and Cheaper Edition. 5s.

History of Christianity. By W. C. TAYLOR, LL.D. 6s. 6d.

On the Early Fathers; a Lecture by Professor BLUNT. 2s.

The Early Christians. By the Rev. W. PRIDDEN, M.A. Fourth Edition. 4s.

The Book of the Fathers, and the Spirit of their Writings. 9s. 6d.

The Church of St. Patrick; an Inquiry into the Independence of the Ancient Church of Ireland. By W. G. TODD, A.B. 4s.

The Civil History of the Jews; from Joshua to Hadrian. By the Rev. O. COCKAYNE, M.A., King's College, London. Second Edition. 4s. 6d.

Burnet's History of the Reformation, abridged. Edited, with additions, by Professor CORRIE, Master of Jesus College, Cambridge. 10s. 6d.

A History of the English Reformation. By F. C. MASSINGBERD, M.A., Rector of South Ormsby. A new Edition, Revised and Enlarged. 6s.

A History of Popery, and of its Influence on Society. 9s. 6d.

Fullwood's Roma Ruit. The Pillars of Rome broken: wherein all the several Pleas for the Pope's Authority in England, with all the material Defences of them, are revised and answered. A New Edition, by C. HARDWICK, M.A. Octavo. 10s. 6d.

Wilson's Illustration of the Method of explaining the New Testament by the Early Opinions of Jews and Christians concerning Christ. Edited by T. TURTON, D.D., Lord Bishop of Ely. A New Edition, revised, 8s.

A Commentary on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans. With a New Translation, and Notes. By W. W. EWBANK, M.A. Incumbent of St. George's, Everton. To be completed in Two Volumes, Post Octavo. Vol. I., 5s. 6d.

Hints for an Improved Translation of the New Testament. By J. SCHOLEFIELD, M.A., Regius Professor of Greek, Cambridge. Third Edition, 3s. 6d.

Guericke's Manual of Antiquities of the Christian Church; translated and adapted to the Use of the English Church. By A. J. W. MORRISON, B.A., Head Master of Grammar School, Truro. 5s. 6d.

Twysden's Historical Vindication of the Church of England in point of Schism. Edited for the Syndics of the Cambridge Press, with the Author's MS. Additions, by the Rev. Professor CORRIE, Master of Jesus College, Cambridge. Octavo, 7s. 6d.

Twenty-five Village Sermons. By C. KINGSLEY, jun., Rector of Eversley. 5s.

College Chapel Sermons. By W. WHEWELL, D.D., Master of Trinity College, Cambridge. Octavo, 10s. 6d.

Two Series of Discourses. I. On Christian Humiliation. II. On the City of God. By C. H. TERROT, D.D., Bishop of Edinburgh. Octavo, 7s. 6d.

Practical Sermons, by Dignitaries and other Clergymen. Edited by J. C. CROSTHWAITE, M.A., Rector of St. Mary-at-Hill. Three Volumes, Octavo, 7s. each.

Butler's Three Sermons on Human Nature, and Dissertation on Virtue. With Preface and Syllabus, by W. WHEWELL, D.D. Second Edition. 3s. 6d.

Butler's Six Sermons on Moral Subjects. With Preface and Syllabus. By DR. WHEWELL. 3s. 6d.

The Choral Service of the United Church of England and Ireland. By JOHN JEBB, M.A., Rector of Peterstow. Octavo, 16s.

Sermons Preached before the University of Oxford. By C. A. OGILVIE, D.D., Canon of Christ Church. Octavo, 5s.

The Scriptural Character of the English Church considered. With Notes. By D. COLERIDGE, M.A., Principal of St. Mark's College. Octavo, 12s. 6d.

The Calling of a Medical Student; Four Sermons preached at King's College, London. By E. H. PLUMPTRE, M.A., Chaplain and Divinity Lecturer. 1s. 6d.

The Literature of the Church of England, exhibited in Specimens of the Writings of Eminent Divines, with Memoirs of their Lives, and Historical Sketches of the Times in which they lived. By R. CATTERMOLE, B.D. Two Volumes, Octavo, 25s.

The Churchman's Theological Dictionary. By ROBERT EDEN, M.A., Chaplain to the Bishop of Norwich. Second Edition, 5s.

The Statutes relating to the Ecclesiastical and Eleemosynary Institutions of England, Wales, Ireland, India, and the Colonies; with the Decisions thereon. By A. J. STEPHENS, M.A., F.R.S., Barrister-at-Law. Two large Volumes, Royal Octavo, with copious Indices, 3l. 3s. Bound in law calf, 3l. 13s. 6d.









1 1012 01012 6011

