

## LECTURE IV.

### THE SECONDARY MESSIANIC PROPHECIES.

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

But besides primary or direct, there are also what have been denominated secondary or indirect Messianic prophecies—prophecies which we cannot, with the same degree of assurance, refer exclusively to the Messiah. To these secondary Messianic

prophecies objections have been made. It has been asserted that the meaning attached to them is fanatical and absurd. Such a view, it has been affirmed, introduces into Scripture the superstitious and unintelligible notion of a double sense ; as if, over and above the plain meaning of a prophetic passage ascertained by the ordinary rules of criticism, there were a mystical or allegorical sense. On such a mode of interpretation, the meaning of a prediction would be left to individual caprice, and a wide door would be opened for all extravagant assertions.<sup>1</sup> But this objection, so far as it goes, does not materially affect the great argument from prophecy. Even were it admitted that no argument could be drawn from these so-called secondary prophecies in favour of the Messiahship of Jesus, yet the primary prophecies remain untouched. It has been proved that there are Messianic prophecies in Scripture, and if these have been fulfilled in the life and character of Jesus of Nazareth, we have a sufficient proof that He is the Person referred to in them. We are, however, far from relinquishing the secondary prophecies ; we trust to be able to prove, in the sequel of this lecture, that it is neither absurd nor fanatical to maintain them, but that they rest upon a solid foundation of truth, and that we may reasonably infer that in such secondary pro-

<sup>1</sup> Collins' *Grounds and Reasons*.

phesies a reference to the Messiah was divinely intended.

At the same time, it is admitted that the subject is involved in difficulty, and that at first sight there appears to be some truth in the above objection. And especially the abuse which has been made of the idea of a prophecy of a secondary sense, and the many extravagant instances of types, and analogies, and double senses, and forced interpretations which have been maintained, have created a prejudice against such predictions. The question which here meets us is, What prophecies are Messianic? On what grounds, it is asked, can it be asserted that a prediction or a statement which is plainly applicable to David or Solomon, is also applicable to the Messiah, and receives its fulfilment in Him? What criterion have we to distinguish such prophecies, and to judge between their primary and their secondary sense? What right have we to attach a double sense to the words of the prophet? These and such like questions are difficult to answer. Besides, the phrase *secondary prophecy* is unfortunate, and is calculated to convey a wrong impression. When it is asserted that the primary sense of a particular Psalm refers to David, and its secondary sense to the Messiah, the words suggest that the Messianic meaning is the inferior or subordinate sense; whereas what is meant is precisely the reverse: that the Psalm

receives its partial fulfilment in David, and its complete fulfilment in the Messiah; so that what we call the *primary* sense is the inferior and subordinate meaning, and what we call the *secondary* sense is the higher and more important meaning. It is accordingly carefully to be borne in mind, that in this lecture by the term *primary* we do not mean chief, but only *first* in order of time; and by the term *secondary* we do not mean inferior or subordinate, but only *second* in order of time. Perhaps some other words, such as typical and antitypical, or direct and indirect, would have been more appropriate and less liable to misconception.

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

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

By a secondary Messianic prophecy we mean a prediction which is capable of a twofold application, and which has received a first but incomplete fulfilment in some particular person or event in Jewish history, and a second but more complete fulfilment in the Messiah. It is maintained that such secondary prophecies do exist in the Old Testament—prophecies which, for example, in

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

But the great objection to the idea of secondary Messianic prophecies is that it is apparently founded on an alleged double sense in Scripture. The words of the prophets are made to bear a twofold meaning. We would hardly apply such a theory to the interpretation of any other writing, unless

it professed to have a twofold meaning, as in the case of a satire, an allegory, or a parable. Accordingly, Bishop Warburton applies the allegorical principle of interpretation to prophecy. And yet a secondary prophecy is entirely distinct from an allegory. In an allegory the primary sense refers merely to the words, and the facts stated may be fictitious, or at least are wholly unimportant; whilst the secondary sense refers to the events, and is alone of importance. Whereas in a secondary prophecy both the primary and secondary applications are real and important. — Others, again, endeavour to evade the difficulty of a ‘double sense,’ by affirming that a secondary prophecy is not to be considered as a prophecy of a double sense, but rather as a twofold prophecy, having its real and complete fulfilment in the Messiah; it is so partially fulfilled in another as hardly to be applicable to him. Thus, for example, David in one of the Psalms says: ‘Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt Thou suffer Thine Holy One to see corruption’ (Ps. xvi. 10). No doubt David is here speaking of himself, and expressing his confidence in God; and yet in no sense were these prophetic words fulfilled in him; for, as St. Peter argues, David died, and saw corruption: there is here what may be called a secondary prophecy, but there is no double sense. The words have only one sense, and are only applicable to the

Messiah: 'David, seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of the Messiah, that His soul was not left in hell, neither His flesh did see corruption' (Acts ii. 31). This distinction, however, between a twofold prophecy and a prophecy of a double sense, is vague and ambiguous, and is in many instances not applicable. We are rather disposed to affirm that prophecy may receive a variety of fulfilments, until its complete fulfilment culminates in the Messiah. Certainly the sense of any book is the meaning which the author designed to attach to it; but we must not forget that the true Author of the prophetic writings is God; and if this be admitted, there is nothing to prevent us from admitting that the words have a higher meaning than that which lies on the surface, or which the writers themselves intended, supposing that they did not understand the full meaning of their prophecies.

'In sorting the prophecies of Scripture with their events,' observes Lord Bacon, in the second book of the *Advancement of Learning*, 'we must allow for that latitude which is agreeable and familiar unto divine prophecies, being of the nature of the Author, with whom a thousand years are as one day; and therefore they are not fulfilled punctually at once, but have springing and germinant accomplishment throughout many ages, though the height or fulness of them may refer to some one age.'

As an example of what is meant by a secondary prophecy, let us take that remarkable prediction of Immanuel, in the prophecies of Isaiah: 'The Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil, and choose the good. For before the child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings' (Isa. vii. 14-16). The evident intention of these words was to encourage Ahaz, or if not him, at least the house of David, with the assurance that the kings of Israel and Syria, by whom the country was invaded, would not finally prevail. Now, the primary meaning of this prophecy, and that probably which would only suggest itself to the wicked monarch, was a promise of deliverance from the formidable attacks of those two hostile kingdoms; that before a child to be born should attain to its moral consciousness, both of these kingdoms would be deprived of their kings. Such an interpretation, we consider, is absolutely necessary, because to refer it exclusively to the miraculous birth of the Messiah, which was to happen hundreds of years afterwards, could not possibly be any sign of deliverance to Ahaz. And, besides, there is a note of time appended which can only refer to a child then to be born: 'Before the



child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings.' All attempts to give another explanation of these words, as if the child here spoken of was a different child from Immanuel, or as if the land mentioned was not the kingdoms of Israel and Syria, but the land of Canaan—the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, are futile, and give rise to forced interpretations. Nor is the august title 'Immanuel,' 'God with us,' any objection; for it is not necessarily the distinctive title of a person, but may be intended to denote that God was on the side of Judah, that He was with them as their Helper; and, indeed, the word is so used in this prophecy a few verses further on: 'Take counsel together, and it shall come to nought; speak the word, and it shall not stand: for (Immanuel) God is with us' (Isa. viii. 10).

But, besides this primary meaning, the words have a secondary and far higher sense. The prophecy is directly applied by the Evangelist to the miraculous birth of the Lord Jesus Christ: 'Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us' (Matt. i. 22, 23). In the Messiah the prophecy was to receive its complete realization: He was to

be virgin-born; to Him the name Immanuel belonged in its fullest sense, and the sign given had respect to a much greater deliverance than from the attacks of any earthly enemies. And this secondary and higher sense is evident from the prophecy itself, and is no mere fanciful or mistaken accommodation of the words by the Evangelist to Jesus. This mysterious child may be traced throughout the whole of this prediction. To Him the land of Judah belonged as His peculiar right; it is termed, 'Thy land, O Immanuel' (Isa. viii. 8); He is to diffuse the light of truth among those who walk in darkness, and dwell in the land of the shadow of death (Isa. ix. 2); He is to be a mighty King, who is to subdue all the enemies of His people (Isa. ix. 3-5); and He it is who is denominated in the same prophecy as 'The Wonderful, The Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace,' and who is to sit upon the throne of David for ever (Isa. ix. 6, 7). And, in all probability, there is a reference to this prophecy by the contemporary prophet Micah, who often borrowed from Isaiah. After announcing the birth of the Messiah in Bethlehem Ephratah, Micah adds, 'Therefore will he give them up,'—that is, God will give up the Jews to their enemies,—'until the time that she which travaileth hath brought forth' (Micah v. 3). 'Both prophecies,' observes Rosenmüller, 'illustrate one another:

Micah designates the divine origin of the Promised One ; Isaiah, the miraculous circumstances of His birth.'<sup>1</sup>

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

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in Hengstenberg's *Christology*, vol. ii. p. 50 ; Supplement I.

His name shall endure for ever: his name shall be continued as long as the sun: and men shall be blessed in him: all nations shall call him blessed' (Ps. lxxii. 5-8, 11, 17). Indeed, such expressions are so inapplicable to Solomon as to convert the Psalm into a primary prophecy of the Messiah.

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

and whom all nations are commanded to worship ; others have reference to His human nature as Son of man, whom the Lord has made strong for Himself (Ps. lxxx. 17). Some testify of the sufferings of the Messiah, but the greater number proclaim His eternal glory.

Thus, in the Second Psalm, we have a description of a mighty King. He is the Lord's Anointed, or Messiah ; the strong confederacy formed against Him is the object of His derision ; He sits as King on the holy hill of Zion ; He is declared to be the Son of God ; His inheritance embraces all nations : all His enemies are subdued under His feet and punished for their rebellion, and the kings and judges of the earth are warned to submit to His authority. 'Be wise now, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son, lest He be angry, and ye perish from the way, when His wrath is kindled but a little' (Ps. ii. 10-12). In the Forty-fifth Psalm, He is described as fairer than all the children of men ; as combining majesty with grace ; as everywhere victorious : His arrows are sharp in the hearts of the King's enemies, whereby the people fall under Him ; as ruling in righteousness, and anointed as the Messianic monarch ; and as dignified with the incommunicable name of God : 'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: the sceptre of Thy

kingdom is a right sceptre' (Ps. xlv. 6). In the Hundred and tenth Psalm, He is represented not as David's Son, but as David's Lord ; as sitting at the right hand of God until His enemies are made His footstool ; as ruling in the midst of His foes ; as surrounded by a willing people ; as a Priest upon His throne, after another order than that of Aaron ; as striking through kings in the day of His wrath ; and as judging among the heathen. In the Twenty-second Psalm there is a change in the description ; the sufferings of the Messiah are delineated ; He is forsaken of God ; He is a worm, and no man, a reproach of men and despised among the people ; the wicked compass Him about ; they pierce His hands and His feet ; they part His garments among them, and cast lots for His vesture. And yet, as is evident from this same Psalm, this is the great Messianic King who is so used ; His glory follows His humiliation ; all the kingdoms of the world are converted into His subjects ; all the kindreds of the nations worship before Him ; a seed shall serve Him, and it shall be counted to the Lord for a generation. Such descriptions, as are contained in these Psalms, are so entirely inapplicable to David or Solomon, the greatest of the Jewish monarchs,—they so evidently point to the ideal King, the Anointed of the Lord,—that we cannot regard them as secondary prophecies at all, but as primary predictions of that Son of David who was to sit

upon his throne, and whom both Jews and Christians regard as the Messiah.<sup>1</sup>

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

<sup>1</sup> Supplement II.

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

The observations which have been made regarding the alleged secondary prophecies are also applicable, to a considerable extent, to those prophecies which are of a typical nature; both are to be regarded as Messianic in their full meaning and application. Indeed, there is not much difference between a type and a secondary prophecy; and, at one time, I thought of substituting the word *typical* for secondary, as a more appropriate term and less liable to misconception. A secondary prophecy foretells the distant future under the veil of an event which has happened, or which is soon to happen. A type, again, is divinely appointed to foretell the same future by representative acts or symbols. The one addresses itself more to the mind; the other more, in the form of signs, to the bodily senses. And yet, in another point of view,



especially in the case of typical persons, the difference between them is evanescent. Thus many of the secondary Messianic prophecies may be considered as truly typical ; David and Solomon, to whom these prophecies refer, being considered as types of the Messiah. The existence of such types or typical prophecies is clearly recognised in the New Testament.

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

And as there are typical rites, so also there are *typical persons*. David, for example, is held forth as a type of the Messiah not only in the Psalms, which may have been composed by him, but in the books of the prophets which were written long after

his death. It is not only predicted of the Messiah that He shall be the Son of David, a Prince of the Davidic line, and that He shall sit on the throne of David, but He is expressly called David. 'They shall serve the Lord, and David their King,' says Jeremiah, 'whom I will raise up unto them' (Jer. xxx. 9). 'I shall set up one Shepherd over them,' says Ezekiel, 'and He shall feed them, even my servant David, a Prince among them' (Ezek. xxxiv. 23, 24). 'In the latter days,' says Hosea, 'Israel shall return, and seek David their King' (Hosea iii. 5). These prophetic utterances can by no possibility refer to David personally, for he had been for ages dead and buried; they are, in truth, primary prophecies of the Messiah. But the Messiah is here called by the name of David; because David, the man according to God's own heart, was the constituted type of the Messiah: he was in an inferior sense what the Messiah was in a complete sense—the Anointed of the Lord. Among the Jews, David has been always considered as a type of the Messiah. 'The whole life of David,' says the *Jalkut chadash*, 'was a type or parable of the Messiah.'<sup>1</sup> And in the prayers which they still offer up in the synagogues, the Messiah is frequently mentioned by the name of David. Thus in the preparatory service for the Sabbath we have the following prayer: 'Shake off the dust; arise, O my

<sup>1</sup> Wünsche's *Die Leiden des Messias*, p. 87.

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

In considering typical rites and persons, the greatest caution must be exercised. We must carefully guard against fanciful resemblances, nor must we unwarrantably multiply the points of similarity between type and antitype. The Messiah, we are informed, was to be a prophet like unto Moses. It is evident that this refers to a resemblance in those characteristics which distinguished Moses from all other prophets, as being a legislator and a mediator ; but to give twenty or forty points of resemblance between Christ and Moses is certainly a very useless exercise of ingenuity, and tends to expose the subject to ridicule. So, also, we must guard against the unnecessary multiplication of types, which are unauthorized by Scripture, as

opening a wide door to extravagant interpretation. Joseph, sold by his brethren, in a state of slavery and afterwards in a state of exaltation, nourishing all his father's house, may possibly be a type of Jesus Christ; but I for one would not venture to assert, as has been frequently done, that Samson also was a type of our Lord.

## II. *The Validity of the Secondary Messianic Prophecies.*

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

This is the view which has been taken of the matter by Bishop Marsh, who may be regarded as its best exponent. He will not admit of any secondary prophecies, except those which are recognised in the New Testament as such; and

consequently such prophecies cannot be logically and fairly used as proofs, except when the truth of the New Testament is admitted. He argues that our only ground of belief in the existence of secondary prophecies is the assertion of Scripture ; that the question of secondary senses resolves itself into a question of authority ; and that we must restrict the secondary prophecies to those passages which are referred to in the New Testament. 'Since,' he observes, 'in every instance, where a passage of the Old Testament has a secondary sense, the existence of that secondary sense depends entirely on the divine authority, which has ascribed it to the passage, we must wholly confine the application of a secondary sense to those particular passages, to which a secondary sense has been ascribed by divine authority. There is no supposed logical propriety, no supposed moral fitness, which can either establish the existence or lead to the discovery of such senses. It is authority, and authority alone ; though we may fairly presume from the very exercise of such authority, that in every instance, where a secondary sense is applied by such authority, there is a moral fitness for the application.'<sup>1</sup> And he makes a similar observation with regard to typical prophecies : 'There is no other rule by which we can distinguish a *real* from a *pretended* type, than

<sup>1</sup> Marsh's *Lectures on Criticism*, pp. 453, 454.

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

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

<sup>1</sup> Marsh's *Lectures on Criticism*, p. 373.

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

But, further, the above opinion unnecessarily weakens the argument in favour of the Messiah-

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

<sup>1</sup> 'In any other than the Christian sense,' observes Coleridge, 'it would be a specimen of more than Persian or Mogul hyperbole and bombast, of which there is no other instance in Scripture.'



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

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

<sup>1</sup> See some profound remarks on the nature of secondary prophecies and the validity of the arguments derived from them, in Butler's *Analogy*, Part ii. chap. vii. See also Bishop Alexander's *Bampton Lectures*, 'Witness of the Psalms to Christ and Christianity,' p. 66.

undoubtedly is to interpret Scripture by Scripture ; to seek for the meaning of the Spirit of God, not from our own fancies, but from other parts of the sacred volume. 'No prophecy of the Scripture,' says St. Peter, 'is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man : but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost' (2 Pet. i. 20, 21). The following rule of interpretation laid down by Dæderlein, is probably as cautious and judicious as any that can be given: 'If a prophetic description of the greatness of an illustrious person, and the blessings conferred by him, be more exalted than can belong to any king, or prophet, or any circumstances of the Jews ; and if it be clearly foreign to anything in the situation of the prophet ; then it is proper, and even necessary, to consider it as belonging to the nobler dispensation of the Messiah. If it be manifest that the expressions employed by the prophet cannot, with any propriety, be applied to himself or to his situation, we are authorized to regard them as declaring the dignity, character, and history of the Messiah.'<sup>1</sup>

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

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Dr. Pye Smith in his *Testimony to the Messiah*, vol. i. p. 146.

Messianic, as seen both in the terms in which they are expressed and in the correspondence between them and the events said to be their fulfilment, there are others whose application is not so evident. The reality of these must rest on divine authority, and consequently cannot be employed as an argument with unbelievers in the inspiration of Christ. We consequently do not intend to apply such prophecies in the first place, because their existence as Messianic prophecies is a matter of dispute. But after the Messiahship of Jesus has been established, and after His authority and that of His apostles have been recognised, then secondary prophecies serve many important purposes. They serve to connect more closely Judaism with Christianity; to prove that the same spirit of Christ pervades both dispensations—that, in fact, the one is wholly a prediction of the other. And they open up to us new and enlarged views of the extent and grandeur of the dispensations of God: that, from the first promise down to the advent of Christ, there has been a constant preparation going on by prophecy, by type, by history, by all the dispensations of Providence, and by all the communications of revelation, for the erection of that great spiritual kingdom of which Christ is the King, and whose subjects are redeemed men; thus proving and declaring the truth of the assertion of St. John, that ‘the

testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy' (Rev. xix. 10).

We have thus considered the secondary Messianic prophecies—prophecies which, although they may, when delivered, have applied to some other persons or events, yet receive their complete fulfilment in the person of the Messiah. Several of these prophecies, especially those contained in the Messianic Psalms, are so evidently Messianic that they can hardly be regarded as secondary, and are as strong and convincing as the primary prophecies, and therefore may well be employed in considering the application of the Messianic prophecies to Jesus. Other secondary prophecies are not so evidently Messianic, and therefore no argument can be derived from them. But still there is sufficient evidence to prove that the Messianic element pervades the Old Testament; that the prophets foretold the coming of the great Deliverer; and that it may be affirmed generally of the Old Testament prophecy, that its spirit consisted in the testimony borne to the Messiah. And thus we are now prepared to apply the test of prophecy to the claims of Jesus—to inquire whether or not His life and character corresponded to the predictions of the Messiah in the Old Testament; and I trust to be able, in our next lecture, to demonstrate the full truth of the declaration, that the testimony not merely

of Christ or the Messiah, but 'the testimony of Jesus'—the testimony borne to Him as an individual—'is the spirit of prophecy' (Rev. xix. 10).<sup>1</sup>

---

## SUPPLEMENT I.

### IMMANUEL.

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

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

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

<sup>1</sup> Supplement III.

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

withstanding your refusal, the Lord Himself, of His own accord, will give you a token of speedy deliverance from the power of your enemies: 'Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil, and to choose the good. For before the child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings.'

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

agree either with the Hebrew or the Septuagint: 'Behold, the virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel' (Matt. i. 23).

There is some difficulty in the exegesis. The article before virgin points to some definite virgin—not 'a virgin,' but 'the virgin.' The correct meaning of the word *Almah* (עַלְמָה), here rendered *virgin*, has been much disputed. Some critics suppose that it denotes a maiden,—one who is of a marriageable age, but not married,—and that the proper word to designate the virgin state as such is *Bethulah* (בְּתוּלָה).<sup>1</sup> Others consider that our translation is perfectly correct. And certainly the versions favour it: the Septuagint has ἡ παρθένος; the Vulgate, *virgo*; and the Syriac, a word of similar import. The derivation of the word does not give us much assistance in determining its meaning. Some derive it from עָלַם, *to hide, to conceal*, with reference to the customs of the East, as virgins were obliged to live in retirement; others, from the Chaldee עָלַם, *to grow up, to be strong*; hence, also, עַלְמָה, *a youth*, which certainly favours the meaning *maiden*. Besides the passage before us, it occurs six times (Gen. xxiv. 43; Ex. ii. 8; Ps. lxxviii. 26; Prov. xxx. 19; Cant. i. 3, vi. 8) in the Old Testament; and in all these places the word denotes a young unmarried woman.—The

<sup>1</sup> Thus Gesenius.



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

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

<sup>1</sup> So Anger, Delitzsch.

<sup>2</sup> So Jarchi, Bishop Lowth.

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

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

1. The first class of interpreters refer the prophecy entirely to the time of Ahaz. They suppose that the prediction was uttered by Isaiah to encourage Ahaz and his kingdom with the promise of deliverance: that before a child to be born would be able to know to refuse the evil and to choose the good, the kingdoms of Syria and Israel would be deprived of their kings; or, as it is ex-

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

<sup>1</sup> See Anger's *Vorlesungen über die Messianische Idee*, p. 48.

was with the kingdom of Judah to help it, and the word is so employed in the next chapter (Isa. viii. 10).

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

<sup>1</sup> Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho*, chap. lxvii.

<sup>2</sup> Smith's *Scripture Testimony to the Messiah*, vol. i. p. 244.

<sup>3</sup> Delitzsch *On Isaiah*, vol. i. p. 218, Clark's translation.

<sup>4</sup> Bishop Chandler and Mansel, in the *Speaker's Commentary*, with much plausibility suppose that Hezekiah was only the adopted

Abarbanel evade the difficulty by the hypothesis of a second wife to Ahaz. (2) Others suppose that the *Almah* was the wife of the prophet Isaiah, and Immanuel was his son. This opinion is now the most prevalent; it is adopted by Abenezra, Jarchi, and Adler<sup>1</sup> among Jewish, and by Gesenius, Knobel, Hitzig, Hendewerk, Davidson, and Williams among Christian writers. According to some, she is the prophetess mentioned in the next chapter, and Immanuel is the same as Maher-shalal-hash-baz (Isa. viii. 2-4). But a difference in the name would seem to denote a difference in the children. Besides, the prophet's wife would have been more definitely designated *the prophetess* (Isa. viii. 3). And Isaiah had already a son Shear-jashub, so that his wife could not have been denoted by the title *Almah*. Some try to remove the difficulty by supposing the *Almah* to be the prophet's second wife, to whom he was then only betrothed;<sup>2</sup> but this is evidently a mere evasion. (3) A third opinion, adopted by Michaelis, Eichhorn, Koppe, and Paulus, is that no definite child is alluded to; but that what the prophet means is that before any child to be born of a maiden shall attain to the years of discernment, the land shall be forsaken of

son of Ahaz, being the heir to the throne. The king's own son Maaseiah was slain by the Syrians and Israelites, and the house of David was threatened with extirpation.

<sup>1</sup> See Adler's *Discourses*, pp. 18, 19.

<sup>2</sup> So Gesenius.

both its kings. The definite article before virgin, designating her as some particular virgin, is an objection to this opinion, as according to it no force is assigned to the article.<sup>1</sup>

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

<sup>1</sup> See Hengstenberg's *Christology*, vol. ii. pp. 63, 64.

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

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

<sup>1</sup> So Calvin. See his *Commentary on Isaiah, in loco*.

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

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

Some (Chandler, Kennicott, Maclaurin<sup>1</sup>) suppose that the lad mentioned in verse 16, called נָהָר (*Nahar*), *the lad*, is different from Immanuel, and is the prophet's own son Shear-jashub, who accompanied him (Isa. vii. 3). They suppose that Isaiah, in saying, 'Before the lad knows,' or, as they render it, 'Before this lad knows,' pointed to his own son. There is a plausibility in this view, as it assigns a reason for Shear-jashub accompanying the prophet, and for the difference

<sup>1</sup> Chandler's *Defence of Christianity*, p. 246; Kennicott's *Sermon on Isaiah vii. 13-16*; Maclaurin's *Works*, vol. ii. p. 197.



in the words *בֵּן* and *נֶעַר*. It has, however, too much the appearance of an evasion to escape a difficulty. There is no indication in the text of a change of subject; on the contrary, the same quality of rejecting the evil and choosing the good assigned to Immanuel in verse 15, is assigned to the lad in verse 16, indicating that they are one and the same. Calvin supposes that the reference in verse 16 is not to any particular child, but to children in general. 'The meaning,' he observes, 'is before the children, who shall be born hereafter, can distinguish between good and evil, the land which thou hatest shall be forsaken,'<sup>1</sup>—a meaning which is forced, unnatural, and wholly inadmissible.

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

<sup>1</sup> Calvin, *in loco*.

<sup>2</sup> M'Caul's *Messiahship of Jesus*, p. 181; Basset's *Search and See*, p. 106.

distinguish between good and evil, the land of Israel shall cease to have any independent king or kingdom.'<sup>1</sup> But such an exposition cannot be maintained; the two kings mentioned are evidently Rezin and Pekah, and the land is the land of which they are kings,—namely, Syria and Israel,—the singular being used because they formed one coalition.

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

<sup>1</sup> M'Caul's *Messiahship of Jesus*, p. 182.

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

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

<sup>1</sup> Hengstenberg's *Christology*, vol. ii. pp. 55, 56, Clark's translation.

maiden a wife of the king, or even his own.' But then he appears to think that the prophet imagined that the birth of the Messiah would take place at once. He speaks of 'the young Messiah in the first age of His development,' and supposes that verse 16 means that before the boy enters upon his riper age, therefore a few years from the present time, the allied kingdoms of Syria and Israel would be desolate.<sup>1</sup> Nor is the explanation of Delitzsch free from the above rationalistic tendency; whilst he maintains the direct Messianic interpretation, he still appears to intimate that the prophet considered that the birth of the Messiah was to be immediate. 'The birth of Immanuel,' he observes, 'apparently falls between the time then present and the Assyrian calamities, and His earliest childhood appears to run parallel to the Assyrian oppression.'<sup>2</sup>

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

<sup>1</sup> Ewald's *Prophets of the Old Testament*, vol. ii. pp. 88-91, Theological Translation Library.

<sup>2</sup> Delitzsch *On Isaiah*, vol. i. p. 223.

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

<sup>1</sup> Kidder *On the Messiah*, vol. ii. p. 98 ff.; Lowth *On Isaiah*, p. 187 ff.; Smith's *Testimony to the Messiah*, vol. i. p. 237 ff.; Row's *Bampton Lectures*, p. 213; Wordsworth *On Isaiah*, p. 20; Barnes, *in loco*.

<sup>2</sup> Barnes, in his *Commentary on Isaiah*, has a long and exhaustive note on Immanuel, which I only saw after this supplementary note was written.

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

<sup>1</sup> Lowth *On Isaiah*, note to chap. vii. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Smith's *Testimony to the Messiah*, vol. i. p. 239.

to be born, Syria and Israel should be overthrown. Emmanuel might improperly be the name of a common child, just as Jesus or Joshua was; but both apply to our Lord, and to Him only in unexaggerated strictness.'<sup>1</sup>

---

## SUPPLEMENT II.

### THE MESSIANIC PSALMS.

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

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

<sup>1</sup> Arnold's *Life and Correspondence*, p. 509, 6th ed.

<sup>2</sup> Ps. ii., viii., xiv., xvi., xix., xxii., xxiv., xl., xli., xlv., lxxviii., lxxix., lxxxix., xcvi., xcvi., cxii., cxix., cx., cxvii., cxviii.

<sup>3</sup> See, for a variety of opinions concerning the number of the Messianic Psalms, Baur's *Geschichte der alttest. Weissagung*, p. 412.

ence to their own time, which have by the writers of the New Testament been accommodated to express Christian doctrines and feelings. According to the second, they are secondary prophecies: primarily, they refer to some actual Jewish king; but they idealize his government, and thus receive their full accomplishment only in the Messiah, the great ideal King. According to the third, the Psalmists, filled with the idea of the theocratic King, that Seed promised to David who was to sit upon his throne, and influenced by the Spirit of inspiration, describe the glories of the kingdom, and the character of the great King. Certainly, in some Psalms, the Messianic element is more evident than in others; and in the Psalms which we have commented on in our lecture, we consider that the sufferings, but especially the glory, of the Messiah are foretold.

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

<sup>1</sup> Alexander's *Bampton Lectures*, Lecture II.



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

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

The Second Psalm is repeatedly referred by Jewish writers to the Messiah. The Targum of Jonathan has: 'The kings of the earth stand up, and the rulers are united together to rebel before the Lord, and to contend against His Messiah.' Trypho, in *Justin Martyr*, refers the Psalm to the Messiah, though he denies its applicability to a suffering Messiah. The ancient book, *Zohar*, has the following passage: 'Of the Messiah it is said, Kiss the Son. Thou art my Son.' Abenezra explains the whole Psalm of David and of his Son Messiah. 'If the words,' he observes, 'be

applied to the Messiah, the matter is clear.' Kimchi observes: 'Some interpret this Psalm of Gog and Magog, and the Anointed as King Messiah; but it is more natural to suppose that David spoke of himself.' And Rashi makes the following candid avowal: 'Our masters understood this Psalm of King Messiah; but for replying to the heretics (that is, the Christians), it is better to understand it of King David.'<sup>1</sup> There is, it is admitted, a difficulty in the translation of verse 12, 'Kiss ye the Son.' The word here rendered *son* is not the common word בן, as in verse 7, but the unusual Chaldee word בַּר, occurring elsewhere in this sense only in Prov. xxxi. 2. In other parts of the Old Testament בַּר signifies *clean, pure, chosen*. The Septuagint has δρᾶξασθε παιδείας, *receive instruction*; and the Vulgate, *apprehendite disciplinam*. Adler renders it, 'Arm yourselves with purity,' as the verb אָרַם sometimes signifies *to arm oneself*. But if we retain the meaning *pure*, we must consider it as an adjective, and render it, 'Kiss ye the pure or the chosen One.' The great lexicographers Gesenius and Fürst give the preference to the rendering, 'Kiss ye the Son.'<sup>2</sup>

The Twenty-second Psalm, so evidently Mes-

<sup>1</sup> See Chandler's *Defence of Christianity*, p. 212; Smith's *Testimony to the Messiah*, vol. i. p. 197, and *Speaker's Commentary on Psalm ii.*; M'Caul *On the Messiahship of Jesus*, pp. 150, 151.

<sup>2</sup> So also De Wette and Abenezra.

sianic, and so descriptive of the sufferings of the Messiah, was probably not so regarded by the ancient Jewish writers, because in general they overlooked the idea of a suffering Messiah. We are well aware that in the sixteenth verse of this Psalm, quoted in the lecture as applicable only to the Messiah, there is a diversity in the reading of the Hebrew manuscripts, and a great difference of opinion. The word *pierced*—‘they pierced my hands and my feet’—is replaced in most of the Hebrew manuscripts by another word, differing only in one letter, namely פָּאַרַי instead of פָּאַרַי. This has been rendered by some critics, *like a lion*; though, according to others, it admits of the meaning *piercing*. On the other hand, all the versions retain the reading, *they pierced*. Thus the Septuagint has ἄρυσαν χεῖράς μου καὶ πόδας μου, *they pierced my hands and my feet*. The Vulgate translates the word by *foderunt*, ‘they dug or pierced.’ And the Syriac has a word of similar import. The rendering, *as a lion*, hardly makes sense: ‘The assembly of the wicked have enclosed me: as a lion, my hands and my feet;’ whereas *they pierced*, or *piercing*, gives an easy and obvious meaning. The distinguished Jewish lexicographer Fürst, decides in favour of the meaning *pierced* or *piercing*. Thus, in his *Dictionary* he observes: ‘פָּאַרַי, to shut around, enclose, fetter: better פָּרַר, to bore through (Ps. xxii.

17), where either פְּאַרִי, part. masc. pl. constr., or פְּאַרִי, should be read.<sup>1</sup>

The Forty-fifth Psalm is regarded by the ancient Jewish Church as undoubtedly Messianic. The Targum of Jonathan has: 'Thy beauty, O King Messiah, is superior to that of the sons of men; the Spirit of prophecy is given into Thy lips, therefore God hath blessed Thee for ever.' Kimchi, in quoting the words, 'God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows,' says, 'The Psalmist spoke these words in the person of the Messiah;' and he thinks that this is implied in the title to the Psalm, Jedidoth, which he considers to be a name of the Messiah. 'This Psalm,' observes Abenezra, 'treats of David, or rather of his Son, the Messiah; for that is His name, My servant David shall be a Prince in the midst of you.'

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

<sup>1</sup> See this verse discussed at great length in Basset's *Search and See*, pp. 59-79; M'Caul's *Messiahship of Jesus*, pp. 158-161. See also Gesenius' *Dictionary* on the word פְּאַרִי; Perowne *On the Psalms*, vol. i. pp. 246, 247. His conclusion is: 'It is probable that the Masoretic interpretation ought to be given up, especially as *like a lion* is not very forcible, and leaves the structure of the sentence incomplete.'

the collection, and is applied by Bible readers in general, without hesitation or conscious difficulty, to the Messiah of Nazareth, as beautifully describing the spirit of His reign.’<sup>1</sup> The ancient Jews acknowledge its Messianic character. Thus the Targum of Jonathan: ‘O God, give King Messiah the ways of Thy judgment!’ Jarchi confesses that the ancient Rabbis refer this Psalm to the Messiah. Kimchi observes there were that explained this Psalm of the Messiah, who is otherwise in Scripture called Solomon; and he adds that the expressions in it are great exaggerations if applied only to Solomon. And the Rabbis thus translate verse 17: ‘His name shall endure for ever: his name Yinnon, before the sun;’ and hence they infer that the name Yinnon is one of the names of the Messiah, and preceded the creation of the sun.<sup>2</sup>

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

<sup>1</sup> Higginson’s *Ecce Messias*, p. 30.

<sup>2</sup> Chandler’s *Defence*, p. 214; Leathes’ *Witness of Old Testament to Christ*, p. 116.

Lord said unto my Lord, Sit Thou on my right hand, till I make Thine enemies Thy footstool' (Luke xx. 41-43). It is also asserted by the Rabbis to be Messianic. Thus in the Talmud it is said: 'God placed King Messiah at His right hand, according to Ps. cx. 2, and Abraham at His left.'<sup>1</sup>

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

---

### SUPPLEMENT III.

#### QUOTATIONS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT.

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

<sup>1</sup> For Talmudic references to this Psalm, see Perowne *On the Psalms*, vol. ii. pp. 297-299.

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

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

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

<sup>1</sup> *Testimony to the Messiah*, vol. i. p. 145.

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

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

<sup>1</sup> See Fairbairn's *Typology of Scripture*, vol. i. p. 104.



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

One or two quotations, the suitableness of which is not to us apparent, are not sufficient to counterbalance those many quotations which are at once obvious and applicable. The question under dis-

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