

A SYLLABUS  
OF THE MESSIANIC PASSAGES  
IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

BY

*O. S. Stearns.*

PROFESSOR IN NEWTON THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION.

BS648  
.5.S79

From the Library of  
Professor William Henry Green  
Bequeathed by him to  
the Library of  
Princeton Theological Seminary

5.5.79  
BS. 73  
.5.579









A

SYLLABUS

OF THE

MESSIANIC PASSAGES

IN THE

OLD TESTAMENT.

BY

O. S. STEARNS.



BOSTON :  
PRESS OF PERCIVAL T. BARTLETT,  
105 SUMMER STREET.  
1884.





A  
SYLLABUS OF THE MESSIANIC PASSAGES  
IN THE  
OLD TESTAMENT.

---

MESSIANIC TEXTS.

EXPLANATION.

By Messianic Texts is meant such passages in the Old Testament Scriptures as seem, when fairly interpreted, to portray one or more characteristics of the Christ of the New Testament. The Hebrew word *Máshich*, “*anointed*,” out of which comes by transliteration the Greek *Messias*, and the Greek translation of which is *Christos*, is applied in the Old Testament to kings<sup>1</sup> and priests<sup>2</sup> who were anointed with holy oil, and thereby dedicated to their official position, and to a king<sup>3</sup> or the Jewish nation<sup>4</sup> as appointed to some special service, but its application in the Old Testament to the ideal king, priest and prophet, whose antitype is the Christ of the New Testament, is very rare. In Ps. ii. 2, he seems to be so designated. In Dan. ix. 25, he seems to be referred to as “The future One as high priest and king in one person.” Possibly there is a reference to Him in 1 Sam. ii. 35. The term was evidently accepted as a technical one, denoting the Messiah, *par excellence*, long before the Christian era. John i. 41; iv. 25.

In the examination of some of these texts, it will be assumed that the Old Testament Scriptures are a revelation from God to man, progressive in its character and redemptive in its purpose. It will also be assumed that the Hebrew text as it now exists is our best source of

<sup>1</sup> 1 Sam. xxiv. 7, 11; 2 Sam. xxiii. 1. <sup>2</sup> Lev. iv. 3, 5, 16. <sup>3</sup> Isa. xlvi. 1. <sup>4</sup> Hab. iii. 13.

information on this subject. Versions and Targums will be referred to as subsidiary aids. It will likewise be assumed that many questions raised by historical criticism as to the authorship and date of the books of the Old Testament need not be considered, unless they evidently impinge upon or nullify the apparent meaning of a given passage. Whatever the age of a book quoted from or whoever was its author, it antedated the Messiah who was to come.

#### GENERAL DIVISION OF MESSIANIC TEXTS.

Delitzsch in his "Messianic Prophecies,"\* says: "In the Old Testament the Mediator of salvation is made known:

(1) *As the Seed of the Woman, who is the conqueror of evil in mankind;*

(2) *As the Seed of the Patriarchs, who is the blessing of the nations;*

(3) *As the Seed of David, who is the salvation and glory of Israel.*

In the New Testament, Christ is revealed as the Son of David, who, born in Israel, seeks the lost sheep of the house of Israel; then as the Seed of Abraham, who, through the apostolic preaching, since it breaks through the old barriers, becomes a Blessing to the nations; and finally, as the Son of Man, who, as the conqueror of evil and of death, sets over against the Adamic race a new one, born of God, and which is comprised under Him as its head." To unfold such a division of Messianic predictions, both unique and suggestive, would carry us beyond our present purpose. It would require many volumes to do it justice. Merely as a help to the memory, we may divide the texts to be considered into three classes: those found in the *Pentateuch*, those found in the *Psalms*, and those found in the *Major and Minor prophets*. Of these, however, only the more important ones will claim our attention.†

\* Chap. 6, § 1.

† For Messianic Literature, see article "Messiah," in Smith's Bib. Dict., Appendix.

## PENTATEUCHAL TEXTS.

The passages in the Pentateuch usually referred to as expressing the Messianic idea are Gen. iii. 14-15; ix. 26-27; xii. 2-3; xlix. 8-10; Deut. xviii. 15-19.

It will be noticed that four of these are in the book of Genesis. The evident purpose of the other books of the Pentateuch, aside from their historical element, is to inculcate and explain the civil, moral and ceremonial laws of a select nation, out of which Messiah is to come; to develop minutely the Ten Words, or Sinaitic Law, a true apprehension of which would necessitate the redemptive work of the Messiah; and to discipline and educate the people into a correct idea of an absolutely holy God, so as to intensify the desire for a Messianic Redeemer. These books, therefore, may be regarded as co-ordinate with the Messianic idea, and so far as the ceremonial polity is concerned, it is typical of that idea. But in Genesis we have a sketch of the early history of the human race, as well as of the origin of the Jewish nation; and if the Messiah is to be for the well-being of mankind, we naturally expect some hint of that fact. And accordingly we find in Genesis the thought of a Messiah, shadowy indeed, yet more personal in its movement than in the other books of the Pentateuch. In fact, the first three chapters of Genesis contain the essential elements of all subsequent revelation.

---

 THE PROTEVANGELIUM.

This epithet is applied to Gen. iii. 14-15. The passage has been deemed Messianic by Jewish tradition and by the Christian Church, and its essential thought of sin and a remedy has entered into the religions of the world. See *Lange* and *Kalisch*, on *Genesis*, *in loco*.

## LITERATURE.

- The Beginnings of History. F. Lenormant.  
 Origin of Nations. G. Rawlinson.  
 Bib. Sac. vol. 38, art. by W. H. Ward.  
 Bib. Sac. vol. 40, art. by Dillmann, trans. by Prof. G. H. Whittemore.

Bib. Sac. vol. 18, art. by S. C. Bartlett on "Theories of Messianic Prophecy."

The Messiah. Art. in Ency., Brit., 9th edition.  
The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture. G. T. Ladd.

#### EXEGESIS.

*Words.* The word rendered "bruise," in A. V., is derived from a Hebrew word, which, according to Fuerst, signifies "to pierce," "to wound," "to bruise," "to crush." Gesenius gives as a definition "to pant after," "to lie in wait for." The only parallel passage is Job ix. 17, where it cannot signify "to lie in wait." Ps. cxxxix, 11. is sometimes referred to as containing the word, but critics generally deem the word there an erroneous reading. Delitzsch says: "It is the stereotyped Targum word for 'to crush.'" The subject of the verb, in the clause, "he shall bruise, etc.," might be collective, but the usage of the word translated 'seed,' with a singular suffix, would indicate the personality of a single person. See *Bib. Sac. vol. 38, art. by R. Hutcheson.* The crucial part of the passage is the last clause of vs. 15, which is to be translated thus: "He," *i.e.*, the seed of the woman, "shall bruise thee as to the head; and thou," *i.e.*, the serpent, "shalt bruise him," *i.e.*, the woman's seed, "as to the heel." So Syr. Sam. version, the Targums of Pseudo-Jonathan, and Jerusalem. The Sept. renders the verb "to bruise" by "to watch for." Paul in Romans xvi. 20, renders it "to bruise." The Roman Catholic interpreters, without textual authority, make the subject of the verb feminine, and refer it to the Virgin Mary.

The surface thought of the verse would be this: there shall be perpetual enmity between the serpent and the woman, and between her seed and his seed; but the seed of the woman (pronoun emphatic) shall bruise or crush the serpent and his seed on the head, the most vital part, and the serpent and his seed shall bruise or crush her seed on the heel, the less vital part. In a word, the conflict between the two parties will result in a victory for the woman's seed. There seems to be also in the language the idea of immediate instinctive resistance on the part of the woman's seed, like the spontaneous effort to crush the serpent's head when one is bitten on the heel.

## REMARKS.

*Remark 1.* The language itself, and by itself, would simply express the divine assertion that, in consequence of the violation of God's law, by our first parents, there should be a mutual hatred between the human race and the serpent race. Such has been essentially the fact in human history, generally accounted for as the result of instinct, education, or tradition.

*Remark 2.* But the occasion which called out such a declaration would seem to demand much more than such a trite thought. Man's disobedience, with its sad consequences, calls for a ray of hope to the *soul* rather than to the *body*.

*Remark 3.* Hence the Scriptures assign the temptation to an agent acting through the serpent. This may not be found in explicit passages, because in no passage is the scene of the temptation minutely described or unfolded. But (*a*) Satan, as the foe of man, with personal attributes, is spoken of in Job i. 6-13; Zech. iii. 1-3; Matt. iv. (*b*) Satan is represented as the enemy of God and of Christ, and as the Prince of a Kingdom of darkness. John xii. 31; 2 Cor. iv. 4. (*c*) Satan, as the prime cause of evil, is referred to in Rev. xii. 9; and, if we add to these passages, 2 Cor. xi. 3, and Rom. xvi. 20, the agency of Satan through the serpent is scripturally conclusive.

*Remark 4.* The passage under consideration may, therefore, be fairly considered Messianic, as unfolded by subsequent revelations. (*a*) We cannot determine with certainty the exact meaning of the passage as understood by Adam and Eve. It sounded the note of victory, but the medium of the victory is left indefinite. Even a picture, however, is a teacher of fundamental truth. (*b*) As already said, the pronoun "he," "he shall bruise," etc., may be collective or individual. If collective, the passage when scripturally considered, would be a prophecy of the antagonism and victory of a peculiar race with an antagonizing race, the family of God and the family of Satan. If individual, which is possible, it would express the antagonism and victory of the head of a given class as opposed to the head of an opposing class; or, by the subsequent

development of revelation, Christ and Satan. (c) The passage may therefore be considered as essentially and generically Messianic.

#### OBJECTIONS.

1. It is objected to the above interpretation that the scene in the garden of Eden, as described in Gen. iii, is *mythical*. But the language of Scripture elsewhere, especially in its use of similar imagery, implies a literal transaction. (a) From it as a seed the whole history of man develops from Adam to Christ, as a literal account; so that, scripturally considered, the genealogy of Christ in Matt. i. might as well be termed mythical. (b) The scene in the garden is frequently referred to in both the Old and New Testaments as an historical event. When the prophets refer to it, the Masoretic text has been careful so to point the word as to guard against any mistake as to its local meaning. For the Old Testament, see Gen. xiii. 10; Isa. li. 3; Eze. xxviii. 13; xxxi. 9; Joel ii. 3; Job xxxi. 33. For the New Testament, see Matt. xix. 2-5; 2 Cor. xi. 3; 1 Tim. ii. 13-14; Rom. xvi. 20; Rom. v. 12-18, the last passage tracing minutely the analogy between Adam and Christ. (c) It gives us the only known origin of the human race. This would imply that the narrator intended to speak of a literal transaction.

2. It is objected to the Messianic application of this passage that the scene in the garden is *allegorical*. To this it may be replied that there is nothing in the language itself to imply such an interpretation. No unbiased exegete would so interpret the language by itself. He may indulge that opinion when he attempts to explain the *how* of the recorded narrative, but such an interpretation is merely the insertion of his opinion. It is not exegesis. Were we sure, however, that the language was allegorical, it would not annul the essential facts; for even allegory, to be consistent allegory, must rest on well-authenticated facts. The story of Dives and Lazarus, by some critics is called an allegory. The facts, however, remain the same, be it so or not. As Professor Conant says in his "*Genesis with Notes*": "In regard to the tempter's mode of communication with Eve,

it matters not whether we suppose the serpent to have appeared visibly, and in actual bodily form, to the eye of Eve, addressing her in audible words, or that the communication was purely mental, the tempter appearing in this form to the mind of Eve." "The reality of the transaction, as viewed by our Lord and his apostles, is not affected by interpreting the whole passage as an embodiment of great moral truths in sensible imagery, in order to make them more readily intelligible to all degrees of intellectual culture, and to give them a stronger hold upon the mind." This view would be termed the symbolical method of interpretation, against which there are few if any objections.

---

## NOACHIAN PROPHECY.

### GEN. IX. 25-27.

The position of this prophecy in the sacred record is very suggestive. The bow of promise, as the symbol of preservation to man's physical life, beautifully associates itself with the word of promise for the preservation of man's spiritual life. This promise is enclosed in a special benediction upon Shem. The term employed in this benediction, Jehovah-Elohim, includes the idea of God as Creator and Governor, and that of special Revealer and special Covenanter. The choice of this term, as the text now stands, for the blessing upon Shem,\* which term is omitted in the blessing upon Japhet, and the marked curse pronounced upon Canaan, the son of Ham, shuts in Shem as the head of a people upon whom and through whom the world was to be blessed. It expresses as much as this: that "because Jehovah is the God of Shem, Shem will be the recipient and heir of all the blessings of salvation which God, as Jehovah, bestows upon mankind." *Delitzsch Com. on Genesis*. Even Tuch, belonging to a less conservative school of critics, says, referring to the clause, "And Japhet shall dwell in the

\* See, for a somewhat similar usage, Gen. xiv. 20; Ex. xviii. 10; 2 Sam. xviii. 28.

tents of Shem": "This declaration goes back to the united act of filial piety of both brothers, and is intended to represent the ideal union in which, at a subsequent time, their posterity shall, as their progenitors now, be united for a higher object. That is here first indicated in a more general way, which is distinctly declared in the subsequent history, chap. xii. 3, that the salvation of all nations shall proceed from the offspring of Shem, who, in making Zion the common centre of their efforts, shall, without distraction, be united in the fear of the Lord." *Quoted from Bib. Sac. vol. 8, p. 60.* The passage, therefore, may be accepted as *generically* Messianic.

## LITERATURE.

- Hengstenberg's Christology, vols. 1, 2.  
 "Beitrage zur Erklarung des alten Testaments,"  
 Lawr. Reinke, vol. 4, pp. 3 107. Very exhaustive.  
 Schaff's Lange, *in loco*, the fullest of the Coms. on the passage.  
 Bib. Sac. vols. 12, 13. arts. by G. B. Cheever.  
 Bib. Sac. vol. 8, art. by R. D. C. Robbins.

## GENERAL EXEGESIS.

The text, as it now is, is obscure. If, as critics assert, it is a combination of parts of the Jehovistic and Elohistie documents, by a Redactor (*Dillmann*), his work is certainly not to be praised. Seemingly, a Redactor would have sought to leave his mark of perspicuity upon the patch. That the translators of the several versions and the paraphrasts were compelled to use the text as it now stands is evident, for they vary in their translations and paraphrases just as any tyro in Hebrew would do at the present day. Thus in vs. 25, "to his brethren" naturally means those of the same race, *i.e.*, that Canaan shall be a "servant of servants" to the Hamitic race, or the Hebrew word for "brothers" may have a broader signification, so as to express the servitude of C. to the Semitic and Japhetic races. In the 26th vs., "And let Canaan be a servant to him," (A. V.) the pronoun\* may be plural or collective, *i.e.*, "to them," *i.e.*, Shem and Japhet. In vs. 27, the subject of the verb "to dwell,"

\* Usage assigns to *tamo* a collective or plural meaning; yet see Ps. xi. 7; Job xxii. 12; Isa. xlii. 15; Ges. § 103 marginal note.



may be Elohim, or Japhet, giving the idea of a specially repeated favor to Shem, in lieu of the common interpretation that Japhet is to occupy the tents of Shem. An expanded translation of the passage will make these differences more apparent. Vs. 25, "And He said, Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be to his brothers," *i.e.*, those of his own Hamitic race, or those of all the races. Vs. 26, "And He said, Blessed be Jehovah, the God of Shem; and let Canaan be a servant to him, or them," *i.e.*, to Shem, the Semitic race, or to the Semitic and Japhetic races. Vs. 27, "May God enlarge Japhet; and may *"He,"* or *"he,"* *i.e.*, God or Japhet, "dwell in the tents of Shem; and let Canaan be a servant to *them;*" *i.e.*, Japhet and Shem; or "to *him,*" *i.e.*, Shem. In other words, guided merely by the text, its possibilities allow the servitude of Canaan to be limited to the Hamitic race, or enlarged to a servitude connected with the Semitic and Japhetic races. The history of Canaan, so far as is known, verifies this language of Noah essentially according to either interpretation.

#### THE BLESSING UPON ABRAM.

##### Gen. xii. 3.

The chapter which contains this prophecy is a transition chapter from universal history to national history. Previously, in the book of Genesis, we have a sketch of the origin of the world, the origin of the human race, the origin of hope to the race subsequent to the fall, and the selection of one of the sons of Noah, as the channel of this hope to the postdiluvian world. Now, from one of the descendants of Shem, the favored son of Noah, a selection is made, through whom "all the families of the earth shall be blessed." Abram, as one of the descendants of Shem, thus becomes the trust in whom rests the hope of the world. The story of redemption is thus narrowing itself into the history of an individual. As Kalisch (*Com. in loco*) says: "This is the Hebrew writer's avowed principle, and henceforth he devotes his narrative *exclusively* to the destinies of that race."

## LITERATURE.

Bib. Sac. vol. 11, art. by E. P. Barrows.  
 Bib. Sac. vol. 22, art. by Samuel Harris.

## EXEGESIS.

The last clause of the verse is as universal as the language can express. *All* the families of the earth shall be blessed, in connection with or by means of the Abram, who, in the previous verse, is selected as the head of a great nation. "I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and I will surely make thy name great." The word translated "shall be blessed" is Niphal, and by some is considered reflexive, *i.e.*, "shall bless themselves," *i.e.*, make him the *beau ideal* of the greatest blessedness, which in his name they invoke upon themselves. Ps. lxxii. 17; Isa. lxxv. 16. But usage, with some exceptions, requires that when a verb in Kal is transitive, and an Hithpael is likewise in use, the Niphal should be construed as passive.\* Besides, the word is not to be found in the imperative of Niphal, which would imply its usual passive use. The preposition "in" (in him) is instrumental, *i.e.*, by means of him, with the additional idea of unity as a source, *i.e.*, Abram is to be both the medium and the source of this blessedness. In the clause, "All the families of the earth," strictly "all the families of the soil," perhaps the selection of the word reflects upon the origin of man, and the curse upon the ground. Elsewhere, Gen. xviii. 18, the more common phrase is found; *i.e.*, "All the nations of the earth." By "families of the earth" is meant the division of the human race into families, *i.e.*, the whole human race. Gen. x. 5; xxviii. 14. In Gen. xxii. 18, we have, instead of "in thee," "in thy seed." So also in xxvi. 14, which repeats the blessing to Isaac, and in xxviii. 14, that upon Jacob. The words translated, "to curse," in the first clause of the verse, are distinct in meaning. In the first instance, the word means the reproaches and blasphemous curses of man; in the second, the judicial curse of God.—Keil. The verse as thus explained, may be expanded thus: And I will surely bless, *i.e.*, let my benediction rest upon those who bless,

\* Nord. § 141, notes. Ges. § 51, 2, p. 130. Gr. § 80, 2, 2.

or let their benediction rest upon thee and thy seed; and I will judicially curse those who reproach or blaspheme thee and thy seed: and in connection with thee as the head of a peculiar race, thou being the human source, all the families of the ground, *i.e.*, the whole human family shall be partakers of my benediction.

## REMARKS.

*Remark 1.* The prophecy teaches the universality of a divine blessing, emanating from Abram. It is as broad and catholic as any kindred assertion of the New Testament. It harmonizes with the Messianic passages in Ps. xxii. 28, and lxxii. 17, and with its verification as affirmed in Acts iii. 25; Gal. iii. 8 9.

*Remark 2.* According to the testimony of Christ, Abram received the prophecy as forecasting a Messianic era. John viii. 56. This language in John cannot properly refer to any vision of Christ in Heaven, because, (*a*) It was the custom of Christ to reason from Scripture, and out of Scripture, to prove his assertions. (*b*) The objection of his hearers was to the fact and to the fact alone. (*c*) The reply of Christ to their cavil is an appeal to the fact. The passage affirms that Abraham saw the *day* of Christ, not necessarily his person, except so far as that person might be concealed in the Jehovah or the Angel of Jehovah, but the *day* of Christ, the period when his mission should be put into execution. He rejoiced, he exulted in the activity of his faith, with strong, longing spirit, to see the Messianic era, with its blessings. See *Ellicot. Phil. i. 6-10; Meyer. and Westcott, on John viii. 56.*

*Remark 3.* According to the Scriptures, Abraham is the head of a race of believers in the Messiah, and a type of Christ. Rom. iv. 11; Gal. iii. 16. On the latter passage, Dr. Hackett says: "The Apostle does not refer to any particular passage which contains the words, but avails himself of this brief mode of speaking, as a convenient formula for summing up the entire teaching of Scripture on this subject. It is as if he had said, "Search the Scriptures from Genesis to Malachi, they are of one strain; they make no mention of a plurality of seeds; they speak of a single seed only, the believing race, who are like

Abraham in his faith. Christ here represented his people as being in Him." The passage, Gen. xii. 3, may therefore be accepted as *generically* and *spiritually* Messianic. Abraham, according to the Scriptures, was to be the father of our Lord Jesus Christ, according to the flesh (Matt. i. 1), and the father of all true believers in Christ. Gal. iii. 16.

---

## THE BLESSING OF ISAAC UPON JACOB.

GEN. XXVII. 27-29.

Of this prophecy as a connecting link between that given by God to Abraham, and that given by Jacob to his sons, the explanation of Delitzsch is so clear and comprehensive, I quote the entire section. *Mess. Prophs.*, ch. vii., § 8.

"It is the promise respecting the benediction of the nations through the seed of the patriarchs, and therefore of the completion of the divine work which the patriarchs bestow as a blessing upon their first-born, since they thus make them bearers of the great promised blessing, and mediums of the preparation for its fulfilment. Isaac is Abraham's first and only son by Sarah, and hence entitled to the reception of this blessing. Jacob snatches away the blessing of the first-born, which belonged to Esau, and even retains it, but only as he atones for the sin connected with the act, and obtains it anew from Jehovah by wrestling in prayer and tears. The blessing of the first-born (Gen. xxvii. 27-29) consists of four parts, in which Jacob is promised:

(1) The possession of the land of Canaan, under the divine benediction (vs. 27 *b*, 28): "See, the smell of my son is as the smell of a field which Jehovah has blessed; and God will give thee of the dew of Heaven, and of the fatness of the land, and plenty of corn and must";

(2) The subjection of the nations to such an extent that every limitation is contrary to the words of the text, (vs. 29 *a*): "Peoples shall serve thee and nations shall bow down to thee;"

(3) The primacy over his brothers, that is over those blood-relations, whose posterity were outside the line of promise (vs. 29 *b*): "Be lord over thy brethren, and let thy mother's sons bow down to thee."

(4) So high a position in redemptive history, that blessings and curses are conditioned by the relation which men take to him who has received the blessing (vs. 29 *c*): "Cursed be they that curse thee, and blessed be they that bless thee." Compare Gen. xii. 3, and Num. xxiv. 9, which is referred to the people of Israel. This fourth part shows that it is the same promise, received by Abraham, which Isaac bestows upon Jacob. Its goal is Christ. The promise extends to the nations, and even shortly becomes national, and so Messianic. For Jacob's twelve sons form the transition from the family to the people of promise."

---

## THE BLESSING OF JACOB UPON JUDAH.

GEN. XLIX. 8-12.

### LITERATURE.

- Turner's A Companion to the Book of Genesis.  
 Wright's The Book of Genesis in Hebrew.  
 Tuch's Genesis. Very full.  
 Knobel's Genesis for monographs.  
 Kurtz's History of the Old Covenant, vol. 2.  
 Cheyne's Prophecies of Isaiah. Essay 4.

### BRIEF EXEGESIS.

An analysis of vss. 8-10 gives three characteristics:

1. Judah's preëminence over his brothers, and his victory over his enemies. Vs. 8.
2. Judah as the lion-hearted, courageous son, and to be increasingly so. Vs. 9.
3. The perpetuity of his preëminence. Vs. 10.

Verse 10th is the crucial verse, and the meaning of two of its words is doubtful. They are *M'hokēk* and *Shilōh*. The former in Deut. xxxiii. 21; Isa. xxxiii. 22, and Ps. lx. 9, seems to mean lawgiver or governor, but

most critics prefer here the translation "staff," corresponding with sceptre, as the symbol of royalty, the picture being that of a king on his throne leaning on his staff or sceptre, which is between his feet. Num. xxi. 18. See *Layard's Nineveh*. The form of the word is active and intensive, and its usage implies either an actor or the impersonation of an actor. The view of Gesenius the Sept. and Onkelos, that the phrase in which it stands signifies a *royal descendant*, has much in its favor. The second word may be derived from a *Lameth He* verb, signifying 'to be tranquil,' 'to be at ease,' 'to be restful,' or from an unused *Ayin Vav* verb, signifying 'to hang from the shoulders as a garment,' 'to rest,' but the difficulty in the use of the word does not lie in its derivation so far as meaning is concerned. The older critics supposed it was an Aramaic combination of the relative and its antecedent, *i.e.*, 'whose it is,' but for such a contraction we have no pentateuchal usage. The supposed correspondence in Gen. vi. 3 is now ruled out.\* And the common reference to Eze. xxi. 32, as a parallel instance of such combination, or as expository of this word, has little authority. That passage, however, is doubtless Messianic. The word is either a personal, descriptive name, or a local name. The verb connected with it may have this word for its subject, or he, *i.e.*, Judah, may be the subject. The renderings "until he comes to Shiloh," or "until Shiloh comes," are possible, grammatically. The word in A. V., translated "gathering," "unto him shall the gathering of the people be," should be translated 'obedience' or 'submission.' Prov. xxx. 17. The tenth verse, which is the chief one now in question, may be translated thus: "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor the staff (of royalty) from between his feet (or royalty itself) until Shiloh come, or until he comes to Shiloh."

## REMARKS.

*Remark 1.* It is well to consider this very difficult text *subjectively*, *historically*, and by way of *verification*.

*Remark 2.* Considered *subjectively*, *a priori* to a believer in a divine revelation, there can be no objection

to its Messianic character, if fairly it can be so interpreted. For (a) Jacob had been previously the recipient of divine revelations, some of which referred to him as the progenitor of a select people through whom the human race was to be blessed. Gen. xxviii. 14. (b) Jacob had been made acquainted with the prophecies given to his ancestors on the same subject. Gen. xxxi. 54; xxxi. 42; xxxii. 10. (c) The selection of Judah, the lion-hearted, harmonizes with the condition of Jacob's family at this time. Reuben, the first-born, and Simeon and Levi, his successors, had forfeited their claim to the rights of primogeniture, and as a consequence to any typical position as the head of a spiritual race. The glowing blessing upon Joseph (xlix. 22-26), according to I Chron. v. 1, transferred to him the honors of the birthright, and if to anyone the primacy of leadership (I Chron. v. 2), and the blessing would be the gift to Judah as the fourth son. (d) We naturally expect, according to the law of progress, that, from the selection of a patriarch in whom the general blessing rested, we should pass to an individual of that family, to whom a special personal blessing should be confided. Antecedently, therefore, we may justly look for the Messianic to assume in this passage a personal or tribal character.

*Remark 3.* *Historically* considered, (a) more monographs have been written upon the poem in which this prophecy is found than upon any other in the Old Testament. See *Tuch*, § 570. (b) The word *Shiloh*, as referring to a personal Messiah, was the generally accepted view until several centuries after the Christian era. The Sept., the purest part of which is the Pentateuch, date about 280 B.C., reads, "Until He come for whom these things are reserved." In the Peshito, Syriac, date between the first and second centuries A.D., we have, "Until He come whose it is." In the Sam. Pent., date uncertain, the verse corresponds with the 'Textus Receptus.' The version of Onkelos, date probably about 2nd century A.D., (*Deutsch's Literary Remains*, art. *Targums*), reads, "Until the Messiah come, whose the kingdom is." In the Targum of Jerusalem of the 7th century A.D., we have, "Until Shiloh come, King Messiah, whose the

kingdom is." See more in Turner's *A Companion to the Book of Genesis*. (c) Gesenius in the early edition of his lexicon, and Fuerst in his early concordance, assign personality to the word *Shiloh*. The later editions give it a local meaning, the Shiloh where the ark was placed as the centre of national worship. The early authorities are therefore essentially agreed in deeming the passage Messianic.

*Remark 4.* The heading to the poem, "The end of days," as in the fifteen other passages, seems to be an *ideal terminus*, limited as to its scope by the seer's vision, corresponding to "In the last days" of the New Testament. Here it might be the occupation of Canaan, or that as typical of a grander event. See Kurtz' *Hist. of the Old Covenant*, vol. 2, p. 31.

*Remark 5.* The word *Shiloh*, written fully or defectively, in every other instance in the Old Testament, is used for the town Shiloh. Here, as already stated, it may be the subject of the verb "to come," or a local accusative, "until Shiloh comes," or "until he comes to Shiloh." We have no proof that such a place was known to Jacob, and we have none that such was not the case. The place may have taken its name from its historical origin, as the central place of worship, or it may not. Judah, as the leading tribe, the van of the wilderness army, and perhaps during the Canaanitish wars, came to Shiloh as truly as did the rest, and in all probability as the leader of the rest. The statement of a writer in the *Methodist Quarterly*, 1869, p. 419, that "In the numerous battles recorded in Joshua previous to the coming to Shiloh, not a word is said about Judah's taking the lead," is an argument *e silentio*, which is to be treated cautiously. His prior position as leader, presupposes his subsequent leadership, unless his removal from it is historically stated. See Num. ii. 3; x. 14; Josh. xv. 1; Judges i. 2; xx. 18.

*Remark 6.* The facts, therefore, seem to leave the *personal* Messianic signification of this passage, at best, uncertain. But if we take it as tribal and typical, verified in the first instance, as an epoch in Israel, Josh. xviii. 1, when the land being subdued, "the tabernacle of the covenant was pitched" there, and Judah was the leading



tribe, it takes on a sufficiently Messianic character, to harmonize with Rev. v. 5, and is illustrated by the motto on the well-known standard of Judah, under a lion's whelp: "Rise up, Jehovah, and let thine enemies be scattered."

*Remark 7.* As to its historical verification, if we criticise the prophecy minutely, and require that royalty in its kingly personality should be preserved in the house of Judah until the appearing of Christ, it cannot easily be sustained. Lawgiving as such, of course, was in the hands of Moses, a Levite, and leadership, in the hands of Joshua, an Ephraimite, and subsequently in the hands of Samson, a Danite, but from the Davidic era royalty belonged to the tribe of Judah. Yet not always in a kingly form. In the house of David, the sceptre remained until the Babylonian captivity, the other tribes in their history after the secession being under many dynasties. The rulers of the restored people, now called Jews, were at first of the house of David. Ezra iii. 2. Subsequently the chief power lay in the hands of priest-princes, of the house of Levi, yet the nation governed was essentially of the house of Judah. So that in reality the sceptre did not depart from Judah, nor royalty from his successors, until the usurpation of the Idumean Herod, in whose reign the son of David, the son of Judah, came. We may deem the passage, if Messianic, tribally and thereby typically Messianic.

---

## THE PROPHECY OF BALAAM.

NUMBERS XXIV. 14-17.

### LITERATURE.

- Balaam. Monograph by Hengstenberg. Kalisch's Commentary on Numbers. Bib. Sac. vol. 3, art. by R. D. C. Robbins.  
 Bib. Sac. vol. 3, True Date of Advent of Christ, art. by Wieseler, trans. by G. E. Day. The Star of the Wise Man, by R. C. Trench.  
 Stanley's Jewish Church, vol. 1. Ewald's Hist. of Israel, vol. 2.  
 Kurtz' History of the Old Covenant, vol. 2. Messianic Prophecies, Franz Delitzsch, chap. viii., § 13.

## REMARKS.

*Remark 1.* Our limits in this syllabus, and the difficulty in printing Hebrew words, will prevent any careful exegesis of this much-disputed prophecy.

*Remark 2.* *A priori*, it is no objection to the actuality of such a prophecy that the speaker was a bad man. God can use such agencies as he pleases, and there may be even to our eyes wisdom in the selection. Other similar instances in the Scriptures are suggestive.

*Remark 3.* The circumstances would warrant such a prophecy; *i.e.*, God's enemies needed to know His purposes concerning His own people. Its position in the history of God's people is an appropriate and natural one. The controversy as to the locality of the prophecy in the history is capable of adjustment to a believer in revelation. There are difficulties connected with this matter, however, which cannot now be considered.

*Remark 4.* By the symbol of the Star, and that of the Sceptre, we have the idea of *royalty*, and by the use of these emblems in the passage, victory over foes. If the passage is Messianic, and the date correct, it is the first passage which presents to us Messiah as King. Delitzsch says (*O. T. Hist. of Redemption*, § 29), "That which is promised to Judah as the royal tribe, is hereafter connected with the person of a King, through whom Judah attains the dominion of the world, to which, according to Gen. xlix. 10, he was designated after the arrival in Shiloh." "He is the King of the final period, through whom Israel conquers all the neighboring nations; and though Israel for a time is threatened by Ashur, the world-empire of the East, and subjugated by Chittim, the world-empire of the West. (I Macc. i. 1; viii. 5), it victoriously outlasts the nearest and most remote movements of the nations." At any rate, some King is to arise who is to subdue God's enemies; and from the typical usage of Edom and Moab, as the symbols of unchecked hatred to Israel by the later prophets, it is quite evident that this prophecy in the main is Messianic, bringing forward His kingly office. Rev. xxii. 16.

*Note.* The Targum of Onkelos refers to it as *Messi-*

anic. In the Christian Era, the appearance of Bar-cochab was welcomed by the Jews as the fulfilment of this prophecy. The Christian Fathers interpreted it as Messianic.

---

## THE PROPHET LIKE MOSES.

DEUT. xviii. 15-19.

Most conservative critics agree that this passage is Messianic, but they differ as to its *exclusive* reference to the Messiah. Some maintain that the word "prophet" is used *collectively*, for the whole body of the prophets; others that it is used *ideally* as a typical picture of the true Messiah; and others claim that it refers to Messiah alone, a *par excellence*.

### REMARKS.

*Remark 1.* The best way to ascertain the meaning of the passage is to look at it analytically. (*a*) By the context, a sharp contrast is drawn between false prophets and genuine prophets; and Israel is to have a genuine one. Vss. 12-14. (*b*) The prophet to come was to be like Moses. Vss. 15-18. (*c*) He was to be a mediating lawgiver between a dread divinity and a trembling people. Vss. 16-17. Ex. xx. 18-19. (*d*) His word was to be imperative and ultimate. Vs. 18. (*e*) His word was to be so emphatically the expression of the divine mind that Jehovah would take into his own hands the punishment merited by a disobedience of it. Vs. 19.

*Remark 2.* Still more light may be shed upon the passage by comparing it with a kindred passage in Num. xii. 6, and with other passages in the Pentateuch. (*a*) Moses is styled God's prophet pre-eminently. Comparing him with other prophets, this distinction is made by assigning to him an especial immediateness in the reception of his messages, and by the distinctness or matter-of-factness which is to characterize them. In Num. xii. 6-8, where Jehovah rebukes the jealousy of Aaron and Miriam, on ac-

count of the official rank of their brother, Jehovah says: Hear now my words: If ye have, or if there be, a prophet among you, I, Jehovah, will make myself known to him; in a vision, in a dream, I will speak to him. Not so is my servant Moses. He is faithful in all my house. Mouth to mouth will I speak to him, and by an appearance, *i.e.*, with open face, and not in riddles or dark speeches; and the form of Jehovah he beholds clearly. The distinction here drawn between Moses and other prophets lies in the mode of communication and the official position of Moses himself. His message was to be the result of a peculiar, highly-favored intercommunion, an open face-to-face revelation. It was also to be distinct from all mere symbolism and prophetic action, so characteristic of other prophets. They received their knowledge in an ecstatic state, by visions and dreams. He was also the mediator of the covenant for the *whole house* of Israel, with reference to whose laws nothing was to be added or subtracted. Others were simply the expositors to *parts* of Israel of what Moses had already set forth. Heb. iii. 5. (*b*) Moses' pre-eminence is likewise affirmed in Deut. xxxiv. 10. The statement is made by one who added the appendix to Deuteronomy. The author and date are unknown, but the statement may be accepted as authoritative.

*Remark 3.* In the New Testament the passage is referred to as having its fulfilment in Christ. Thus (*a*) Peter refers the language to Christ as affirmed by Moses, expounding thereby the mediatorial office of Christ. He allows, however, to others, as prophets, the province of foretelling the coming of the Messiah. Acts iii. 22-24. (*b*) Stephen does the same, *i.e.*, he has the same purpose evidently in his mind, and would have brought it out, had he been permitted to finish his defense. Acts vii. 37. (*c*) During the ministry of our Lord, the passage seems to have been currently accepted as Messianic. In John i. 21, where John the Baptist denies that he was *the prophet* expected, assuring his questioners that he was merely the forerunner of such an one, according to Isa. xl. 3, and Mal. iii. 1, the reference is apparent. In John v. 45 the direct charge of Christ was that the people

would not listen to Him when He announced His Father's word, and their guilt in the matter was emphasized by the fact that Moses would accuse them of their crime inasmuch as he had written of Him. In both these cases the passage under consideration must be the one in the minds of the speakers, as it is the only place in the Pentateuch where the idea of Messiah as a *prophet* is referred to. See also John vi. 14 and vii. 40, and iv. 25.

*Remark 4.* How the language of this passage would have been understood by the contemporaries of Moses, it is impossible to say. They would have looked merely for another Moses. As a fact, the Jews never saw one like him in his highest office until the Messiah came. While other prophets hold a subordinate place, and are justly typical of the Messiah, the one spoken of here was to stand above them in the immediateness of his connexion with Jehovah, and in the infallibility of his utterances as Lawgiver. No prophet subsequent to the time of Moses attained to that honor. Christ as Son over His own house was superior to Moses as a servant in his own house. Heb. iii. 5. He who could say "The words that I speak unto you, I speak not from myself;" (John xiv. 10), "I speak the things which I have *seen* with my Father;" (John viii. 38), "As my Father taught me I speak these things;" (John viii. 28), "He that hath seen Me, hath seen the Father;" (John xiv. 9), alone illustrates and transcends the prophet like unto Moses.

---

## MESSIANIC PASSAGES IN THE PSALMS.

### LITERATURE.

- J. Pye Smith's Testimony to Messiah.  
 Hengstenberg's Christology.  
 Krummacher's Suffering Saviour.  
 Schöttgen's Horac Hebraicae.  
 Pusey's Daniel.  
 Leathie's Testimony of O. T. to Messiah.  
 Reinke's die Messianischen Psalmen.  
 Böhl's Zwölf Messianischen Psalmen erklärt.  
 Commentaries — Perowne — Delitzsch — Olshausen — Hagenbach  
 — Murphy — Alexander — Jennings and Lowe — Ewald — Hitzig — H.  
 Graetz — Kay — Four Friends — Lange (Moll) — Speaker's — Vaihinger  
 — Thrupp (Introduction) — C. Phillips.

## PRELIMINARY.

Before turning our attention to such Psalms as seem to be Messianic, a few hints as to the preservation of the Messianic idea between the period of the Pentateuch and the early Psalms, deserve a brief notice. As a history of the chosen nation, Joshua, Judges, and I and II Samuel might be expected to give some fore-gleams of the clearer light in the Psalms. They evidently contain history, and are designed for the history of this intervening period, whoever were the authors, and whatever the date of their production. They cover a long, dark period, a period when the longings of a pious heart would seek an expression of its hopes, if such hopes were cherished. And, accordingly, we find something, very scanty indeed, which looks, at least, like the *reflexion* of a rainbow thrown out from this period of storms.

In the farewell of Joshua (Josh. xxiii.; xxiv.) we have nothing strictly Messianic, except as it breathes the spirit of Moses, and looks into the future of the nation, as perhaps a typical nation, at any rate as a nation elected to a pure and sacred destiny, provided that it is faithful to its calling. The brief, prophetic address in Judges vi. 8-10, is merely a warning concerning Israel's backslidings. The triumphal song of the prophetess Deborah (Judges v.), so antique in form as to bear witness to its assigned age, contains little of the Messianic idea, beyond the pæan note of faith's final victory. But when we come to the song of Hannah (I Sam. ii. 1-10), in the days of Eli, the echo of which is Mary's Magnificat (Luke i. 46-54), her closing words seem to anticipate an ANOINTED ONE, through whom Jehovah is to work wonders. Like prophecy, generally, she ascends from her personal victory over her enemy, Peninnah, to a general victory over all of Jehovah's foes, by means of this ANOINTED ONE. "Jehovah will judge the ends of the earth, and will grant power to the King, and will exalt the horn of His ANOINTED." As is well known, there was no king in Israel at this time, nor for many years subsequently. Even when the time came, her son, Samuel, strongly objected to the election of a king. Was this utterance of hers merely a

woman's weak, nervous longing for some king to appear, who should change the chaotic condition of the nation into order and subdue their enemies, or was it an inspired bursting forth of a gleam of hope through the dense darkness?

Passing to I Sam. ii. 27-36, we find an unnamed prophet, proclaiming the rise of a line of priests, distinct from those of the house of Eli, which is to be perpetual. "And I will raise me up a faithful priest, who shall do according to that which is in my heart and in my mind, and I will build him a faithful (permanent) house, and he shall walk before mine ANOINTED forever." Eli belonged to the house of Ithamar, of the house of Levi, of the house of Aaron. The woe pronounced upon his sons, when removing them from the priesthood, was not immediately carried out; for we find Ahijah, the son of Phinehas, the grandson of Eli, in the priest's office (I Sam. xiv. 3), and a brother of Ahijah, Ahimelech, as high priest at Nob. (I Sam. xxi. 2; xxii. 9.) Ahimelech's son, Abiathar, was with David as high priest during David's persecution by Saul, and was the last of the sons of Ithamar to be honored with the high priesthood. He joined in conspiracy against Solomon, and was deposed by Solomon from his office, verifying in his sad fate the woe pronounced upon the house of Eli. (I Kings ii. 27.) Henceforward, the line of Eleazar, or the Zadokian line, as it is called, retains possession of the priesthood; and as Delitzsch says (M. P. ch. viii. § 17), "The promise in I Sam. ii. 35, is primarily realized in all the better Zadokian high priests who stood at the side of the better kings from the house of David. But its ultimate fulfilment is found in the Christ of God, in whom, according to Zech. vi. 13, the ideal king and priest do not stand side by side, but are united."

Passing to II Sam. vii. and I Chron. xvii., the kingly position of Messiah stands out still more clearly. In his desire to build a house for the worship of Jehovah, David is checked by a revelation from Nathan, the prophet, who assures him that while his pious wish in this regard cannot be granted, it shall be compensated for by a higher honor. This honor is the permanency of the Davidic

dynasty, the perpetuation of a line of kings from his own loins. His dynasty is not to be elective as was that of Saul, but hereditary. The highest personal honor, according to the ambition of ancient and modern royalty, was thus guaranteed to him. "When thy days shall be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, then will I raise up thy seed after thee, *which shall proceed out of thy bowels*, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build me a house to my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom, *forever*." (II Sam. vii. 12-19.) The ANOINTED ONE here is not David, but a descendant of David. The immediate verification would be the reign of Solomon. The term "seed," however, in vs. 12, seems to be general as well as individual, when expounded by vs. 13. "I will establish the throne of his kingdom *forever*." What follows, in vss. 14-16, cannot well be explained except as indicating the perpetuity of the Davidic dynasty. And the response of David (vss. 18-19) implies, certainly, that he so understood it. Very jejune would be an interpretation which limited the adoration of the royal singer for this great act of divine condescension to allowing him the privilege of having one son to sit upon his throne.

These hints of something hopeful for the future welfare of Israel, though they are but hints, intimate at least that in the Messianic thought we have passed from the Mosaic prophecy concerning Him as a *prophet* to other offices of his, those of *Priest* and *King*. They are but rays of light in the dark past, but they give the keynote by which the singers of Israel in the Psalms, sung their triumphal songs.

---

### MESSIANIC PSALMS.

The Messianic Psalms may be divided into two classes: those which speak of the Messiah as King and Conqueror, and those which speak of Him as Sufferer. As Priest, He is referred to in Ps. cx., but no entire Psalm presents Him in that peculiar attitude. It was not necessary, perhaps, inasmuch as the ceremonial law



was not yet abrogated: and its evident design, in thought at least, was to keep the priestly intercessory idea ever active in the minds of the Jewish nation.

Of those Psalms which picture the Messiah as King and Sufferer, another division may be made, viz., Predictive and Typically-Predictive. The number of entire Psalms, however, which may be reckoned as Messianic is very small. It is to these we confine our examination. Single passages, as vouched for by quotation in the New Testament, are quite numerous, but these must now be omitted.

As *King*, Psalms ii. and cx. are Predictive. Psalm ii., however, is founded upon an actual as the basis of an ideal. As *King*, Psalms lxxii., xlv., xx., xxi. are Typical, though containing predictive elements. Of these only lxxii. and xlv. can be said to be pervaded by the Messianic elements. As *Sufferer*, Psalms xxii. and lxix. are generally reckoned, but only xxii. can bear an exclusively Messianic interpretation, and this is Typical. Psalm xvi., by the use made of it in the New Testament, may be deemed typically-predictive of Messiah's Resurrection. We will consider the more important of these Psalms as to their Messianic element in the following order: ii., cx., lxxii., xlv., xxii., xvi.

#### PSALM II.

#### LITERATURE.

Bib. Sac. vol. 7, art. by C. E. Stowe.

That this Psalm is Messianic, portraying the Messiah as King and Conqueror, is evident from the following considerations:

1. Jewish commentators, early and late, so interpreted it, though they modified their interpretation of it as to its verification in Christ as the Messiah. They candidly say that the reason for their modification is polemical. See Perowne, Delitzsch, Schöttgen.

2. The New Testament writers ascribe to it a Messianic character. In Acts iv. 24, vs. 27, vss. 1 and 2

are said to have been fulfilled in the conspiracy of the Jewish rulers and of Pilate to put Christ to death. In Acts xiii. 33, Paul adduces vs. 7 as proof of the sonship of the Messiah, as declared, or made manifest, by the resurrection of Christ from the dead. In Hebrews i. 5, it is expressly stated that God addressed the language of this verse to His son. See also Hebrews vs. 5. These passages are not quoted by way of accommodation or illustration, but as verification, as having their real fulfilment in Christ, and in Christ alone.

3. The course of thought in the Psalm demands the Messianic sense. The language cannot be justly applied to any other Prince or Ruler without excessive exaggeration. The dominion is to be universal, including Gentiles and Jews. The representation in this respect harmonizes with what the prophets teach concerning the Messianic reign. Isa. ii. 2; Micah iv. 1; Zech. ix. 10. A verification in Uzziah, Hezekiah, or Alexander Jannaeus, as critics claim, is preposterous.

4. The objections to the Messianic interpretation of this Psalm are not valid when the facts in the case are candidly considered. (*a*) It is said that the Psalm refers exclusively to the reign of David. But allowing the Davidic authorship, it is inapplicable to him, because it treats of a king recently appointed, against whom the princes of the world and the heathen nations rebelled; whereas David when he began to reign was sovereign over only a part of the tribes of Israel, and had made as yet no foreign conquests. If, however, the Psalm is Davidic, the picture might have its background in the last years of his reign, in the Ammonitish wars (2 Sam. x.), and refer to a successor. (2 Sam. vii.) Such a view would give to the Psalm a typically-predictive character. (*b*) It is said that the Psalm refers exclusively to the reign of Solomon, but no rebellion of any mark occurred during his reign, and the events foreshadowed in the Psalm find no correspondence in his recorded history. (*c*) It is said that the language with reference to the enemies of the Messiah is too severe to be applicable to Christ. But it is no more severe than the language of Christ himself. Matt. xxv. 46; Luke xix. 27; Rev. ii. 27; xix. 15.

## ANALYSIS.

1. The enemies of Messiah conspire against Him, and refuse to submit to His authority. Vss. 1-3.

2. Their hostility is vain, because Jehovah has made Him the moral King and Governor of the world, and given Him the power to establish His claim to the title. Vss. 4-9.

3. Unqualified submission being their only escape from a terrible doom, His enemies are bidden yield to His sceptre. Vss. 10-12.

## REMARKS.

*Remark 1.* Studying this Psalm as to its Messianic character, special attention must be given to vs. 7. "Let me relate the particulars concerning a decree (Ps. lxix. 27): Jehovah has said to me, My Son art Thou: this day have I begotten Thee."

*Remark 2.* The subsequent use of this verse, or the thought of the verse, implies a broader meaning than the birth of a merely human monarch. Aside from Dan. vii. 13, and possibly Dan. iii. 25, it is the only passage in the Old Testament to which the divine sonship can be referred as being prophetic. Yet in the New Testament such a sonship is recognized as an expected fact. See Matt. iii. 17; John i. 14; John i. 49; Matt. xxvi. 63; Rom. i. 3; Heb. i. 5, and vs. 5; Acts xiii. 33.

*Remark 3.* The verse in the Hebrew fits this broad application very suggestively. The scene of the dialogue between Jehovah and His anointed is placed by the Psalmist-Seer in Heaven (vs. 4). In vs. 6 the emphatic pronoun introduces the words of Jehovah, and emphasizes the position of the speaker, as if he had said: You have had *your* way, now *I* will have *mine*. I will fit *my* king against *your* kings. I have established my king upon *Zion*: not merely Jerusalem, but the heavenly Jerusalem, of which the earthly Jerusalem is merely a type. The position is conferred, not assumed. Then come the words of vs. 7. The speaker, the Anointed One, quotes the language of Jehovah as addressed to Him. In this language the two emphatic words are the pronoun

and the verb; equivalent to saying: I, on my part, have begotten a Son of *my own proper self; i.e., of my own nature*. Others are called my sons declaratively, or by adoption, but this one is to be *just like me*, the Monogenes. In no other instance in the Old Testament is the verb "to beget" used to denote the begetting of a son by God. Messiah's mother is frequently spoken of, and as the descendant of David He is frequently mentioned, but here, as Moll remarks, "in a *determined* case some one has been placed in this relation by God Himself, and indeed in the *history of revelation*." See Pusey's *Lectures on Daniel*, p. 479. The word "today," or "this day," may signify that at this specific time Jehovah appointed the ANOINTED ONE to the royal position, or that at this time he declared or manifested Him as such. The tense of the verb affirms a *completed act*, either at a moment previously, or at any time previously: (See I Sam. x. 19, and xxvi. 19), equivalent to saying, "Today it is an unquestioned and actual fact that I have begotten Thee." So far as the divine thought is concerned, it may be eternal. So far as the manifestation of the fact is concerned, it might be in the theophanies of the Old Testament, or in the incarnation of the New Testament, crowned as the latter was by undeniable proof in His resurrection.

*Remark 4.* The verse, therefore, by its connection, and by its peculiarity of language, as well as by the use made of it in the New Testament, may be justly considered prophetically Messianic.

#### PSALM CX.

##### LITERATURE.

Bib. Sac. vol. 9, Art. by B. B. Edwards.

This Psalm resembles the second, and has for its principal thought the same theme, Messiah as Conqueror. The evidence for its Messianic character is two-fold; the testimony of the older Jewish commentators and the testimony of Christ himself. In the early Jewish literature nearly every verse of the Psalm is commented upon as Messianic, and the authorship as Davidic; but in the con-

troversies of the Jews with the Christian church, the Rabbis referred the hero of the Psalm to David, Abraham, Hezekiah, and Zerubbabel. See Perowne, Jennings and Lowe, Schöttgen, Hengstenberg. The testimony of Christ is very explicit. He uses the first verse as a proof that Messiah when He comes will be a being so superior to David that David *himself*, under divine inspiration, had once declared that He was David's Sovereign. This testimony is given by each of the three synoptists, as though it was so vital a matter no one of them could omit the record of it. In Matt. xxii. 41-46, we read: "The Pharisees being gathered together, Jesus asked them, saying, What think you concerning the Messiah? Whose Son is he? They say to Him, Of David. He saith to them, How therefore does David in Spirit call him lord, saying, The Lord (Jehovah) said to my lord, Sit at my right hand, until I place thine enemies under thy feet." Mark xii. 35-37 records the scene as follows: "And Jesus teaching in the Temple said, How do the scribes say that the Messiah is the Son of David? David *himself* says, in the Holy Spirit, The Lord (Jehovah) said to my lord, Sit at my right hand, until I place thy foes under thy feet. David *himself* says that he is lord, and whence is he his son? And the whole multitude heard him gladly." In Luke xx. 41-44, the narrator says: "And he said to them (Scribes), How do they say that the Messiah is David's son? For David himself says in the Book of Psalms, The Lord said to my lord, Sit at my right hand, until I place thy foes as the stool of thy feet. David therefore calls him lord, and how is he his son?" Besides the testimony already referred to, it is worthy of note that elsewhere in the New Testament quotations are made from this Psalm, not by way of accommodation, but as proof-texts concerning the work and offices of Christ. See Acts ii. 35-36; I Cor. xv. 25; Heb. vs. 6; vii. 17, 21.

*Remark 1.* From the use which Christ makes of the first verse of this Psalm, there follow two natural inferences: first, that David was the author of the Psalm, and secondly, that under a special divine inspiration he affirmed lordship to some one of whom he himself could be but a type. It has been denied, however, that David

was the author of the Psalm: and it has been affirmed that the expressions "David," "David himself," do not indicate authorship as endorsed by Christ, but that He spoke popularly, according to the current opinion of the times, without any purpose to correct a false view, if such it was. He did not deem it worth His while to go out of his way to guide His hearers as to the little matter of authorship, if indeed He knew the facts in the case. He either saw fit to pass by the question of authorship as a matter of no consequence, or His own knowledge was limited. He played the part of a popular orator if He did know otherwise, or if He did not know, his ignorance was one of the limitations of His divine nature. So *essentially*, De Wette, Neander, Bleek, Schenkel, Keim, Ewald, Meyer. (a) As to the Davidic authorship of the Psalm, so far as the Hebrew text can guide us, we are dependent upon the superscription, which a little suspiciously confines itself in this case to a mere statement of authorship. The location of the Psalm in the fifth Book of the Psalms likewise suggests a difficulty as to the genuineness of the title. Moreover, a superscription in itself is not an infallible guide. If, however, it harmonize with the contents of the Psalm to which it is prefixed, it may be accepted as truthful, whether placed there by the author, which is supposed to be unusual, or by a compiler. In this case the Sept., the Vulg., and other versions agree in assigning the authorship of this Psalm to David: and so far as the contents can aid us, it is as easy to allow Davidic authorship, as to conjecture an author. It is also a suggestive fact that, excepting Heb. iv. 7, and Acts iv. 25, wherever in the New Testament Davidic authorship is affirmed of a Psalm, the affirmation is confirmed by the superscriptions in the Hebrew text. The reference in Heb. iv. 7 is to Psalm xcv., for which there is no title in the Hebrew text. The Sept. refers that Psalm to David. The second Psalm referred to in Acts iv. 25 has no title. It is also worthy of note that in some of these quotations David is spoken of as speaking under the special guidance of the Holy Spirit. In this particular the apostles harmonize themselves with the strong utterance of Christ concerning vs. 1 of this Psalm. (b) As to the objection resting either upon

Christ's ignorance or his disposition to ally himself with popular opinion for the sake of overthrowing a quibble, it does not seem to be well sustained. It was a great day in his life. It was near the close of his ministry. It was a time when if ever he was bound to speak honestly and state the exact facts. He was in no mood to catch his enemies by a quibble. He had just compelled them to hold their peace by setting at rest the query as to the tribute-money. He looked at it as a fact, and treated it as a fact. He had just answered the crafty question of the Sadducees, by appealing to Moses and endorsing Moses, touching the resurrection of the dead. He dealt there with facts, and treated them as facts. Now the Pharisees attempt to overthrow him, and he appeals unto David as to the regal dignity of the Messiah. He deals again with facts and employs acknowledged facts. The scene and the intent of the scene are so unique and concrete, it is hard to believe that he was merely attempting to catch his enemies in a snare. There is so much manliness in it, one can find no crevice for inserting a wilful deception. The argument with his foes turns upon the assertion of David himself as to the regal position of another, superior to the Great King of Israel, whose superiority King David had recognized by a divine revelation, and the word *n'um* in vs. 1, is very suggestive as to Christ's accuracy in this respect. Its position at the beginning of the verse, and its meaning as a prophetic word, are in harmony with the assertion of Christ. (c) The strongest objection to the Davidic authorship lies in the uniqueness of the Psalm historically considered. Other Messianic Psalms furnish us with a background, *i.e.*, some historical event which gave rise to the Psalm. This one laughs us to scorn. Deny the authorship to David and apply the Psalm to him, as do many critics. How of him could it be said, "Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek"? David once wore the *liuen ephod*, but he never was priest. He raised the priesthood to special eminence, but never assumed the office. And besides, the very argument which the writer to the Hebrews (Heb. vii.) uses to establish the superiority of Christ to the *Levitical* priesthood is founded

upon the abrogation of that priesthood, and the affirmation that the priesthood of Melchizedek was the only real type. David never was and never could be a priest after *this order* except by some hypostatic transmutation from the loins of Melchizedek into the loins of Abraham through the house of Levi, into the house of David. Let David be the author and apply the Psalm to Solomon. Was he either a man of war or a priest? Apply the Psalm to Abraham, or Hezekiah, or Zerubbabel, as do the Jews with the authorship Davidic, and the prophecy becomes ridiculous. The person referred to in the Psalm is to be both prince or joint-sovereign with Jehovah, and a priest after the order of Melchizedek. In the Asmonean Dynasty we have priesthood donning royalty, but not royalty donning the priesthood, nor could it claim descent from Melchizedek. If the critics cannot verify the person thus limned by the Psalmist, as being in himself both King and Priest, may it not be that our Lord was truthful and minutely accurate when he confounded the scribes by asserting that the Messiah was both David's seed and David's lord? The parallel passage for the union of royalty and priesthood in the Messiah is Zech. vi. 9-15. Critics, of course, would therefore post-date the Psalm to the time of Zechariah, but that is a horn of the dilemma one can push either way.

*Remark 2.* Concerning the Melchizedek of vs. 4, nothing is known beyond what is recorded in Gen. xiv. 18-20, and Heb. vii. But from these passages it appears (*a*) that he was a Canaanitish priest of the Most High God, (*b*) that Abram acknowledged in him a superiority to himself by welcoming his blessing, ("The less is blessed of the better," Heb. vii. 7), and by giving him the tithes or a portion of the spoils of victory, such as were due to a priest, Gen. xiv. 21; Heb. vii. 6 and 9, (*c*) that typically, by the writer to the Hebrews, he was deemed a type of Christ in four particulars, viz., each was a priest, but not of the house of Aaron: each was a priest whose parentage could not be traced to any human source—no human genealogy in the one case, no divine genealogy in the other (Heb. vii. 3): each was a perpetual priest—in the one case and in the other, neither was to have a



successor (Heb. vii. 3): the priesthood of each was impliedly unique, as reaching the needs of both Jews and Gentiles. Melchizedek was not a Jew, though probably of the Semitic race. As Delitzsch says, rather poetically, "Melchizedek is the setting sun of the primitive revelation, which sheds its last rays upon the patriarchs, from whom the true light of the world is to arise. The sun sets, that when the preparatory time of the patriarchs, the preparatory time of Israel, has passed away, it may rise again in Jesus Christ, the antitype." See Com.

*Note.* "After the manner of," signifies "likeness in official divinity."—Gesenius.

*Remark 3.* The phrase, "The Lord at thy right hand," in vs. 5, is somewhat perplexing. The word "Lord," in the text, is written *defectively*. It is found so written in the Old Testament according to the Masorites 134 times. When written *fully* it may be used for God, or for angels as representatives of God. When written *defectively*, it is limited in use to the Deity, *par excellence*. In this verse, the phrase may signify, that the Joint-Sovereign as *the Lord* who had been placed at the right hand of Jehovah, was about to do what is subsequently asserted, or it may mean that Jehovah is to do that great work, the Joint-Sovereign being a mere witness of the events. That is, the Prince may be honored with the title of Lord, or the term Lord may be a mere synonym for Jehovah. Some rid themselves of this choice by affirming that Jehovah is first addressed, and then the Prince, in vss. 6, 7; for they admit that vss. 6, 7 must express the movements of the Prince. Such transitions are no strangers either in the Psalms or in the Prophets; yet the rush of thought to the abrupt close of the Psalm is against such breaks if they can be avoided. The strongest objection to the view that it is the Prince who is thus dignified by the Divine Name, is that the term is nowhere else applied to the Messiah. But since in vs. 1 the Prince is called "my lord," in the singular number, expressing superiority to the Psalmist, and he is honored with a joint-sovereignty in the conquest portrayed, may it not be that the Psalmist, in the flush of his inspiration, has applied the real Divine Name to him here?

We put it as a tentative. In Psalm xlv. 7, the most natural interpretation, seemingly endorsed in Heb. i. 8, uses Elohim as an epithet for the Messiah. See also the same honor, probably, in Isaiah ix. 6. Revelation may have shown the Psalmist that the Prince of the House of David was infinitely greater than David the King. See John v. 17; x. 30-38.

*Remark 4.* The Psalm may be properly called, as Perowne says, "a prediction, and a prediction of the Christ, as the true King, as the everlasting Priest after the order of Melchizedek."

#### ANALYSIS.

1. The Messiah is represented as sitting at the right hand of Jehovah, and invested with authority to subdue all nations to himself. Vss. 1, 2.

2. He is represented as collecting his hosts for the combat, who gather to him willingly, numerous and fresh as the drops of the morning dew. Vs. 3.

3. He is invested by Jehovah with the priestly office, as well as the kingly, an office of priesthood superior to the Aaronic, and is to exercise it forever. Vs. 4.

4. As associated with Jehovah, he marches from victory to victory, unwearied, until his foes acknowledge his authority. Vss. 5-7.

*Note.* In favor of the Davidic authorship of the Psalm are Perowne, Delitzsch, Hengstenberg, Alexander, Jennings and Lowe, "The Four Friends," Murphy, Kay, Moll, Vaihinger, Rosenmüller, Kurtz, Hävernack, Tholuck, and others.

Against the Davidic authorship and referring the hero of the Psalm to David or others, are Thrupp, (to Zerubabel), Ewald, (to David), De Wette, (to Uzziah), Olshausen, (to Jonathan Maccabeus), Hitzig, (same), Aben Ezra, (to David by an unknown Psalmist), Mendelssohn, (same), and others.

## PSALM LXXII.

This Psalm describes the future power and glory of Messiah under the type of a prosperous King whose dominion is to be marked by a government pre-eminent for its benevolence. It resembles in general purport Psalm ii., but as it is not quoted in the New Testament, and rests upon an actual ground-work, it illustrates an important exegetical principle which deserves special notice.

Some of even the more conservative interpreters maintain that only those Psalms are Messianic which are endorsed as such in the New Testament. But it is certainly unreasonable to suppose that the comparatively few Psalms cited in the New Testament exhaust the Messianic idea of the Psalter. In the New Testament, Christ is represented as the prime subject of the ancient economy: and if only those types and predictions have reference to Him which are specifically applied to Him in the New Testament, it would be difficult to see how the Hebrew Scriptures could bear the character they do, of a predominant reference to the Christian era. We put up all necessary guards, if we claim that the Psalm in question is clearly such as to indicate in its highest sense an applicability to Christ and His Kingdom, and that the ideas concerning Him and His work extracted from it are in harmony with the general scope of such teachings in the Old Testament as are unquestionably Messianic.

This Psalm, according to the superscription composed by Solomon, sketches his peaceful reign very much as Psalm ii. sketches the turbulent reign of some other monarch. Tradition is quite unanimous in giving it a Messianic character, and its contents indicate very strongly that no human monarch ever has realized or ever can realize its prophetic hopes. The Psalm consists of two parts: the theme of the first part being renewed and more fully unfolded in the second part. The topics are, 1. The righteous character of the King. Vss. 1-4. 2. The blessings and glory of His Kingdom as productive of happiness, as perpetual, and as universal. Vss. 5-11. 3. His righteous government as displayed in his compassion for

His people. Vss. 12-14. 4. A renewed celebration of his glorious and beneficent reign. Vss. 15-17.

## REMARKS.

*Remark 1.* No fair interpretation of this Psalm can omit the absolute antagonism between the pure ideal of a divine government and the governments of the nations which bordered upon Judea.

*Remark 2.* The style of the Psalm corresponds very closely to that of the Proverbs of Solomon, and thus hints at the same authorship.

*Remark 3.* At what time he composed it, if he was the author, is unknown. The reference to Sheba, in vs. 10, implies that he had been some time upon his throne. His ardent wishes for so grand a reign were doubtless inspired by what he knew of the prophetic hopes of his father. However Messianic the Psalm may be in its highest sense, it must be interpreted primarily of himself.

*Remark 4.* The word in vs. 1, translated 'King,' has no article, and is used generically and poetically. Therefore, properly translated, "the king." Prov. xxxi. 1. By "the king's son" is meant a king of royal ancestry. So on oriental coins, and such was an oriental custom.

*Remark 5.* The universality of his reign is very marked. Vss. 8-11. See Exodus xxiii. 31; Micah vii. 12; Amos viii. 12; Zech. ix. 10. The Semitic, Japhetic, and Hamitic races are to be included in his sway. It is to be a reign as universal as the limits of humanity, and in this fact appears the strongest proof of its real Messianic import. Vs. 17 has its parallel in the promise to Abraham and his seed. Gen. xii. 2-3.

---

 PSALM XLV.

This Psalm portrays the marriage of a king with a princess, apparently of foreign birth. Many suppose that it celebrates the espousals of Solomon with the daughter of Pharaoh. Others, as Delitzsch, think it refers to the

marriage of Joram, the son of Jehoshaphat, with Athaliah, of Tyrian origin. Hitzig refers it to Ahab's marriage with Jezebel. Hupfeld thinks it refers to the marriage of Solomon with some one of the daughters of Hiram of Tyre. The reasons for supposing that the wife of the King was a foreigner are the Aramaic word applied to her (vs. 10), and the exhortation for her to forget her own people and her father's home, *i.e.*, to break away from her inherited relationship, both in form and in heart. And the strongest reason for denying that Solomon is the king portrayed is the martial character of the reign which the Psalmist pictures combined with the absence of any reference to Egypt. The author of the Psalm is unknown. Whether the phrase in the superscription, "To the sons of Korah," expresses authorship, or is merely a dedication to them to arrange the music for the Psalm cannot be decided.

That the Psalm, primarily an epithalamium, carries with it typically a Messianic ideal has been the almost unanimous opinion of tradition. Jew and Christian are agreed. The King is an ideal theocratic King of the house of David (vs. 6), under the guidance of the KING OF KINGS, and the Psalmist whether or not he understood the full meaning of his language, exalts him to so high a position that the author of the Hebrews overleaps the primary application of the thought of the Psalm and applies them to the Son of Man and the Son of God. The relation of God as the husband of his people is an Old Testament conception as well as the representation of the New Testament. Hosea ii.; Ezek. xvi.; Matt. xxii. 1; II Cor. xi. 2; Rev. xix. 7; xxi. 2. Judging by the use made of vs. 7, in Heb. i. 8-9, the ground-work of the Psalm is human, but its scope is divine. If Messianic, the Psalm is a picture artistically drawn of Messiah as the royal *Bridegroom*.

#### ANALYSIS.

1. A description of the *King*, as beautiful in form, as eloquent in speech, as mighty in war, as exalted in nature or position, and as righteous in his government. Vss. 2-9,

2. A description of the *bride*, her royal appearance, her train of virgins, and her joyful admission into the King's palace. Vss. 10-15.

3. A description of the *fruit of the marriage*, as perpetuating the empire and rendering it illustrious. Vss. 16, 17.

#### REMARKS.

*Remark 1.* That the Psalm is not a mere epithalamium is evident from its being found in the Psalter as designed for the services of the Temple. Its position there can in no other way be accounted for. The very full superscription hints also that the compiler intended to call attention to some profound meaning hidden in the song.

*Remark 2.* There is some internal evidence which favors the opinion of Delitzsch as to the King primarily referred to. (*a*) Solomon had a royal father, but not royal *fathers* (vs. 16); Joram, a sort of second Solomon, was of the royal house with many predecessors. (*b*) Joram was married to Athaliah during the lifetime of his father, and it is natural that such high hopes should centre in his nuptials. (*c*) Thus is explained the Aramaic word for 'bride,' or queen, "a name that is," says Delitzsch, "elsewhere Chaldean (Dan. v. 2 sq.), and Persian (Neh. ii. 6), and is more North-Palestinian than Jewish; for Athaliah sprang from the royal family of Tyre, and was married by Joram out of the royal family of Israel." Joram was a warrior and Solomon was not. But (*e*) if the poet intended to describe the wished-for reign of Joram, he labored in vain. Instead of being realized in that young prince, his reign is one of the darkest, most profligate and idolatrous in the sacred record. His was a pitiful reign and a pitiful fate. The ardent artistically-woven wish can only find its realization in the Christ of God.

*Remark 3.* The natural translation of verse 7 is, "Thy throne, O God, forever and ever; a sceptre of uprightness is the sceptre of Thy Kingdom." That the word Elohim is the vocative, "*O God*," harmonizes with the versions, the Christian Fathers. Jewish commentators

and many modern commentators. The Sept., Chaldee Paraphrast, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodoret, and Vulgate so read. So do Kimchi, Moses, and many Jewish Rabbis even in the 12th century A.D. As to modern commentators, the conservative school favor the vocative. Many critics, however, read "Thy Throne of God," *i.e.*, thy divine throne, a throne divinely given thee, as Solomon's throne is called the throne of Jehovah. (1 Chron. xxix. 23, and I Chron. xxviii. 5). The noun with suffix is thus followed by the genitive of ownership. The cases usually referred to to establish this usage are *appositional*, and do not sustain the desired interpretation here. Others read, "Thy throne is a throne of God," repeating the word "throne," which is supplying an ellipsis merely for a purpose. Others still, "Thy throne is God," as we would say God is a rock. Extremely harsh. A crude impersonation. Whatever view be taken, it must be admitted that the mere application of the term Elohim to an ideal king is not of *itself* a direct proof of the divinity of that person. To say nothing of its being applied to rulers, kings and judges, Exodus xxi. 6: xxii. 7; Ps. lxxxii. 6, and to Moses, Exodus vii. 1, and Exodus iv. 16, as representatives of God, the disembodied spirit of Samuel is called Elohim, I Sam. xxviii. 13. Moreover, in vs. 8, this Elohim has an Elohim above him, "Elohim Thy Elohim," as if to guard against any misapprehension as to the use of this strong word to the King. If he is Elohim, he is Elohim's Elohim; a subordination very suggestive of the relation of the Father to the Son. See Pusey's Daniel, pp. 471-4.

*Remark 4.* There only remains, therefore, a choice between the view of the early Fathers, which ascribed actual Godhead to the King, precise and determinative, and the modification of the term Elohim by its usage elsewhere in a representative sense, reading, "Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever:" *i.e.*, Thou art God's representative King, or reading, "Thy divinely-constituted throne is forever and ever;" *i.e.*, Thy divinely-appointed dynasty is forever and ever. Leviticus xxvi. 42. The thought of the last two is essentially the same.

*Remark 5.* With the last two views, the language of

Heb. i. 8, can be substantially harmonized. This King is a theocratic representative of God, and as such the strong term Elohim is applied to him. In Heb. i. 8, the writer does not say that this language was primarily addressed to Christ, but that it was spoken of Christ, and was applicable to Him. The object of the writer to the Hebrews is to show the superiority of the Messiah to the angels, and his argument as drawn out by Ebrard (*in loco*) is as follows: "Three things are declared of the ideal of a theocratic King—consequently of the Messiah; (a) he is Elohim; his authority is the authority of God himself; (b) his dominion is endless; (c) both are true because he perfectly fulfils the will of God. The perfect theocratical King—therefore Christ (which required no proofs for the readers of the Epistle to the Hebrews), stands in this threefold relation above the angels. He is the absolute revelation of God, and therefore himself God; the angels are only servants. He is King of an imperishable kingdom; the angels execute only periodical commands; he rules in a moral way as founder of a kingdom of righteousness, and his whole dignity as Messiah is founded directly on his moral and spiritual relation to man; the angels are only mediators of outward appearances of nature, by which a rude, unsusceptible people are to be trained for higher things."

*Remark 6.* The Psalm with all its difficulties may be regarded as sketching typically, Messiah as the *Royal Bridegroom*.

#### PSALM XXII.

##### LITERATURE.

- Hengstenberg's Christology, vol. 4, Appendix 44.  
 Reinke's Die Messianischen Psalmen.  
 Böhl's Zwölf Messianischen Psalmen erklärt.  
 C. Phillips' Com. on Psalms. Dr. McCaul's Old Paths.  
 Leslie's Short and easy method with the Jews.

This Psalm is an ideal portraiture of Messiah as the representative Sufferer. It points by way of appropriation or accommodation to the crucifixion. Even Strauss with a sneer calls it "The Programme of the Messianic agony." See "*The Old Faith and the New*," pp. 89, 90.



The quotations in the New Testament are appropriations of the language to the sufferings of Christ, except perhaps verse 18, when quoted in John xix. 23-24, and are not used as direct proofs that the language of the Psalm is Messianic. It is a full and comprehensive picture of the exhausting sufferings of a righteous man, inflicted upon him by his enemies on account of his piety, the fruits of which in answer to his prayers are pæans of praise to God from the whole earth. The picture is so drawn that it may be applied to an individual, to the Jews in captivity, to the Church, or to the Great Representative Sufferer, the Head of the Church. If the Psalm is David's, according to the superscription, we know of no event in his life in which it could have been actualized. It might be his however as a poetical limning of the *totality* of his sufferings from his enemies. If the Psalm is Jeremiah's, as many suppose, the same difficulties present themselves. The theory that the Psalmist personified his nation, as Rashi, Kimchi, Noyes, and many others assert, hardly meets the case. The individuality of the sufferer is very marked. Vss. 22, 23 strongly indicate that the sufferer is an individual member of Jehovah's congregation. It is Jewish in conception, but the last part of it is as broad in its application as the later chapters of Isaiah, and the later prophets.

## ANALYSIS.

The Psalm is divided into three parts. 1. A *complaint*, founded upon the consciousness of the absence of God as a help. Vss. 2-11. 2. A *prayer*, founded upon the extremity of the peril. Vss. 12-22. 3. A *praise*, founded upon the wonderful results of a favorable answer to the prayer. Vss. 23-32.

## REMARKS.

*Remark 1.* The superscription is suggestive. "The hind of the dawn" may be the name of a tune or a song to be used in singing this Psalm, or it may have an enigmatical signification, "the hind" being the symbol of innocence, and "the dawn" of a happier morning: *i.e.*, *persecuted innocence delivered*. Other fanciful meanings have been proposed.

*Remark 2.* For the difficulties in verse 17, see Hupfeld's very full discussion.

*Remark 3.* In a study of this Psalm, Psalm lxi; cii; the Lamentations of Jeremiah, and the 53d chapter of Isaiah should be carefully compared.

#### PSALM XVI.

##### LITERATURE.

Biblical Repository, vol. 1, art. by M. Stuart.

The joyful tone of this Psalm, and the peculiarly hopeful outlook upon his future destiny suggest the thought that it was composed either after the escape of the Psalmist from some imminent peril or in the immediate prospect of death. That the Psalm is David's is admitted by all critics who allow to him the authorship of any Psalm. The language is rugged and archaic, and the translation of the A. V. very imperfect.

The use made of the last part of it by Peter in Acts, ii. 29 sq., and by Paul in Acts xiii. 33 sq., has led to three methods of interpreting it.

One class of interpreters divide the Psalm into two parts, applying the first part to David and the second part to the Messiah. Another class deem the Messiah to be the speaker throughout the Psalm, making the Psalm as purely Messianic as they do Psalm cx. Another class consider David to be the speaker throughout the Psalm, but as in a true and enlarged sense typical of David's Lord. The last view commends itself by its simplicity and its harmony with the interpretation of other similar typical Psalms.

##### ANALYSIS.

*Subject.* The pious man's 'joy of faith' amid the perils of the present life, and in the prospect of death.

1. This 'joy of faith' has its source in the fact that Jehovah is the author of his prosperity. Vss. 1, 2.

2. In his *oneness* of heart with Jehovah's people. Vss. 3, 4.

3. In his *experience* that hitherto Jehovah has bountifully cared for him. Vss. 5, 6.

4. In his *confidence* that Jehovah will abundantly provide for his future happiness. Vss. 7-11.

REMARK.

It is necessary in order to understand the application of verses 8-11 to Christ, as illustrated in His resurrection, first of all to give an exact translation of them with a running exegesis.

*Translation.*

Vs. 8. I have placed Jehovah before me continually: because He is at my right hand (as Defender and Protector), I cannot be overthrown, *i.e.*, either as to my choice of Him as indicated by vs. 7, or in my present emergency. The Sept. from which the Apostles quote agrees in the verse with the Hebrew text.

Vs. 9. Therefore my heart was glad, and my glory, (*i.e.*, my dignity, my manhood), a poetical term for the soul as the noblest part of man (Gen. xlix. 6: Ps. vii. 5; xxx. 12; lvii. 9, and cviii. 2), has rejoiced: moreover, my flesh (or body) shall dwell (or tent itself awhile) securely. He believes he shall escape the present danger. He will not die, notwithstanding the attack of his enemies, or perhaps the extremities of disease. The Sept. reads, "My tongue has rejoiced," using the word as the organ or medium of the joy. Speech is the special glory of man. For the present and the future his condition is hopeful.

Vs. 10. (It is so) Because Thou wilt not abandon my soul (*i.e.*, as the seat of life, or *Me*, as a personality) to Hades, and Thou wilt not give up Thy saint to see (*i.e.*, experience) the pit. He is not now to be exposed to the terrors of the grave or to enter the abode of departed spirits. The Sept. reads for "to see the pit," "to see *destruction*." The A. V. has "*corruption*," which is incorrect. The Hebrew word is derived from a verb "to sink down," and has for its usual meaning, "pit," or "grave." There is no play upon the word, as Alexander intimates, to fit the difficulties in the argument of the

Apostles. It would be a strange place for a dying man, even an inspired one, to play a *double entendre!*

“Thy saint,” or “Thy pious one,” in the K’tibh is plural, but the K’ri, Sept., and the quotation in the New Testament, give it as singular. The K’ri is doubtless correct. According to Reinke, the singular is correct for the following reasons: viz., 1. So in Sept., Syriac, Chaldee Paraphrast, Jerome, Paul, Peter. 2. Of 269 Mss., in 7 the Ydth is squeezed in. 3. The singular is found in 51 Mss which are supposed to be the oldest. 4. The older Rabbins endorse the singular.

The use of the terms for David’s personality, ‘soul,’ ‘body,’ ‘manhood,’ ‘pious one,’ are very suggestive of his absolute faith in Jehovah, as a perfect Protector of his *whole man* in the time of peril.

Vs. 11. Shall I die? No! Thou wilt make me know (by a blessed experience, something better), the path of life; *i.e.*, life from God, life in God, life with God—the whole course of the truest life. (Thou wilt make me know) fullness, or a satiation of joy, with thy countenance, *i.e.*, with the manifestation of thyself to me. (Thou wilt make me know) pleasures (every kind) forever in thy right hand; *i.e.*, those which are at Thy disposal, *i.e.*, the gifts of an omnipotent Giver. This last clause is omitted by Peter.

This meagre translation and exposition, every word of which in the Hebrew, and every clause of which glows with shining thoughts, reduced to bald prose, gives the thought of David as follows:—“In view of the mercies of Jehovah showered upon me in my past life, I feel assured that the same protecting love will continue, and that I shall be saved from the death which now seems to be so imminent. I shall not now at this time enter Hades nor experience the destruction of the grave.”—“To see the pit” and “to see *destruction*” as in Sept., and as used by Peter and Paul, are essentially the same. The Apostles had they used the Hebrew phrase would have expressed the same thought. Ps. xlix. 10; Eccles. ix. 9; John iii. 36. The argument of the Apostles turns upon the force of the expression “*to see*,” *i.e.*, to experience. David in his faith believed that at that time he should not die and

be buried, though he afterwards died and was buried and suffered the destruction of the grave. Christ did not see the destruction of the grave, did not succumb finally even at death to the destructive powers of the grave, and will no more be subject to them. But David did in due time. Comparing Acts xiii. 34 with Acts xiii. 37, it is evident that what Paul means is the *abiding in* the powers of the grave, rather than the *experiencing* the powers of the grave, and he illustrates the case of Christ, by the contrast with the actual fact in the case of David, reaching by illustration what Peter reaches by the *prophetic* assertion of David. What was true of David, that at this time he did not succumb to the powers of the grave, was in the highest sense true of Christ, for Christ was absolutely delivered from such destruction, while David was not.

As to the prophetic consciousness of this assertion of David, which is asserted by Peter, see Peter himself. I Peter i. 10-12. As is said by Jennings (Jennings and Lowe), "David bases his hope of escaping death on Jehovah's intervention, and since Jehovah prostrated the powers of death by the agency of Jesus, the Psalm becomes predictive of Jesus."

---

## MESSIANIC PASSAGES IN THE PROPHETS.

### LITERATURE.

#### *Prophecy.*

Prophecy viewed in respect to its Distinctive Nature, etc. P. Fairbairn.

Structure, Use, and Interpretation of Prophecy. J. Davison.

Prophets and Kings of O. T. F. D. Maurice.

Ruling Ideas in Early Ages, Lecture I, J. B. Mozley.

History of Israel, vol. 1. H. Ewald.

Introduction to O. T. J. Bleek.

Smith's Bib. Dic. Art. Prophet.

Alexander's Kitto Encyc., Art. Prophet.

Imperial Dictionary, Art. Prophets. P. Fairbairn.

McClintock and Strong's Ency., Art. Prophet.

The Prophets of Israel and their place in history to the close of the 8th century, B.C. W. Robertson Smith.

Prophets of the O. T., vol. 1. H. Ewald.  
 Moses and the Prophets. W. H. Green.  
 The Prophets and Prophecy in Israel. A. Kuenen.  
 Prolegomena Zur Geschichte Israels. J. Wellhausen.  
 Daniel the Prophet. E. B. Pusey.  
 The Typology of Scripture. P. Fairbairn.

## COMMENTARIES.

On *Isaiah*. Alexander, Delitzsch, Lange, Speaker's, Cheyne, Barnes, Cowles, Birks, Gesenius, Knobel, Hitzig, Umbreit. Essay by Cheyne, in vol. 2, *Isaiah and his Commentators*.

On *Jeremiah and Lamentations*. Speaker's, Lange, Keil, Burroughs, Henderson, Scholz, Hitzig, Graf.

On *Ezekiel*. Fairbairn, Lange, Speaker's, Hävernick, Hengstenberg.

On *Daniel*. Lange, Speaker's, Stuart, Keil, Cowles, Hävernick.

On *Minor Prophets*. Lange, Speaker's, Keil and Delitzsch, Pusey, Henderson.

*Hosea*. Wünsche, Pocock, Umbreit, Hitzig.

*Joel*. Wünsche, Credner, A. Merx.

*Jonah*. Kalisch, King, Perowue T. T.

*Zechariah*. Wright, Lowe, A. Koehler, W. Pressel, T. Kliefoth.

*Malachi*. L. Reinke, A. Koehler, W. Pressel.

## QUOTATIONS FROM OLD TESTAMENT.

Old Testament Synonyms. R. B. Girdlestone.

Principles of New Testament Quotation. J. Scott.

Hebraisms in the Greek Testament. W. H. Guille-  
 mard.

Steward's Mediatorial Sovereignty. Vol 1, Part I.  
 Bib. Sacra, vol. 23, art. by W. Calkins.

The O. T. in the New. D. McTurpie.

The Gospel in the Law. C. Taylor.

Quotations from the O. T. in the New. B. Jowett.  
 (Theol. Essays.)

## HERMENEUTICS.

Sacred Hermeneutics. S. Davidson.

Grundriss der biblischen Hermeneutik. J. D. Lange.

- Biblical Hermeneutics. S. M. Terry.  
 " " Ellicott and Harsha.  
 " " Seller.  
 Horne's Introduction, vol. 2, Part II. (13th edition).  
 Hermeneutics. P. Fairbairn.

## MESSIANIC PROPHECY.

- Christology of the O. T., etc. E. W. Hengstenberg.  
 Die Messianischen Weisagungen bei den grossen und  
 kleinen Propheten des Alten Testaments, vols. 1-4. L.  
 Reinke.  
 O. T. Prophecy. Stanley Leathes.  
 Witness of the O. T. to Christ. Stanley Leathes.  
 O. T. History of Redemption. Franz Delitzsch.  
 Messianic Prophecies. Franz Delitzsch.  
 The Religion of the Christ. S. Leathes.  
 The Witness of History to Christ. F. W. Farrar.  
 Christ and other Masters. C. Hardwick.  
 Messianic Prophecy. Edward Riehm.  
 The Jewish Messiah. J. Drummond.  
 Theology of the O. T. G. F. Oehler.  
 The Ideal Isaiah. The Expositor, 1883, art. by E.  
 H. Plumptre.  
 Premium Essay on Prophetic Symbols. Winthrop.  
 The Symbolical Numbers of Scripture. White.

## MONOGRAPHS.

- The Servant of Jehovah. W. Urwick.  
 Der Knecht Jehovas. Hertzog's Ency., von F.  
 Oehler.  
 The Jewish Interpretation on Isa. liii. Ad. Neu-  
 bauer and S. R. Driver.

## LIST OF MESSIANIC PASSAGES IN THE PROPHETS.

Critics differ as to the number of such passages, and as to the key for a correct selection. The student will find a very full list in the first index of Hengstenberg's Christology (vol. 4), together with the corresponding

quotations in the New Testament. In a broad sense all prophecy is Messianic; but as the purpose of this syllabus is to consider only those which pertain to Messiah's person and position, many which refer to his kingdom inclusive of Jews and Gentiles will be omitted. Of the list subjoined, we shall select but a few, chiefly those which we deem the most important. Nor need we disturb ourselves as to any chronological order, inasmuch as the date of a prophecy does not disturb the fact. Questions of date and authorship will therefore be disregarded.

LIST.—THE GREATER PROPHETS.

*Isaiah*, ch. vii. 14-16; viii. 23; ix. 7; xi. 1; xii. 6; xxviii. 16; xlii. 1-9; xlix. 1-9; l. 4-11; li. 1-16; lii. 13; liii. 12; lv. 1-5; lxi. 1-3.

*Jeremiah*, ch. xxiii. 2-8; xxx. 9.

*Ezekiel*, ch. xxi. 27; xxxiv. 23-31.

THE MINOR PROPHETS.

*Hosea*, iii. 4-5; xi. 1.

*Micah* v; vii. 7-20.

*Zech.* ii. 14-17; iii. 8-10; iv; vi. 12-15; ix. 9-10; xi. 4-17; xii. 1-13.

*Malachi*, iii. 1-6.

*Daniel*, ii. 34-35; vii. 13-14; ix. 24-27.

MESSIANIC PASSAGES IN ISAIAH.

Isa. vii. 14-16.

Alexander's Com. *in loco*. Very full.

Hermeneutical Manual, pp. 456-466. P. Fairbairn.

Die Weissagung von der Jungfrau und vom Immanuel. L. Reinke.

The Messianic Interpretation of the Prophecies of Isaiah. R. P. Smith. Ser. I.

The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah. A. Ederheim, vol. 2, Appendices I, II, VII, VIII, IX, XI.



The prophecies of Isaiah give a fuller description of the personality and work of the Messiah than those of any other prophet. Hence he is called the Evangelistic Prophet. Our purpose omits any careful historical criticism as to the date and authorship of the prophecies contained in the book which bears his name, as it does not affect materially the simple question, What does this book teach concerning the Messiah?

The passage, vii. 14-16, when accurately translated reads as follows:—

Therefore, the Lord himself shall give you a sign: Behold the virgin (or marriageable young woman) has conceived, or is with child,\* and is bringing forth a son, and thou (or she†) shalt call his name Immanuel (God with us). Curdled milk shall be eat, (because the land is waste, vs. 22) for his knowing (*i.e.*, until he knows or about the time of his knowing (former Alex., latter Næg.) to reject the evil and to choose the good. (But no longer Alex.) For before he shall know (how) to reject the evil and to choose the good, the land shall be forsaken (desolate) from whose two kings thou art terribly afraid. The two kings are evidently those of Syria and Israel.

The passage by its setting, by its peculiar structure, by its verbal difficulties, and by the use made of it in Matt. i. 23, as fulfilled in the birth of Christ, is exceedingly perplexing. No solution of it by commentators, thus far, is perfectly satisfactory. Perhaps all the difficulties connected with it will never be removed. We can do no more than present a probable exegesis with a summary of the views of the various schools of interpreters. Our first task is with the text itself.

The word translated 'virgin' in A. V. is derived from a word signifying 'to hide,' 'to conceal,' (Tregelles, Pusey), or from a word signifying 'to be ripe,' 'to be mature,' 'marriageable,' (Fuerst, Ges., Cheyne, and others). The Sept., in spite of the difficulty, translates it 'virgin' here, as also Gen. xxiv. 43, though in Ex. ii. 8, where the word is in the singular, it translates by 'maiden,' and likewise Prov. xxx. 19. The word is found

\* Gen. xvi. 11. † Ges. p. 184.

in the plural in Ps. lxxviii. 26; Cant. i. 3, and vi. 8, translated by Sept. 'maidens.' In all the passages where the Hebrew word in the singular or plural is found in the O. T., the word by its connection implies an *unmarried woman*, and by implication also a *virgo intacta*, unless one wishes to interpret into it a bad sense. "A virgin or unmarried woman is designated as distinctly as she could be by a single word." (Alex.) The strict Hebrew word for 'virgin' is 'b'thūlāh.

The phrase 'has conceived' or 'is with child,' in the former case the verb, in the latter an adjective, and the phrase 'is bringing forth,' are the prophetic of completed action. If they refer here to some one present, or some one then living, then the woman was already pregnant, and if the scene is a prophetic vision, the fact of an unmarried woman with child is as clearly expressed. So far as prophetic usage will aid us, the expressions would be as pertinent to one who should be pregnant centuries hence as a month ago; *i.e.*, to those who recognize the possibility of prophecy. The word Immanuel is elsewhere used in the Old Testament but twice, evidently referring in each case to this child. Isa. viii. 8, and viii. 10. In viii. 8, "Shall fill the breadth of thy land, O Immanuel," we have for this child, "an ejaculatory prayer for the deliverer's advent." (Cheyne). But it expresses the additional thought that the land is Immanuel's, his by right. This child is the sovereign of the land. In viii. 10 there is a play upon the word, "*With us is God,*" implying that in the name itself there was the greatest comfort to the people. Ps. xlvi. 7, 11. In Isa. ix. 6-7, this same child is evidently referred to, clothed with the attributes of Deity.

The expression "curdled milk and honey shall he eat until he knows," etc., vs. 22, sq., indicates that up to a certain time such shall be his nourishment, the time being left indefinite; if of a child soon to be born, within a few years, (*How fulfilled!*) or at that time, *i.e.*, when he has reached the age of moral discretion, such shall be his food, as an index of the condition of the land. Though a land flowing with milk and honey, Deut. xxxii. 13-14, would be a land possessing the means of support without

tillage, it is spoken of in this way prior to the possession of Canaan simply as an index of fertility; but after the land was occupied by Israel, "the natural emblem of abundance," as Alexander says, "would no longer be *milk* and *honey*, but *corn* and *wine*, or *flesh* and *fruits*, so that the prospect of subsisting on the first two, if it did not suggest the idea of personal privation, would suggest that of general desolation, or at least that of interrupted or suspended cultivation." The meaning of privation or desolation is sufficiently obvious by a comparison of the phrase here with the corresponding one in vs. 22.

The 16th verse is the most difficult of all. The structure of the verse is obscure. The expression 'the land' may mean the whole of Palestine, the Northern Kingdom alone, or the Southern Kingdom alone. The terminus *ad quem* seems to be the moral consciousness of this child. And if a literal historical fulfilment is exacted, requiring the desolation of a part of the land or of the whole of it by the Assyrian hordes within this short period, it is simply an impossibility. No straining of history will verify such an explanation. But if the whole prophecy be put into the class of typical or symbolical prophecy, the grave difficulty of this verse may be obviated. Ahaz would not stand the test of the supernatural, and a supernatural event is announced on the part of Jehovah, which would bring into the clearest light the meaning of the original promise to Eve, "*the seed of the woman.*" The burden of prophecy for the ages may now find its fullest expression in the virgin-born son. But before that great event, the two kingdoms of which Israel was composed, Judah and Ephraim, will become desolate, and those who call good evil and evil good (vs. 20), will have brought the land into such degradation that Jehovah must interfere by His Immanuel, who knows how to choose between good and evil, and can teach others also. So considered, the prophecy is essentially typical and the language is to be interpreted in that way.

We do not say that the above interpretation is the correct one, but it commends itself to us for the following reasons. 1. It seems to account in the best way for the sign which Jehovah gave Ahaz.

The prophet, acting under the authority of Jehovah, in order to deter Ahaz from seeking foreign help in the impending troubles, and to assure him that Jehovah himself was an all-sufficient help, offers him the boon of seeking a supernatural sign in the heavens above or in the earth beneath. He would grant him what he did to Hezekiah subsequently, a supernatural index of his readiness to interfere on his behalf. Ahaz, with his own plans arranged in his mind to seek Assyrian aid, very piously, yet very contemptuously, rejects the offer. Whereupon the prophet is ordered to give a sign, seemingly an infallible sign, a sign condemning the impiety of Ahaz and that of the house of David, the sign of the ages, the long-expected, marvellously-endowed Israelite, a *miraculously-produced child*. That child should be the one for whom the nation had been longing during all its history. It had been the hope of Abraham and the hope of David. And even Micah, a contemporary of Isaiah saw a similar deliverance (Micah v. 3). Isaiah also had spoken in a similar way (Isa. iv. 2). Ahaz knew of such prophecies as well as the nation. And if he wanted an assurance of delivery from his foes, or if the prophet wished to overthrow his scepticism, nothing could be more effective than the announcement that the Messiah would come. Thus the sign as often elsewhere was in the *divine assertion*. It was to be accepted on the word of Jehovah, and the fulfilment of that word would be its verification. Thus a sign was given to Moses in Horeb, that Jehovah would release Israel from Egypt, by the assertion, "Ye shall serve God upon this mountain." But Moses was compelled to take the word of Jehovah as a sufficiency until the event proved its truth, which was a long time subsequently. So also in Isa. xxxvii. 30 a sign is announced to Hezekiah which could not have been realized until the invading army was overthrown. So also to Gideon, Judges vi. 37-40. Ahaz was told to ask for a supernatural sign, and declined, and God promises a supernatural sign, not by the miraculous birth of a child in the near present, nor by the birth of a child from the natural order of things, from one who at that time was an unmarried woman, as many suppose, but by a promise which Ahaz

could understand, and would meet the case, near in time to the prophet's vision, perhaps, but afar off in the divine purpose. From the language of the text, it is not necessary, therefore, to place the fulfilment of the prophecy in the time of Ahaz: although if that demand was admitted, whoever the symbolic child might be, he would adumbrate the Greater than he. But as Ahaz was invited to ask for the supernatural, we expect the fact of the supernatural to be brought out, when Jehovah takes the matter into his own hand.

2. The antithesis of this passage with the previous verses suggests the broad and symbolic meaning.

Syria and Israel had combined against *Judah* for her subjugation. It would be virtually the overthrow of a dynasty in which rested the covenant of Jehovah with the house of David. Ahaz cared not a groat for this, but Jehovah did care. And He commissions Isaiah to assure Ahaz that his schemes will miscarry. Ahaz himself shall suffer in his family and in his throne, but for the preservation of the kingdom of the house of David, a sign shall be given, a sign in contrast, a sign infallible, that God purposed to preserve inviolate His promise to His chosen David. This sign shall be a son, a son of *the* virgin, not *a* virgin, a son who should be the predestined heir of David's throne, compared with whom, "the head of Syria which is Damascus, and the head of Damascus which is Rezin; and the head of Ephraim is Samaria, and the head of Samaria is the son of Remaliah," these and nothing more, earthly cities and frail men, are *vanity*: a prediction which Matthew takes up and asserts to have been accomplished in the birth of Messiah, inasmuch as these kings and these kingdoms had long before Messiah's advent ceased to be.

3. The difficulties connected with other interpretations of the passage seem to be more grave than those in the one suggested. In other words a choice of difficulties, for such there are to every explanation of it, favors at least the one proposed. (*a*) The early Jewish commentators affirmed that the child to be born was Hezekiah. But according to the chronology of the Scriptures, Hezekiah was at the time of the prophecy from nine to

twelve years old. II Kings xvi. 2, and xviii. 2. See Thenius, Keil, Ewald, and Bible Com. Besides how could such a natural birth be a *sign* of assurance to Ahaz under the circumstances?

Later Jewish commentators point to a child from the wife of Ahaz or the wife of Isaiah. But is there any evidence that at the time of the prophecy either of these women was an unmarried woman? The same objections meet the modern critics who accept the theory of these Jewish commentators.

(b) Some suppose (Hitzig, Nög.) that the mother of the child was some woman present at the time of the prophecy to whom Isaiah pointed. If she were already pregnant, *illegitimately* as Nögelsbach maintains, the theory is a shock to our moral sensibilities, and would be a violation of the law of God in such cases. If he pointed to some one who was now unmarried, but who in the normal way was to be the mother of a child or *the* child, seemingly the sign would be of little value to Ahaz. If as Cheyne asserts the article with the noun is the article of species, and we may read, *an* unmarried woman, what wonder-sign can be attached to the assertion? Any unmarried woman, by becoming married may become the mother of this wonderful boy! Of course! Nothing novel or strange to Ahaz! The same difficulty, however, is made less difficult by adhering to the text. Neither view obviates the surface interpretation that Ahaz was met by an assertion involving a supernatural act.

(c) Another view, which carries with it most honorable names is that the prophet speaks according to the theory of double sense: *i.e.*, that he refers really to two things, two virgin mothers and two infants born, the first mother and child living in the days of Ahaz, the second at the Christian era. Vss. 15, 16 refer to the child born in the days of Ahaz; vs. 14 to the true Immanuel, the Lord Jesus Christ. The first series of events is supposed to be typical of the second. But this view is contrary to the law of growth in prophecy. That law would require vss. 15 and 16 to precede vs. 14. Especially is this law the law of Isaiah's prophecy. Moreover, how can two virgin mothers be *the* virgin? Were there two miraculous

acts? If not, how can one prefigure the other? There might be some immediate event which foreshadowed a sublimer event, but as the text stands, the law of growth is decidedly at variance with this merely typical theory.

(d) On the whole, without claiming certainty, the view we have suggested seems to be relieved of many of the objections with which the other theories are encumbered. If we connect the prophecies of Isaiah in this group, we have the Messiah in his human nature at least, in ch. iv, originating from a virgin in ch. vii, born with all the glory of divine attributes in ch. ix, an indivisible triad of consolatory images in three separate stages preparatory to his reign which is described in ch. xi. And into this passage we may read with Christian reverence, "Now all this is come to pass, that it might be fulfilled, which was spoken by the Lord through the prophet, saying, Behold the virgin shall be with child and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Immanuel, which is being interpreted, GOD WITH US." Matt. i. 22-23.\*

#### ISAIAH IX. 5-6.

*Translation.* For a child is born to us (*i.e.*, for our benefit), a son is given to us (*i.e.*, by Jehovah), and the government is upon his shoulder (*i.e.*, as a burden, as his robe of office); and his name is called, or they call his name (*i.e.*, in the name will be the character specified). Wonder, Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace: for (or with reference to) the increase of the government (art. in both cases definite), and for peace there is no end, upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom, to establish it (*i.e.*, his kingdom), and to support it, in justice and in righteousness, from henceforth and forever; the zeal, or jealousy of Jehovah Sabaoth shall do this.

In the context (vss. 1-4), the prophet has drawn a vivid picture of the rescue of Israel from their foes, and the marvellous change which takes place, as the result. Those most distressed by the Assyrian invasions, Zebulon and Naphtali, they having suffered the longest, are to

\* Matthew quotes from the Sept.

pass quickly from darkness to light, and revel in joyful harvests. This event in prophetic vision has already been realized, the spiritual antitype of which according to Matt. iv. 14-16, was the preaching of Christ to the darkened Galileans. The prophet then passes from the effects of this divine interposition to the *agent*, using language of the boldest characterization. If we interpret the verses by clauses, we have (a) His *birth* as already having taken place in the prophetic conception. See *Driver's Hebrew Tenses*, § 81. (b) His *government*—not merely of Israel and Judah, but by the parallel passage, Micah v. 3-5, of the world. (c) *His title, i.e.,* by Isaiah's usage of the verb translated 'called,' his *characteristics*. Is. i. 26; vii. 14; lx. 14; Jer. xi. 16. Perhaps there is here an example of the assumption of a new name when one is called to the throne. II Kings xxiii. 14; xxiv. 17. The peculiarity in this name is its length, or rather its particulars. "It suggests," as Cheyne says, "the extraordinary character of its bearer. It reminds us of the long honorific names of Egyptian kings, (*e. g.* in the Treaty of Peace, *Records of the Past*, vol. iv. 27, where the royal titles of Rameses II. take up six lines.)" But it is a query with critics whether in the name given to this Prince of Peace, we have five separate names, or, as Ewald prefers, "two pairs of compound names united, describing the character of Messiah first from within and then from without." In this way the Wonder-Counsellor corresponds to Everlasting Father, as descriptive of the Messiah at home or in his nature, while God the Hero corresponds to Prince of Peace as indicative of his work, in executing his plans. If we interpreted according to this ingenious division, by Wonder-Counsellor is meant, a supernatural counsellor, one whose sagacity transcends human experience. The word for 'Wonder,' in usage, most frequently refers to the supernatural. By 'God the Mighty One' is meant a Mighty Hero charging against his enemies and defending his friends, clothed in the power of Deity. The word here for God, *El*, in Isaiah always denotes God as *power absolutely*. "It is never used hyperbolically or metaphorically." Cheyne. Isa. x. 21. 'By 'Everlasting Father' is meant a prince ruling as a Father, and ruling



as long as his rule endures: eternal in the broadest sense if the subjects of the government needed such a rule. By 'Prince of Peace' is meant a Prince whose victories shall be won and whose government shall be controlled in the interests of truth and righteousness. No sword but truth. Ps. lxxii; Zech. ix. 10; Micah v. 5.

If we give to the Prince here named, the *five names*, we reach substantially the same result, though it is to be admitted that it is not in harmony with the Scriptural designation of names. We then have five predicate accusatives to the verb 'call.' By 'Wonder' is indicated an extraordinary person, one beyond the range of human events: by 'Counsellor,' a person of supernatural wisdom in adjusting the rights of his people, Isa. xi. 2: by 'God the Mighty One,' one who is as powerful as God to aid his people in their conflicts and trials: by 'Everlasting Father,' one with a fatherly heart and that eternally: by 'Prince of Peace,' one whose dominion has for its aim and fruit, peace. By either method we have a unique description baffling all applications to any one other than He who is "King of kings and Lord of lords." Rev. xix. 16. Even Kuenen admits that the strong expression 'God the Mighty One' is the correct translation, though he would insert the preposition of similarity, and read, 'like God the Mighty One.' But there is no such preposition in the text. Nor is such an omission in harmony with the style of Isaiah when enumerating characteristics. That such a bold title might be given to the Messiah according to the Messianic teaching of the O. T., see Gen xxii. 11-12; Ex. iii. 2, 4, 6, 14; Gen. xxxi. 11, 13; Ps. xlv. 6; ex. 1.

(d) *The object of His mission.* This is the extension and peaceful confirmation of the Davidic kingdom. His throne is the throne of David. He is to be David's son. Mic. v. 3. It is to be a kingdom of peace, *i.e.*, prosperous, thrifty on the basis of justice to all. It is to be limitless, locally and temporally. It is to be universal and eternal. Isa. xlix. For kindred passages on the above, see II Sam. vii. 11-16; I Kings viii. 25; Psalm ii; xlv; lxxii; lxxxix; cxxxii; Jer. xxiii. 5; xxxiii. 15; Jer. xxx. 9; Ezek. xxxiv. 23-24; xxxvii. 24; Hos. iii. 5. Judaism

with its king is Christianity with its Christ. The parallel passage in the N. T. for the whole picture is Luke i. 32-33.

(e) Both for his own sake and also for his people's, Jehovah through this Prince will jealously execute his promises.

*Remark 1.* This prophecy was accepted by the earlier Rabbins as Messianic, but the later Rabbins apply it to Hezekiah. German critics are very much divided in opinion, some applying it exclusively to Hezekiah, and some allowing it to be ideally Messianic, but referring it primarily to Hezekiah. See *Alexander* and *Reinke*. To reach such a result they depend mainly upon what an ordinary Hebrew student would deem a maniacal torturing of the language, but their special objections to an exclusive Messianic application are two: (a) because it is not specifically applied to Christ in the N. T., and (b) because the prophet could have had no other than Hezekiah in his mind.

*Remark 2.* As to the first objection it is valid so far as any verbal use of the language by the N. T. writers is concerned. But we have the essential thought in Luke i. 32-33. And were it not quoted even in an essential thought, nothing would be proved against its Messianic character here. The writers of the N. T. used such portions of the O. T. as were fitted to their immediate purpose. They could not condense the whole of the O. T. into the New. Though a very marvellous prophecy, we know of no occasion in the life of Christ which called for the use of such a passage. "The name Jesus," says Delitzsch, "is the combination of all the O. T. titles, used to designate the Coming One, according to his nature and his work."

As to the second objection we may reply that inspiration, to those who believe in its reality, is not limited to so narrow a verge as these critics assert. Moreover, granting that Hezekiah might have been in the prophet's mind, the language cannot be strained so as to apply to him, without the grossest exaggeration. For (a) the tenses in the verses are factitive or prophetic presents. The child is in the conception of the prophet already endowed with the insignia of royalty. The word for

‘child’ is elastic, it is true, being used for one just born, or for one who has reached the age of twenty, but in the conception of the prophet, the government is already upon his shoulders. This could be true of Christ, but not so true of Hezekiah, at the time of the prophecy. He was not more than twelve years old at the time. (b) Such attributes as are ascribed to this Prince could not be applied fairly, in the reverent style of Scripture, to any mere man. (c) Any torturing of the language, by a play upon the accentuation, so as to render it applicable to Jehovah, as the giver of great supernatural power to Hezekiah, is the mere resort of those who cannot away with the idea that the Messiah was to be superhuman. See Del. *in loco*. (d) As an historical fact Hezekiah was more of a warrior than a Prince of Peace. He waged war against others; his kingdom was itself invaded and subjected to a foreign power from which he afterward revolted.

(e) No such perpetuity as is here described can fairly be ascribed to the reign of Hezekiah. His reign was neither peaceful, progressive, nor perpetual. Such perpetuity as is here spoken of, as Alexander says, “cannot be the joint-reign of himself and his successors; for the line was broken at the Babylonish exile. It cannot be the reign of the Maccabees or Hasmonean princes, for these were not the sons of David but of Levi. The prediction, if fulfilled at all, could only be fulfilled in a reign which after it began was never interrupted, and has ever since been growing in extent and power. Is not this the reign of Christ?”

#### ISAIAH XI. 1-5.

*Translation.* 1. And there shall go forth a shoot from the stump of Jesse, and a twig (or branch) from its roots shall bear fruit. 2. And the spirit of Jehovah shall rest upon him, a spirit of wisdom and discernment, a spirit of counsel and strength, a spirit of knowledge and of the fear of Jehovah. 3. And his sense of smelling, (*i.e.*, his pleasurable perception) is in the fear of Jehovah, or as Ewald “his breath is in the fear of Jehovah;” (*i.e.*,

reverence for Jehovah is the vital air he breathes); and (as a consequence) he shall not judge according to the sight of his eyes, nor decide according to the hearing of his ears. 4. But he shall judge in righteousness the helpless, and decide in equity (or impartiality) for the humble of the earth; and he shall smite the earth\* with the sceptre of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he put to death the ungodly. 5. And righteousness shall be the girdle of his loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins.

The transition from chap. x. to chap. xi. is very suggestive. Assyria under the figure of a forest is to fall forever. It is the forest of Lebanon with which Assyria is compared, a cedar-forest, which sends out no shoots, and has therefore no power of self-propagation. When it falls its mission is ended. But though the house of David and the Jewish State might fall into decay, and become like an oak whose trunk has been cut off, it has life in its roots, and from the roots there will come branches and fruit. The prophet gets his hope for his people in the divine selection of a king from the obscure house of Jesse, as unpromising in itself as the twig of a tree-stump, and portrays the character of a king, of whom David was but a feeble type. As David sprang from the obscure family of Jesse, so the second David shall arise to his throne from great humiliation. Such was the fact according to the genealogies of our Lord as given by Matthew and Luke. Analyzing the whole passage, we have in vs. 1, The obscure origin of this king; in vs. 2, his divine qualifications for his kingship; the abiding presence of the spirit of Jehovah, keeping him intellectually, practically, and spiritually *en rapport* with Jehovah; (the genitives are the genitive of effect): in vs. 3 his impartiality in administering his government; in vs. 4 his righteousness and benevolence in defending the helpless of his people and overcoming his enemies and their enemies by his truthful mandates; Hos. vi. 5; Zech. ix. 10; Isa. xlix. 2: in vs. 5, by the emblem of the girdle, he is ready for every emergency. Justice and fidelity girding him about he is fully

\* Some change the text, and read "the terrible"

equipped for his work, and is the prompt executor of the divine will.

*Remark 1.* The emblem of the twig and shoot should be associated with the emblem of the sprout found elsewhere as a delineation of the Messiah. The words are not the same here as elsewhere, but the idea is the same. See Jer. xxiii. 5, 6, "Behold the days are coming, saith Jehovah, that I will awake unto David, a righteous sprout." "And this will be the name by which they will call him, JEHOVAH OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS." Also Zech. iii. 8, "I will bring forth my servant, the *Sprout*;" Zech. vi. 12, "Behold a *man* whose name is *Sprout*."

*Remark 2.* The terms used for the spiritual endowment of this king are sometimes divided into pairs, and Delitzsch finds in them (Mes. Prophecies), the seven spirits of Jehovah, resting '*charismatically*' upon him, corresponding to the seven-lighted candlestick. Rev. i. 4; iv. 5; v. 6; Ex. xxv. 17; Zech. iv. 2. A sharp distinction in the synonyms used will give a beautiful variation in his qualifications, but the *tout ensemble* is sufficient; empowering him *intellectually, practically, and spiritually*. "He whom God hath sent, speaketh the words of God; for he giveth not the spirit by measure." John iii. 34.

*Remark 3.* Paul in II Thess. ii. 8, applies the last clause of vs. 4, to the destruction of Anti-Christ or the Lawless One, at the coming of Christ. The quotation is evidently a quotation of accommodation, though the promise in vs. 4, as to the overthrow of the enemies of the king, includes all of every class.

*Remark 4.* The application of this passage to any other than *the* Christ is extremely difficult. It has been referred to Hezekiah, to Zerubbabel, and to the Maccabees. But Hezekiah sprang from a house whose condition could not be described as a root or twig from a broken-down or severed trunk. Nor did he ever reach even in imagination a reign so paradisaic as this is represented to be in vss. 6-9. The Maccabees were not descendants of the house of Jesse, and the leadership of Zerubbabel produced no such marvellous results. Hence with a peculiar uniformity critics have allowed to *this*

passage the authority of being Messianic. As Henderson says, "The exposition given of the first verse in the Targum, 'And the king shall come forth from the sons of Jesse, and the Messiah shall grow up from his sons' sons,' has been sustained and defended by Jarchi, Abarbanel, and Kimchi; by the best biblical scholars since the Reformation, especially among the moderns \* \* \* and even Eichhorn, Gesenius, and Hitzig are forced to fall in with such an application, though, as might be expected, they only recognize their *ideal* Messiah in this chapter."

#### OTHER MESSIANIC PASSAGES IN ISAIAH XII-XXXV.

These are chiefly known to us as such by the use made of them in the N. T. Several of them have a primary and more particular reference to the people of Israel as typical of the church as the body of Christ. At least they harmonize with such passages in the second general division of the book of Isaiah, as they indicate that by the Servant of Jehovah is evidently meant the pious Israel. E. g. Isa. xxv. 6-8 gives a picture of Zion as the source of moral influence for the whole world; ch. xxviii. 16 compared with Rom. ix. 33; x. 11, and I Pet. ii. 6, reveals a sure foundation to the believer; ch. xxxiii. 17, perhaps, Messiah's royalty, though from the connection it can be only as Hezekiah might be deemed Messiah's type; chap. xxxv. gives a glowing contrast between the sufferings of Israel and their redemption. With chap. xxxv., close the Messianic limnings of Isaiah so far as they are found in the first division of his prophecies. Messiah's origin, birth, attributes, reign, and his benevolent sway over his people, are thus given with sufficient fulness to prepare us to welcome a fuller representation of his person and triumphs. These we find in

#### ISAIAH XL-LXVI.

These prophecies\* are a poem or a series of poems, with little if any logical connection between them. With poetic license, the prophet ever and anon leaves the con-

\* Questions of authorship and date are not here considered.

secutiveness of his thought to enlarge upon that thought which for the moment holds his ecstatic vision. Yet there are three leading topics, including such diversions from them as the immediate purpose of the prophet required, which are aids to the memory when one desires to grasp the substantial contents of the whole. These are indicated by the similar close to chapters xlvi; lvii; lxvi. The theme is "THE PROMISED REDEMPTION TO THE PEOPLE OF GOD."

This is unfolded in the *first division*, by a comforting comparison between *Jehovah* and *idols*, and between *the chosen Israel* and *the heathen*. xl-xlviii. The summary thought is Jehovah's ability to execute His purposes in behalf of Israel, and His love for Israel as prompting Him to execute His purpose.

In the *second division*, the theme is unfolded by a comparison between the selected suffering Servant of Jehovah, and his subsequent glory, as indicating the *medium* for the execution of Jehovah's purpose. xlvi-lvii.

In the *third division*, the theme is unfolded by a comparison between the destiny, present and future, of those who welcome the Servant of Jehovah, and identify themselves with Him, and those who reject Him. lviii-lxvi.

*Summarily*, REDEMPTION PROMISED; REDEMPTION PROVIDED FOR; REDEMPTION IN ITS RESULTS.

As the Servant of Jehovah in his person and work is the chief Messianic thought of this portion of prophecy, and as critics are very divergent in their theories concerning Him, we will omit the exegesis of any special passage or chapter, and give a brief sketch of those various theories.

#### SERVANT OF JEHOVAH.

1. *The Jewish people*. In the classic passage (xlii. 1), "Behold my servant: I will take hold of him: my chosen One whom my soul hath accepted;" the Sept. inserts '*Jacob*' as explanatory of 'servant,' and '*Israel*' as explanatory of 'chosen One,' indicating thereby the meaning of the term 'Servant of Jehovah,' in the opinion of those early translators. This was the view adopted by

the orthodox Jews of the 12th century, with the natural modifications, that the term should be strictly applied to none but to the body of pious Jews. But to this exclusive application even to the pious Jews, it may be objected, (a) that the phrase 'Servant of Jehovah,' is used by Isaiah in different senses. In xx. 3, it is applied to the prophet himself; in xxii. 20, to Eliakim, son of Hilkiah; in xli. 8, 9; xlv. 1, 2, 21; xlv. 4; xlviii. 20, to the Jewish people as a body or as the pious Israel, in xlii. 1-7; xlix. 1-9; l. 5-10; lii. 13-53, to a divine Legate of whom either ideally as the head of a chosen people, or typically as the head of a body which includes the people of God universally, certain attributes are predicated, which cannot be justly applied to the Jews as a body, to the prophets collectively, or to any one of them specially. (b) The description of the 'Servant of Jehovah in xlii. 2, 3, does not fit the character of the Jewish people. (c) Usage connects the phrase 'Servant of Jehovah' with the verb in the singular, while the singular and plural are interchanged when the Jewish people are personified by this term.

2. *Cyrus.* This theory cannot harmonize with the facts. It could not be said of him, "He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street," xlii. 2: nor "that he was brought as a lamb to the slaughter," nor "for the transgressions of my people was he smitten." liii. 7.

3. *The Prophet Isaiah.* He is so called in xx. 3. The eunuch imagined that it was he and Philip corrected him. Acts viii. 34, 35. It could not be said of him truthfully, "I have given thee to be the light of the nations, to be my salvation to the ends of the earth," xlix. 6. Nor could the vicarious element in ch. liii. be applied to him or any other prophet.

4. *The Prophets Collectively.* But the conversion of the Gentiles is never ascribed to them. The singular is used purposely when this work is assigned to the Servant of Jehovah. (xlii. 6; xlix. 6.) While there is no interchange of singular and plurals as would be expected if a prophet as a unit, or prophets as units, of a body were referred to, ch. liii. cannot be explained in harmony with



this view. Besides, Jewish history knows little if anything of a prophetic guild as a body ecclesiastic.

5. *The Messiah par excellence.* This view corresponds with the language of Isaiah in certain places, as verified by the New Testament writers.

(a) The passage xlii. 1-4, is quoted in Matt. xii. 17-21, as applicable to Christ.

(b) A part of vs. 1 is verbally adapted to Christ's Messiahship at the Jordan. Matt. iii. 17.

(c) The testimony of Simeon, Luke ii. 32, harmonizes with Isaiah ix. 2; xlii. 6; xlix. 6; lx. 1. 2. 3.

(d) The totality of character pertaining to the Servant of Jehovah favors this view.

6. *Messiah as a Complex Person*, a representative of God among the nations. This is the view of Alexander, and some English critics. According to this view, sometimes the Servant of Jehovah, and sometimes His people, are brought the more distinctly before us. The analogy between the Servant and his people corresponds to the relation of Christ as the Head and the Church as his Body. When the term is applicable both to the Head and the Body, there is no need of distinguishing between them. When sinful imperfection is implied, the language is applicable to the Body alone. When absolute sinlessness or Divine power is implied, the language refers to the Head alone, but may be considered as descriptive of the Body as far as the ideal or design is concerned, but not in reference to its actual condition. This theory is ingenious and plausible, it covers most of the cases where the term is used, when expounded separately. It makes too little account of the scope of prophecy.

7. *An ideal title which the prophet has formed, to which he ascribes personality.* This view, on the whole, seems to be the preferable one. Aside from the fact that it harmonizes with the language of Isaiah as verified by the New Testament writers, it is just that every inspired writer should be interpreted by himself. One of the marked characteristics of Isaiah is that, as he warms with his theme, he passes out from the literal into the ideal, and from the ideal to the personal. Thus, when the great liberator looms up before his mental horizon, he appears

as a power bursting forth from the east (ch. xli. 2, sq.), to whom nations are given, and by whose sword the nations are beaten into dust. Soon he rises from the north and from the east, as a potter treading his foes in the mire. Then he shows himself in the full panoply of a man, a shepherd, God's anointed, and Cyrus is his name, before whom Jehovah himself goeth to level the rough places, to shiver the two-leaved doors of brass, and open the secret treasures of surrounding peoples, for the sake of his chosen Jacob.

So in this case the prophet begins with the lower and rises to the higher theme. He begins with the Jewish people in his mind as the heralds of the good news to the Gentiles: he ends with him who is the Truth, the Teacher, the Sufferer for all. Like the Messianic character of the Old Testament as applied to the New, we may take the typical character of what are termed the later prophecies of Isaiah as inclusive of the chosen people, and exclusive of others. The earlier prophecies belong to the sphere of reproof to the people of Israel as a whole; the later especially belong to the true Israel as the medium of hope for the redemption of the world. And so in harmony with some of the Psalms, for example Pss. xxii. and lxxii, the prophet, under the full sway of inspiration, has before him the ideal church of God, with Messiah at its head. Sometimes he speaks from the stand-point of the people, and sometimes from the stand-point of Messiah himself; but redemption is his theme, and the working out of redemption his design. The characteristics borrowed from inferior and typical personages have their full expression in the one grand central figure to which they all point, "Who," as Delitzsch says, "is more than a prophet, for 'the isles wait for his law,' more than a priest, for he offers up himself, more than a king, for through his glory he makes kings tremble. Not mere king, mere prophet, mere priest, is the Servant of Jehovah, who is none of these exclusively, but is all together, and they are only three emanations of his glory."

In a word, the term is an ideal which the prophet has gathered around him, to which ultimately he ascribes true personality. The ideal does not reach its climax until

we come to ch. liii., and was never actualized until he, who was the Servant of Jehovah, in the fullness of times, appears and gathers around him the true Israel, the body which is of Christ.

The salient passages for this view are xlii. 1-7; xlix. 1-9; l. 4-10; lii. 13, to liii. 12.

#### MESSIANIC PASSAGES IN THE MINOR PROPHETS.

These passages are not numerous. Aside from Zechariah, the minor prophets give little additional information as to the person of the Messiah or his work. In Hosea iii. 5 we have the use of the phrase "David their king," and the phrase "at the end of days," the latter in prophetic language seemingly referring to the Messianic era. By "*David their king*" is expressed primarily a king of the house of David, but typically their true king, Messiah. See Jer. xxx. 9; Ezek. xxxiv. 23-24. In Hosea xi. 1, the child Israel in Egypt is used by Matthew as typical of the temporary sojourn of Christ in Egypt. Matt. ii. 14-15. Joel has nothing to say of the Messiah as such, nor does Amos, though the former predicts a pentecostal descent of the spirit (Joel ii. 28-32), and the latter the restoration of the fallen hut of the house of Israel. Amos ix. 11. Obadiah tells us of "the kingdom which shall be Jehovah's," but that is all. Oba. i. 21. Jonah is used as a type of our Lord's abode in the grave by our Lord himself. Matt. xii. 40. Micah foretells the birth-place of Christ, his divine nature, the promulgation of his mission from Mount Zion and its results, and the universality of His kingdom as an echo of Isaiah. Micah v; Matt. ii. 6; Micah iv. 1-8. Nahum's prophecy as against Nineveh cannot be expected to enlighten us as to the Messiah. Habbakuk embraces his people in his arms as a mother her weeping child and sings his quieting lullaby, but adds no new Messianic thought. Zephaniah is the *dies iræ* of the O. T., yet it contains a rainbow of hope. Ch. iii. 14-15. Haggai seems to view the Second Temple, though far inferior to the first, as the seat of a purer worship, and assumes the identity of the Second Temple and the Church of the Messianic era. Hag. ii. 1-9. But

when we come to Zechariah, though he speaks in symbols, we have the ripening of the Messianic idea into its real redemptive grandeur.

#### MESSIANIC PASSAGES IN ZECHARIAH.

While the Angel of Jehovah, who is the Messiah, has filled important offices in the previous symbolisms, it is not until we come to ch. iii. 8, sq., that He is specifically characterized. There He is described as a lowly servant, under the term

‘BRANCH.’ “Hear, I pray, O Joshua the High Priest,  
Thou and thy colleagues who sit before thee,  
For men of wonder (or omens) are they,  
For behold, my servant Branch.”

Happily the symbol Branch is accepted by Jewish expositors and modern commentators as referring to the Messiah. The phrase, ‘My servant,’ is familiar to all students of Isaiah. The lowly origin of this Servant is indicated by the word *Branch*. It is akin with the rod which was to spring from the trunk of the tree Jesse, and the shoot which was to spring from its roots. (Is. xi. 1.) It was to be beautiful and glorious to the escaped of Israel. (Is. iv. 2.) It was to be a righteous king, executing righteousness and judgment in the earth,—named by Jeremiah, *Jehovah our Righteousness*. (Jer. xxiii. 5.) But here, by the connection, the lowly Servant is to be *an atoning High Priest*. Hear, O Joshua, the High Priest, and your colleagues who are typical signs of things to come. For, lo! I am bringing forth in my own time, my Servant Branch: and *more*: lo! The stone which I have placed before Joshua, upon one stone are seven eyes. Lo! again, I am gravestoning its gravestone, and as the result I will remove the iniquity of this land in one day, or at *once*, and *once* for *all*. So runs the paraphrase.

Whether the stone, concerning which there has been so much wrangling discussion, refers to the people of God as the foundation-stone from which to construct the Temple of God, or to the Messiah himself, as the Chief Corner Stone, any sound exegesis must admit that the resultant of this appointment of the Branch is a *specific*

*atonement work.* The background of the vision is the High Priest, antagonized by the Adversary, whose hostility is annulled by the pardon of the High Priest for all ceremonial defilement, symbolized by the removal of his filthy garments, and the substitution of the white sacerdotal attire preparatory for the work of the great day of atonement. He is thus assigned to his appropriate station as **THE RESTORER OF TRUE WORSHIP**; when with a *Lo!* calling attention to a new fact, the lowly servant, Branch, appears in the vision as the **FULL REALIZATION OF THE O. T. HIGH PRIESTHOOD**. And as, according to the Talmud, the great day of atonement being ended, the High Priest was escorted home, and gave a magnificent feast to his friends, while youths and maidens made the gardens and vineyards jocund with the song and the dance, so this vision of the Greater High Priest closes with the same emblematic scene, when, sin pardoned, access to the throne of God secured, because the Deliverer in the plenitude of his grace had come, each true Israelite is represented as inviting his friends to partake of festal cheer under his own vine and fig tree.

The next Messianic passage is found in ch. vi. 9-15. It is not a vision. The visions are ended. It is a broad day-light symbolical action. It may be termed "The crowning of the Branch as Priest and King." The purpose of this royal priesthood is to build a spiritual temple to Jehovah, and the agencies employed are Gentiles and Jews. Few critics deny its Messianic import. A running commentary will bring out its main thought. And the word of Jehovah came unto me, *i.e.*, after the previous night-visions—the next morning or soon after, the formula itself introducing a new topic,—Take from the exiles, *i.e.*, those who have just returned from the exiles still in Babylon, to wit, from Cheldai, from Tobiah and from Jediah, and go thou on that day, go into the house of Josiah the son of Zephaniah, whither they, *i.e.*, the three above-named, have come from Babylon. We know nothing especially of these men; but Josiah was the host, and these men were his guests, and the guests had evidently come with choice gifts to aid in the restoration of Jerusalem. And take silver and gold, *i.e.*, from these men

and make *crowns*,—possibly plural of dignity, but more naturally a composite crown representing the royal position of the crowned one—and set them upon the head of Joshua the son of Josedeck, the high priest. Not *Joshua and Zerubbabel*, as some would have it, but upon *Joshua alone*. And speak unto *him*, *i.e.*, *Joshua*, a man who knew well enough that the high priest never wore a crown, and never sat on a throne. His posture was a standing posture, as an interceder for the people, and he, therefore, must have been aware that this new calling was typical rather than real. This fact is so evident in history that Judas Maccabeus, though priest and warrior and conqueror, refused until his very last days the proffered honor of a crown. Speak unto him, saying, Lo! You represent a man whose well-known name is *Branch*,—and he shall shoot up from his place (Ex. x. 23), *i.e.*, not as an *exotic*, but out of his *own land and nation*, the native stock of whom are the heirs of the promises. And *HE*, not *you* nor *Zerubbabel*, shall build, not a temple, such as you are erecting, but *the true temple of Jehovah*. I wish, he says, to make the distinction clear. I emphasize the *pronoun*, *He himself* shall build the temple of Jehovah in expectancy, and *He himself*, not *you*, shall take up for himself, and bear for himself royal majesty and glory, and shall sit upon His throne with the dignity of a *king*, and rule with the authority of a *Monarch*. More than that, He shall be also a *priest, when on his throne*, and the counsel which procures peace shall be between them *both, i.e., the priest and the king*. *Sovereignty and intercession* shall secure *reconciliation* between God and all His *exiled ones*.

These two offices were never to be executed by Joshua. There would be nothing remarkable in appointing him as High Priest. The priesthood was to continue as long as the nation. But an *atonement king* is the first step towards the ultimate spiritual kingdom which is to fill the whole earth. And no wonder that as Haggai saw the glory of Jehovah in the house of Jehovah, he portrays the desirable things of all nations entering into its structure, Zechariah winds up this prophecy with the

bold statement, "And they that are far off"—the Gentile world—"shall come and build in the Temple of Jehovah."

The next passage requiring examination is contained in chap. ix. 9-10. As it is in the disputed portion of these prophecies, and as it describes the Messiah as a humiliated King, it has been subjected to sharp criticism. Jew and rationalistic Gentiles have joined hands in admitting the prophetic and Messianic elements in the prophecies thus far considered, but they refuse to go farther. They propose any number of discordant theories. The earlier Jewish authorities interpreted the passage as Messianic, and Jarchi denies that it is possible to interpret it of any other than the Messiah. But in the 12th century, other opinions held sway. Believing that Messiah was yet to come, they quibbled; some asserting that if the Jews were *worthy*, he would come in the clouds of heaven, if *unworthy*, as poor and riding on an ass. Others resorted to a double Messiah, Messiah ben-David, and Messiah ben-Joseph. The *ass* was the trouble. They found themselves perpetually tantalized with the *ass*. Lightfoot records the story that King Sapor, a Persian monarch of B.C. 240, haughtily addressed a Jewish Rabbi with the taunt, "You say that your Messiah will come upon an ass. I will send him a noble horse." To which the Rabbi replied, "You have not a horse with a *hundred colors* like his ass." On which reply Lightfoot remarks, "In the deepest humility of the Messiah, they dream of pride even in His ass."\* By modern critics the prophecy has been referred to Nehemiah, who never was a king; to Judas Maccabeus with as little show of reason; to Zerubbabel, never a king; to Simon Maccabeus, John Hyrcanus, Uzziah and Hezekiah, with no possible historical illustrations to sustain them. Their best theory is the Messiah to come.

But the prophecy as verified in our Lord, purposely or not, seems sufficiently clear. "Rejoice exceedingly, Daughter of Zion, shout, Daughter of Jerusalem,"—the summons to a fresh prophecy—"Behold thy king cometh for thy good." "*Just*:" no guile found in his mouth: "*saved*:" not bringing salvation, but preserved in his mis-

\* Lightfoot's Works, vol. 11, chap. 21.

sion, so that even the bands of death cannot hold him: "*afflicted*:" not meek, but a soul-sufferer as the word generally signifies elsewhere; "and riding upon an ass, to wit the colt of an ass:" an emblem of humiliation rather than of kingly exaltation. He is a sovereign unlike other sovereigns. He is an afflicted sovereign. Royal personages may have used such an animal prior to the days of Solomon. But the forbidden horse was used for state occasions subsequently. (Jer. xvii. 25.) In the prophet's time, and in the time of Christ, the horse was the pride of kings. But this one, without pomp, without splendor, is totally unlike the expected Messiah, and his coronation-day was to crown him as the *crowned sufferer*. Even the unriden young ass seems to emphasize this fact. To ride not upon a horse, not upon a trained ass, but upon an untrained colt, so accurately verified, betokens lowliness and humiliation. And possibly we may go as far as Köhler, who says, "That inasmuch as all animals devoted to the service of Jehovah were not to be used in the service of man, the selected animal in this case indicates the *separateness* of the *suffering* Messiah to the sacred service of Jehovah." Such a one is he who comes to slay his enemies by the breath of his mouth.

Passing ch. xi., the obscurest of all, where seemingly under the guise of a symbolical action, the prophet impersonating not Messiah, but Jehovah as the Good Shepherd, who is rejected, as was Christ by the traitorship of Judas, we come to the noted prophecy in chap. xii. 10-12, "And I will pour upon the house of David the spirit of grace and supplication; and they shall look unto me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn over him, as one who is bitter (in grief) over the first-born." The crucial phrase in this passage is, "And they shall look unto me, whom they have pierced." This is the exact rendering of the original text so far as it has been ascertained by a careful collation of the existing Mss. All the versions sustain it, except the Sept., which, according to its usual treatment of an anthropomorphic passage, softens the word 'pierced' into 'insulted.' The verb "to pierce" is never elsewhere used with any other meaning. The person pierced, according to the connec-



tion, is not the prophet, nor the Angel of Jehovah, but Jehovah himself, who is the speaker throughout the section. John in quoting it, as verified, in part at least, by the centurion's spear, uses the language of the Hebrew text, instead of that of the Sept., with the exception of the substitution of the pronoun *him* for *me*, which may be merely expository. He seems to be almost nervously eager, by the assurance of personally witnessing the scene, to convince his readers that *then* and *there* the utterance of Zechariah was fulfilled. And this eagerness is not perhaps to be wondered at, for candor compels the admission that unless the word Jehovah is a synonym for the Messiah, for which as yet we have found no sufficient evidence, it is the revealing, covenant-keeping God, and not the intervening Servant of Jehovah, who is here said to be pierced. What idea that assertion would convey to Zechariah, or to his hearers and readers, it is impossible to determine. A prophecy may contain much more than its surface-impression upon the prophet or the people whom he addresses, but it must contain some idea of value to, and capable of appreciation by both prophet and people. A pierced prophet of Jehovah, or a pierced Angel of Jehovah might have been understood by the men of O. T. times, but a pierced God was a thought from which they would have recoiled. And the marvel is, that the stern, religious Jew allowed the "unto me" to remain in the text. The K'ri, it is true, in some Mss., reads "unto him;" but they are a late authority. The Christian who is convinced of the divine nature of Christ may admit that Jehovah and the Servant of Jehovah are one, and thus escape the difficulty, but, regarded from the stand-point of the prophet, it is not at all surprising that Jew and Gentile have sought to escape the thought of a *pierced God*. Even Calvin chose the paraphrase of the Sept., and says, "The piercing must be accepted as a metaphorical expression for a *perpetual* irritation," and denies its verification in the crucifixion of Christ. And the whole school of rationalists, echoed by the Jews, shouts, "Good for old Calvin." Their thunder is small thunder, however, for in his commentary on the passage in John, he urges his interpretation as a proof that Christ

was God. Of course, the difficulty may be removed by changing the text, or by putting something into the text. Some change the verb and read "leap up unto me, and mourn," but we have no parallel example. Others read, "They have pierced the heroes and martyrs, and mourn on account of their persecution." But there is no authority for such a paraphrase. Others read, "They shall look up to me with respect to each one whom they have pierced," *i.e.*, Jew mourning for the Jew whom he has martyred, an expression too incongruous to require refutation. No solution offered by these critics is satisfactory, and until more light shines upon the expression, it is a pierced Jehovah to whom the prophet refers. That it is Messianic in thought is evident from the connection between this prophecy and the previous one. The rejected shepherd who was then the prophet or Jehovah, is here the pierced Jehovah. Wünsche in a monograph on "*The Sufferings of Messiah*," a work which deserves translation for polemical purposes, cites two passages as evidence that the theory of two Messiahs appeared shortly after the Christian era, founded upon this passage, and became the teaching of the early synagogue. The Jerusalem-Gemara (A.D. 230-290) referring to this text, says, that there were among the Rabbins two opinions; one says, that which they (the people) mourn is the Messiah; and the other, that which they mourn is evil desire, (original sin). In the Babylonian Gemara (A.D. 350-500), the question is put, "What is the cause of this mourning? In this the Rabbins differ. The one said, It was for Messiah ben-Joseph who was slain; and the other said, It was for evil desire (original sin), which is to be slain; for it is written, 'And they shall look unto him whom they have pierced.'" "By a fair and quite complete classification of the non-controversial writings of the Jews, Wünsche shows that the idea of a suffering, atoning Messiah was the ordinary teaching of the early synagogue. And, as Wright says, "It is natural enough that the modern synagogue should have changed its views on these points, but it is not fair that attempts should be made to silence or misrepresent on such points the testimony of the older

Jewish authorities,"—a criticism worthy of regard by Drummond, the author of *The Jewish Messiah*.

The last passage to be noticed is ch. xiii. 7: "Awake O sword against my Shepherd, and against a strong man, my fellow, saith Jehovah of Hosts. Smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered. And I will stretch out my hand for the benefit of my little ones." Like all the others it is a dramatic burst from an obscure connection. We are startled by it and put to the strain to ascertain its meaning. Here the prophet seems to go back upon himself. He had slain the Messiah. Was not that enough? *No!* He turns us to the *slayer*,—*Jehovah of Hosts*. And this constitutes the climax of all he has to say. There is a *divine agency* in the death of the Good Shepherd, perhaps explaining more clearly the term Good Shepherd in the previous chapters, and the fruit of this agency is the scattering of the sheep, and the rescue of the chosen little flock.

There is strictly no difficulty in the words themselves to do away with the evangelical interpretation of this passage. A fair comparison of it with cognate passages, especially Isaiah (ch. liii.), and the quotation of it by our Lord, emphasizes its meaning as expressed by Peter, "This man, delivered up according to the established counsel and fore-knowledge of God, ye slew, crucifying him by the hands of lawless ones."

The thread we have thus tried to follow carefully and candidly, traces for us a *Messiah* as a *lowly servant*, a *Messiah* as *Priest-King*, a *Messiah* as an *afflicted humiliated Monarch*, a *Messiah* *betrayed and rejected*, a *Messiah* *slain*, a *Messiah* *slain under the agency of Jehovah himself*.

#### THE ANGEL OF JEHOVAH.

Malachi, the last of the prophets, speaking for Jehovah, says, "Behold I am sending my messenger, and he will prepare a way before me; and suddenly (unexpectedly), will come unto His Temple, the Lord whom ye are seeking; even the Angel of the Covenant, whom ye are delighting in; behold he has come, (or is coming,) saith Jehovah of Hosts." Mal. iii. 1.

This Angel of the Covenant, to whom the divine epithet, 'the Lord,' is applied in the previous clause, is evidently the same person who is elsewhere called 'the Angel of God,' 'the Angel of Jehovah,' "the Mediator between God and man in all God's communications and dealings with men:" *i.e.*, in the O. T. In Isa. lxiii. 9, He is called "The Angel of his Presence," or *face*, where there is an allusion to Exodus xxxiii. 14-15.

Collating this passage with Mal. iv. 5-6, and the use made of them by the writers of the N. T., the Angel of the Covenant corresponds to Christ, and the Elijah who was to make a way ready for Him, is John the Baptist. Matt. xi. 10-15; Mark i. 2-8; Luke, vii. 27-29.

*Note 1.* By 'the Angel of the Covenant' is evidently meant the *old* covenant, corresponding to the Angel of Jehovah elsewhere referred to in the O. T. He does not appear in the N. T., a silence significant of the apparent fact that the Angel of Jehovah in the O. T., is no other than the Christ of the N. T.

*Note 2.* My friend, Professor C. Goodspeed, in a very able article (Bib. Sac. vol. 36), after an examination of the passages in which the phrase, 'Angel of Jehovah,' and 'Angel of God' is employed, summarizes his conclusion as to the divinity of this person as follows:—1. "He frequently applies to himself the name Elohim and Jehovah, and declares that the name, 'I am that I am' was to be his name to all generations. 2. Whenever he speaks to men he speaks with absolute and independent authority, assuming to himself prerogatives inconsistent with the pretensions of any other than a divine person.

3. He exacts from men divine honor, worship, and sacrifice. 4. Scripture writers designate him by the divine names Elohim and Jehovah." His closing sentence is worthy of reverent consideration. "If our conclusion is correct, and Christ and the Angel of Jehovah are one, then, we repeat, the incarnation of Deity, the preëxistence of our Lord, the Divinity of Christ, and the doctrine of the Trinity—carrying with them, as they do, the whole superstructure of apostolic teaching—are not exclusively of New Testament growth, but strike their roots down through all inspired teaching to the beginning

of the world, thus binding all revelation together in a complete unity, in a progressive and harmonious whole."

Passages for consultation on the Angel of Jehovah are Gen. xvi. 7-14; xviii. 1 sq.; xxii. 11 sq.; xxxi. 11 sq.; xxxii. 1, and Hos. xii. 4 sq.; Ex. iii. 2 sq.; xiv. 19 and 24; xxiii. 20-23; xxxiii. 14; Num. xxii. 35; xxiii. 5; Josh. iii. 13-15; Judges ii. 1; vi. 11 sq.; xiii. 3 sq.; I. Kings xix. 4-15; Zech. iii. 1; xii. 8.

#### MESSIANIC PASSAGES IN DANIEL.

These are chs. ii. 34-35; vii. 13-14; ix. 24-27. They require a fuller exegesis than our limits allow. See for literature, Lange's (*Zöekler*) *Introduction to the Prophet Daniel*, § 12. Also *Old Testament Prophecy*, by Stanley Leathes in reply to Kuenen.

#### CONCLUSION.

The object of this Syllabus is simply to place in the hands of the student the material, with cursory suggestions, by which he may work out for himself the Messianic idea as it appears in the writings of the Old Testament. To me, the one word DELIVERER expresses it, when the several passages are grouped and condensed into their true significance. *Mediation* is the red vital line running through Old Testament prophecy, connecting the Protevangelium with the Sufferer on Calvary. The Angel of the Israelites, the King of the Psalmists, the Teacher of the Prophets, the Priest-King of Zechariah, find their central purpose in Isaiah Fifty three, and its sublime realization is in the seventeenth chapter of John. "The one believing will not make haste;" or "give way." Cheyne. Isa. xxviii. 16. "Prove all things: hold fast that which is *good*." I Thess. v. 21.















BS648.5 S79

A syllabus of the Messianic passages in

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00055 951