

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

and Vyâsa are still revered and studied, the teachings of Plato, Bacon and Descartes find also many a zealous defender upon the banks of the sacred river. England has hitherto given India an education shorn of Christianity, and the consequence has been that the favorite school with "Young Bengal" is a school of Deism; but a brighter day is dawning: revolutions in opinion do not spring up suddenly in this oriental world; yet the time is coming, when the Gospel of Christ, having gained access to the spiritual convictions of the multitude of India, shall gather up and appropriate to itself those secret truths which Hinduism contains, and shall solve those serious problems of life and eternity with which the Hindu mind has been so long and fruitlessly engaged.

ARTICLE II.

THEORIES OF MESSIANIC PROPHECY.

BY REV. S. C. BARTLETT, PROFESSOR IN CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

THE subject of Messianic Prophecy is attended with great difficulties. Certain portions of the Old Testament are so direct in their reference to Christ and his Kingdom, and so distinctly appropriated by him and his apostles, as to secure a general recognition among all who believe in prophecy and inspiration. But around this circle of clear light — the direct prophecies — there is a broad penumbra of doubt and debate.

In regard to a large part of this debated ground, the question among evangelical expositors has often been more as to the mode than the fact of a Messianic reference. And their concurrent recognition of the fact has often been the more weighty and impressive by reason of their diverse theories concerning the mode. It is interesting also to

observe how the weight of evidence in regard to particular passages has sometimes pressed upon candid scholars, till it has forced them to remodel their theories, or even to receive the fact to the detriment of their theories. Rosenmuller was constrained to reverse the judgment of his first edition, and in his Compend to receive not only the second, forty-fifth, seventy-second, and one-hundred and tenth, but even the twenty-first Psalm, as Messianic. Hengstenberg, in the interval between his Christology and his Commentary on the Psalms, found it necessary very materially to modify his views, and to include the thirty-fifth, thirty-eighth, forty-first, and sixty-ninth Psalms in the same class with the sixteenth, twenty-second, and fortieth. He did it by abandoning the exclusive reference of the latter class to Christ, and making them a set of generic utterances concerning "the ideal righteous sufferer," which apply in their fulness only to the suffering Saviour. We may question the theory; but it resulted in very considerably enlarging his catalogue of the Psalms ultimately relating to Christ. The late Professor Stuart, in discussing the numerous citations of Psalm sixty-ninth by Christ's apostles,¹ though he takes the position that "David is originally and personally meant, and not Christ," and that these citations are made only as apposite and felicitous quotations, just as "we are accustomed continually to quote and apply maxims and sentiments from the classic writers," yet changes the whole bearing of his position by the brief remark that "David, as King, was, beyond all reasonable doubt, a type of King Messiah; and what was done in respect to the type may, by the usage of the New Testament writers, be applied to the antitype."² The gradual expansion of view in the mind of Tholuck is well exemplified by a single instance: The fourth edition of his Commentary on John explains the Saviour's declaration, "Moses wrote of me" (John v. 46), as a reference to the

¹ Matt. xxvii. 34, 38, xxiii. 38; Mark, xv. 23; John, ii. 17, xix. 28, 29, xv. 25; Acts, i. 20; Rom. xi. 9, xv. 3.

² Stuart's Hints on Prophecy, pp. 37, 39.

single passage found in Deut. xviii. 18. But in the seventh edition he writes as follows: "On ἔγραψεν the commentators refer to different Mosaic prophecies, especially to Deut. xviii. 18. But the train of thought in our passage leads us to take it in a universal sense, by virtue of which Bengel adds to ἔγραψεν a 'nusquam non, he writes everywhere.' . . . Christ may have had in his eye the indirect and typical prophecies of Moses as well as the direct ones."

The fluctuating views of individuals, no less than the conflicting opinions of different writers, indicate the intrinsic difficulty of the subject. The topic itself has lain before the church and occupied the attention of its leading minds from the beginning. It was not brought there by idle curiosity; but the sacred writers themselves have placed even its more difficult aspects on the threshold of the gospel. The first two chapters of Matthew comprise four of the most perplexing of the Old Testament citations. Mark begins his narrative with quotations from Malachi and Isaiah. The first chapter of Luke connects the infant Saviour with the "throne of his father David" and the "house of Jacob," and in various ways binds the new dispensation close upon the events and predictions of the old.¹ John's gospel brings at once before its readers in connection with Christ, the voice in the wilderness, the Lamb of God, Jacob's vision, the psalmist's zeal for his Father's house, the temple, and the brazen serpent. And similar allusions run through the whole texture of the New Testament. The subject was not introduced by Rabbins, nor Alexandrian Jews, nor Christian Fathers, but by the sacred writers themselves.

The recent Oxford doubters have well indicated the importance of the topic. After objecting to such things as the recognition of any "symbolism of the gospel in the law," or of any distinction "in the elder prophecies between

¹ E. g., the sending of Gabriel, the prophecy concerning "Elias," the quotations from Zachariah and Isaiah, and the putting of Hannah's song in the mouth of Mary.

the temporal and the spiritual Israel," one writer proceeds as follows: "The question which has been suggested runs up into a more general one, 'the relation between the Old and New Testaments;' for the Old Testament will receive a different meaning accordingly as it is explained from itself or from the New. In the first case, a careful and conscientious study of each one for itself is all that is required; in the second case, the types and ceremonies of the law, perhaps the very facts and persons of the history, will be assumed to be predestined or made after a pattern corresponding to the things that were to be in the latter days. And this question of itself stirs another question respecting the interpretation of the Old Testament in the New. Is such interpretation to be regarded as the meaning of the original text, or an accommodation of it to the thoughts of other times?"¹ The writer does not exaggerate the importance of the question, nor deny the method of the sacred writers, while he clearly intimates his refusal to accept their authority as interpreters. He also, by implication, suggests some of the sources of difficulty.

The difficulties of the subject may be best presented by a few well-known instances. Of Christ's abode in Egypt and return to Palestine, it is declared in Matt. ii. 15: "He was there until the death of Herod, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, Out of Egypt have I called my Son." But the original passage (Hosea ii. 1), as Mr. Barnes truly says: "evidently speaks of God's calling his people out of Egypt under Moses;" and he ventures to add: "It cannot be supposed that the passage in Hosea was a prophecy of the Messiah, but was only used by Matthew to *express* that event." Again, Hebrews i. 5 applies to Christ the declaration: "I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son." The quotation is from 2 Sam. vii. 12—16, a passage in which God promises David a posterity with an everlasting kingdom, but threatens that posterity with chastisement "if he commit

¹ Professor Jowett, in "Recent Inquiries in Theology," p. 407.

iniquity," and closes with the assurance that "my mercy shall not depart from him, as I took it away from Saul." So the citation in Hebrews x. 5—7 ascribes to the Messiah the utterance of the words in Psalm xi. 6—8: "Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not," etc., though the same speaker, in verse 12, speaks of "mine iniquities." A similar difficulty in the sixty-ninth Psalm (ver. 5) was so formidable as to prevent Hengstenberg from admitting it into his Christology, although, as Alexander truly observes, no Psalm except the twenty-second is more distinctly applied to Christ in the New Testament. In 1 Cor. x. 3—6 we read that the fathers were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual rock which followed them, and that rock was Christ; and that these things were our examples" (*τύποι*). John records, xix. 35, of the exemption of the Saviour from the breaking of his bones: "these things were done that the scripture should be fulfilled, which says, A bone of him shall not be broken." But the passage, Exodus vii. 46, which he quotes, is a direction concerning the paschal lamb. Paul, in Gal. iii. 16, refers thus to the promise to Abraham and his seed (Gen. xiii. 15, xvii. 8): "He saith not, And to seeds as of many, but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ." Afterwards he argues that by the union of believers to Christ, the same promise is to them, and concludes in verse 29: "And if ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Add to these instances the quotation of the eighth Psalm in Heb. ii. 6—8, with the subsequent application to Christ, the use of Isaiah vii. 14 in Matt. i. 22, 23, and of Isaiah xxix. 13 in Matt. xv. 7, and we have at least specimens of the chief forms of difficulty surrounding the subject of Messianic Prophecy.

The problem is to discover some fundamental and central principle, according to which these various kinds of passages can be understood, so as neither to abrogate the authority of the New Testament, nor to set aside the authority of the Old.

In enumerating the various attempts to solve the problem, we now lay aside the Rationalistic view, which holds that the cited passages of the Old Testament, and all other supposed Messianic prophecies, were destitute of all such reference, and that the apostles in their use of them were only misled by false methods of interpretation prevalent among their contemporaries. This ripe and rotten fruit of Neology seems at last to have found its way bodily into the English church.¹ This view strikes at the root of all authoritative teaching in the New Testament, and does not fall within the scope of this discussion.

Among the attempts made in modern times to meet, in whole or in part, the difficulties of the problem, we encounter:

I. The theory of accommodation. It might well be called of forced accommodation. It endeavors to escape the difficulty of some of the most troublesome passages, by denying that the apostles intended to cite the passages as veritable prophecies, and affirming that they employed them only as apt quotations. This principle was rigidly applied to all cases, however distinctly alleged by the evangelists to have been fulfilments, and even designed fulfilments, of the Old Testament, in which an earlier intended reference of the language plainly appeared. For the theory involves the principle that a given utterance can have but one legitimate reference.

The exegetical corner-stone of this theory was laid in that interpretation of the phrases *ἵνα πληρωθῆ, ὅπως πληρωθῆ, τότε ἐπληρώθη*, so elaborately defended by Tittmann, and in this country adopted so incautiously, as we think, by some of the standard-bearers of the church, till, through the great influence of Stuart and Woods and Robinson and Barnes, it has been spread through the land.² A chief part of the process was to maintain that *ἵνα* in the New

¹ See the articles by Dr. Williams and Professor Jowett, on Bunsen's Biblical Researches and the Interpretation of Scripture, in "Recent Inquiries."

² Tittmann's Discussion, with Professor Stuart's endorsement, may be found in the Biblical Repository, Jan. 1835.

Testament, besides its *telic* sense, denoting purpose, has also an *ecbatic* sense, "marking the event, result, upshot of an action, *so that, so as that*, implying something which actually takes place," and that this ecbatic sense is a very common signification.² The subjunctive mode of the following verb of course loses the force of a subjunctive, and becomes virtually indicative. Thus all intention is eliminated from the statement. Still further, the asserted "fulfilment" ceases to be an accomplishment of any actual *meaning* of the Old Testament writer, and becomes, in fact, a simple coincidence with his words. That this statement is not overdrawn appears in the language of the venerable Dr. Woods: "These phrases," he says, "are indeed used, and very properly, to introduce a real prediction which is accomplished, but not for this purpose only. They are often used, and with equal propriety, to denote a *mere comparison of similar events*, — to signify that the thing spoken of answers to the words of a prophet, so that his words may be justly applied to it. Accordingly, we might in many instances take a passage where it is said, such a thing was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, or that what was spoken by the prophet was fulfilled, and might express the same thing by saying, the declaration of the prophet had an accomplishment in what took place, or his words may be justly applied to it, or *they very well express it, or his observation is true in reference to the present case, or this thing is like what the prophet describes.*"³ The only thing that could well be added to this extreme latitude of meaning would be Kuinoel's remark, that these phrases are employed not only when the very thing which was predicted takes place, but also "when anything occurs of such a character as to bring words like these to our own recollection!"⁴ And the convenient breadth of the principle was such that, while by means of it evangel-

¹ Robinson's N. T. Lexicon, Article *ἴσα*.

² See Tittmann's article, and Robinson's Lexicon.

³ Woods' Works, I. p. 122. The italics are his.

⁴ Kuinoel in Matt. i. 22.

ical writers were removing the difficulty from such passages as Matt. ii. 15, 17, Kuinoel and his fellows were taking out the prophecy from the citation in Matt. i. 22, and all similar declarations in the New Testament. And thus it made little difference whether you denied the inspiration or forced the language of the evangelists; the same result was easily reached.

Theological considerations have even been adduced to help the exegesis. It has been argued that to insist upon the telic sense in the passage last referred to (Matt. i. 22), would make the sacred writer assert that the Saviour's birth and the circumstances connected with it took place simply or chiefly for the sake of fulfilling a prophecy of Isaiah. "But," says Professor Stuart, "here the reflecting reader will be constrained to pause and ask, What, then? was it not to redeem a world in ruin that the Saviour's miraculous birth and the events accompanying took place, rather than merely to accomplish a prediction of Isaiah?" Yet in the next sentence he gives a virtual answer to his own difficulty: "The proper answer to this question may undoubtedly be that *both* of the purposes named were to be accomplished by the birth of Jesus. The world was to be redeemed, and the prophecy was also to be fulfilled. But the great and ultimate end must be the redemption of mankind. The other, viz. the fulfilment of the particular prophecy in question, was altogether subordinate, and merely preparatory."¹ Very true. But may not the writer ever allude to the subordinate end, especially when he is narrating the very circumstances that bear directly upon its accomplishment? In that connection it is the only relevant allusion. God had provided for the prophecy and the fulfilment. There was a designed adjustment of the circumstances of Christ's birth to meet the prophecy; and the events were brought to pass as they were, *in order to complete* God's arrangement. In stating that design and its accomplishment, the writer neither affirms nor denies the great purpose of his mission

¹ Bib. Repos. Vol. V. p. 86.

to the world. Precisely so the evangelists continually record the immediate and proximate ends of the Saviour's own proceedings, without deeming it necessary on every occasion to state the chief end of his life and labors. On this very ground Professor Stuart rebukes the excessive zeal of Tittmann. For when the latter pronounces the *ŷva* of John xviii. 37 to be ecbatic ("For this end was I born," etc.), Professor Stuart expresses a doubt whether it be necessary to abandon the telic sense, adding: "We do not suppose the Saviour to mean that he had no other ends in view."¹

Another mode of argument, is employed by Tittmann: "In Matt. ii. 15 we are told that Joseph remained concealed in Egypt till the death of Herod, that it might be fulfilled," etc.; but "it is quite certain that the end proposed by Joseph, and to be accomplished by staying in Egypt, was not the fulfilment of prophecy." True; but Matthew most manifestly relates it as one of *God's* designs in the case. To this it is objected by Dr. Robinson,² that to recognize the purpose of God in the case rather than the purpose of the subject of the clause, "is to introduce a new element in interpretation, and to destroy the force of language." But, we ask, can this principle be pushed through a single book of the Bible, that to learn the real and avowed purpose of a transaction we are tied down to the purpose of "the subject of the clause?" Or does the Bible, from beginning to end, distinguish between the lower, human intent and the *real, divine* object of that transaction? Is it not characteristic of the book? And do we need to be told by such men as Knobel, Meyer, and Winer, that "the Hebrew *teleologia* represents every (important, and especially every surprising) event as intended and designed by God?" And is it not a narrow principle of interpretation in any book that will, at all hazards, set aside the clear scope of the whole representation, and nowhere admit any other purpose of the

¹ Bib. Repos. Vol. V. p. 107, note.

² New Testament Lexicon, *ŷva*, ii. note.

³ Winer's N. T. Grammar, § 53, 6.

transaction than the purpose of the subject of some "clause," in connection with which the purpose is stated? Now, in these narratives of fulfilled prophecy, are the Evangelists viewing man or, most manifestly, God as the chief actor in the event? And when the sacred writer, thus clearly viewing God as the real author of the series of events which he describes, adduces one of God's prophecies as receiving a designed fulfilment in that series of events, which, we ask, is the new element of interpretation,—to recognize, or to refuse to recognize, the intention of the moving agency to which the writer plainly refers the whole transaction? And is it destroying the force of language to understand the aim of a phrase of citation in accordance with the very design for which the writer makes the citation? It is of no consequence whether the citation be of a direct prophecy, or of an historical or typical parallel. If the writer sees fit to assert a real and pre-arranged connection between the type and the antitype, it is the duty of an interpreter to permit him to make his own statements.

The laws of language, fairly applied, must govern here. And the best scholarship of the present day, by an overwhelming vote, repudiates this view of ἵνα πληρωθῆ, and this forced accommodation. The advocates of this view had at least four points which they were bound to establish: well-proved instances of the ecbatic use of ἵνα in the New Testament; a clear necessity for substituting the alleged exceptional meaning in *any* given case for the almost universal telic meaning; the most weighty reasons for elevating this exceptional meaning into a quite common usage; extraordinary arguments to justify such a course in the case of utterances so deliberately and distinctly asserting an intention and arrangement, as, "all this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet;" "these things were done that the scripture should be fulfilled," etc. But even the first of these positions is far from being unanimously conceded at present. Tittmann, indeed, with a dashing carelessness of citation, found plenty of instances, and among them such as John i. 7; xi. 4; xv. 42;

xviii. 37, and the like! But Meyer declares that the particle *iva* in the New Testament "is never anything else than the particle of purpose, *that, in order that.*" Alford takes the same ground, and endeavors to sustain it in his interpretation of particular passages. Olshausen asserts that it "always expresses an intention."¹ Passow, in the last edition of the *Lexicon*, though referring to the N. T. use of the word, does not give the ecbatic meaning as found there. Winer in his *grammar* goes through with a brief examination of passages, and does not, unless in a single instance (found in the Apocalypse), distinctly admit the meaning. Tholuck (on Rom. iii. 19) ventures only to say that the ecbatic meaning "can hardly be denied with safety in the New Testament, since at all events the distinction is here and there so subtle, that it can scarcely have come to the speaker's consciousness." Ellicott guardedly admits three uses of *iva*, — the final, sub-final, and eventual; the first being "the primary and principal, and never to be given up except on the most distinct counter arguments;" the second, "occasional;" the third, "apparently in a few cases, and due, perhaps, more to what is called 'Hebrew Teleology,' (*i. e.* the reverential aspect under which the Jews regarded prophecy and its fulfilment) than grammatical depravation."²

Such is the present attitude of eminent scholars even on the naked question of the ecbatic or eventual use of the conjunction *iva*. But as to the other points involved, and especially the main question, whether the phrase *iva πληρωθη*, under all the circumstances in the passages referred to, can fairly be understood in the sense advocated by Dr. Woods, Prof. Stuart, and Mr. Barnes, and whether it indicates anything short of a previously designed correspondence, — some sort of objective connexion between the fact and the Old Testament utterance, — the best modern scholarship, so far as we are aware, is almost wholly on one side, — and that side is the negative. Such is the position not only of Meyer, Alford, Winer, and Olshausen, but of De Wette,

¹ See the comments of Meyer, Alford, and Olshausen on Matt. i. 22.

² Ellicott on Ephesians, i. 17.

Wordsworth, Tholuck, Alexander, Davidson, Fairbairn, Lee.¹ Thus Winer, *e. g.*, says in regard to the expression in question, "there can be no doubt of its having in the mouth (of a Jewish teacher and consequently) of Jesus and the apostles (in reference to an event already taken place) strictly and precisely the sense of *that it might be fulfilled.*" And Rudelbach sums up the present state of the case thus: "The signification of the oft-recurring phrase, *ἵνα πληρωθῆ*, as involving a real connection between prophecy and its fulfilment, is no longer questioned by the more judicious expositors. The fact that grammar itself, against the will of those who handle it, is compelled at least to give formal testimony to the Faith, is not to be overlooked as an apologetic element of the Christian evidences; and indeed it has never, when the occasion offered, been overlooked by the ancients. The sense, however, of that formula is plainly nothing else than what lies in the expression itself, viz. that the fulfilment has taken place *in order* to display the truth of the prophecy."² We need have no hesitation in accepting substantially this statement of the case; in the words of Alexander, "the event was necessary to the execution of the divine purpose, as expressed in the prediction." For even if we should admit an occasional "hypotelic" or "eventual" use of the single word *ἵνα* in the New Testament, yet in those deliberate statements in which the sacred writers are solemnly recording the wonder-working Providence of God, that made event and utterance correspond, we believe that to reduce the grave declaration, *τοῦτο δὲ ὄλον γέγονεν ἵνα πληρωθῆ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου*, or the simpler phrase, *ἵνα πληρωθῆ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ κυρίου*, to the announce-

¹ See the Commentaries of Alford, Alexander, De Wette, Meyer, Olshausen, Wordsworth; Davidson's Hermeneutics, p. 473, seq.; Fairbairn's Typology, Vol. I. p. 401, seq.; Winer's N. T. Gramm. p. 482; Tholuck's Citations of the O. T., Bib. Sacra, Vol. XI. p. 601; Lee on Inspiration, p. 304.

It should be remarked, however, that Tholuck and some others of the German scholars commit themselves only to the fact that such was the view of the sacred writers. They do not always regard that view as correct, — in other words, do not fully admit their inspiration.

² Quoted in Lee on Inspiration, p. 304.

ment of a mere general similarity, or of a superficial correspondence to the words, and not to the intent and meaning of God's prophecy, is but an evasion of the real scope of the passages, accomplished too at the expense of the lexicon and grammar and the true laws of language.¹

II. The theory of alternating subjects of prophecy is a crude hypothesis, perhaps now nearly, but not altogether, obsolete. It is not only among the theories to be found in Poole's Synopsis, and occasionally advanced by Henry, Scott, and Adam Clarke, but still finds a place in certain books designed for popular use. The fossil remains of it are found embedded in the vast morasses of the "Comprehensive Commentary." This work draws its supply, in this respect, partly from Williams' Cottage Bible and Morison's Exposition of the Psalms, two English works published just before it.

The theory endeavors to solve difficulties by referring one portion of a connected passage (a Psalm, for example) exclusively to one subject, perhaps David or Solomon, and another exclusively to another subject, perhaps Christ;

¹ It may be impertinent, in such a discussion, for the writer to express his profound sense of obligation to the venerable men from whose views he differs, including, as they do, two of his own instructors. But it is proper to say that their error, if it be so, was for a time the prevalent view, and that the whole subject has since undergone much careful investigation, of which they had not the benefit. We would suggest that Dr. Robinson's articles bearing on this subject, in his excellent Lexicon, seem to require a revision. Out of more than six hundred instances of the use of *ἵνα* in the N. T., some fifteen are cited to prove the ecbatic use. Several of these are unhesitatingly rejected by such expositors as Alford, Hackett, Eadie, Ellicott — indeed the case is clear at a glance — e. g. Acts, ii. 25; viii. 19; Gal. v. 17; Phil. i. 26; John, v. 20. Nearly all the instances cited by him require only the recognition of so simple facts as the existence of subordinate or coördinate ends, or of purposes in God's mind somewhat distinctly implied by the writers, to harmonize perfectly with the legitimate use of the word. E. g. Luke xxii. 30 is quoted as a clear case of the ecbatic sense, with the remark: "Here the feasting is not the end or purpose of the kingdom to be given, but a result or consequence." To which we need only say, the blessedness thus described is one of the ends of the heavenly kingdom. After this limited and questionable set of cases, it is added, "here belongs the frequent phrase *ἵνα πληρωθῆ, κ. τ. λ.*"; and all the instances occurring in the N. T. are summarily included.

sometimes returning to resume at the end of the passage the subject that was excluded in the middle. This theory of a vibratory subject was applied to such passages as 2 Sam. viii. 11—16, Psalms xl., lxi., and the like, in which a portion of the remarks imply an erring and sinful being, and other portions are applied by the scriptures to the Messiah. In regard to the fortieth Psalm, we are informed that Williams, after Kennicott, divides the Psalm into three parts, the first of which (vs. 1—5) he applies primarily to David, and typically to the Redeemer; the second, (vs. 6—10,) to the incarnation, and to that only; the third, (vs. 11—17) again to David. And Morison is quoted as referring vs. 7—11 strictly to the Messiah, but at verse 12 remarking: "I am not without suspicion, sustained by some of the most distinguished biblical critics that ever lived, that the theme is here changed, and that David speaks in his own person, and expresses his own experience and that of the Church." Williams, we also learn, interprets Psalm sixty-ninth "partly of David and partly of Christ."¹ Dr. Scott says of the last-mentioned Psalm: "it is so manifestly a prophecy of Christ, that we should consider him as the speaker *in most parts of it.*" Adam Clarke refers Psalm xxii. "partly to Christ and partly to David." Of Psalm xl. he decides that in the first portion David gives thanks for being healed of sore disease; that vs. 9—11 apply only to the atonement of Christ; and that the remainder belongs to the seventieth Psalm. Matthew Henry seemingly distributes the promises of 2 Sam. vii. 12—16, alternately to Solomon and to Christ.

Such a theory is manifestly but a clumsy device to escape the pressure of a difficulty. It deliberately sets aside all aim at unity and continuity of discourse, and, under that form, hardly requires elaborate refutation. Professor Stuart well says: "the violence which is done to sound rules of interpretation by arbitrarily introducing *two* subjects of the writer's discourse when he plainly and obviously presents

¹ The above quotations of Morison and Williams are from the Comprehensive Commentary.

but one, is so great that but little danger to the churches can ever arise from such an error. It is so plainly a trespass against the laws of our nature as to the interpretation of language; it is so arbitrary in its proceedings, when it appropriates one part of the text to one subject, and another part which is indissolubly connected with it to another, that nothing like a general persuasion of propriety in practising such a method of interpretation can ever be brought about.¹ The difficulty of interpretation is not to be met by sacrificing the fundamental principles of rational discourse.

III. Another attempt to solve a portion of the difficulties is the theory of a twofold signification, or "double sense." These significations are called primary and secondary — lower and higher — literal and allegorical or typical. It is a very ancient method. Chrysostom held that the eighth Psalm treated primarily of man, but in a higher sense (*κυριώτερον*) of Christ, the first-born of the human race. In more modern times Poole says: "undoubtedly the Psalmist had in view the Messiah; nevertheless I do not, with others refer this whole Psalm literally, properly, and immediately to Christ." So Scott says of Psalm lxix: "It is probable that David composed this Psalm during Absalom's rebellion, with reference to his own case; but the Holy Spirit evidently spoke of the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow." Poole speaks in a similar manner of the forty-first Psalm. Henry and Scott consider the fortieth Psalm as relating primarily to David, but secondarily, and in parts exclusively, to Christ. It is, perhaps, unnecessary to adduce instances of a view which has been quite common.

Here, perhaps, should be reckoned Olshausen's view of the *ὑπόνοια*, or deeper sense of the scriptures, which recognizes the literal or historical sense as strictly true (in contradistinction from the "allegorical" theories of former times, which denied it), and finds also a further meaning, not differing in character from the literal one, "but only a deeper

¹ Hints on Prophecy.

lying sense, bound up with the literal one by an internal and essential connection — a sense given along with this, and in it, so that it must present itself whenever it is considered from a higher point of view, and is capable of being ascertained by fixed rules.”¹

Now, when we consider the number of eminently thoughtful as well as pious minds which have adopted this view in some form, we may suspect that this is a defective mode of statement, or a partial apprehension, of a truth. It is certain that a portion of the argument and ridicule with which it has been assailed have misconceived the theory, — perhaps chiefly from its looseness of statement.

Much has been said of the effect of this theory to turn the scriptures into “riddles, conundrums, and ambiguous heathen oracles,” etc.² But candor compels us to say that this is too strongly put. The more intelligent advocates of a double sense, we believe, have³ not contended that the scriptures admitted *opposite* or essentially *diverse* meanings, but, as they have sometimes expressed it, a lower and a higher meaning *of the same kind*, and lying in the same direction.³ Some portions of Professor Stuart’s reasonings, by failing to do justice to the theory, failed, as we think, fully to meet the case, although his charges as to its lack of law and limit undoubtedly hold good. Thus Davison inquires: “What is the double sense? Not the convenient latitude of two unconnected senses, wide of each other, and giving room to a fallacious ambiguity, but the combination of two related, analogous and harmonizing, though disparate, subjects, each clear and definite in itself; implying a two-

¹ Klausen’s Hermeneutik, in Fairbairn’s Typology, Vol. I. p. 47.

² Hints on Prophecy, p. 17, seq. Bib. Sacra, Vol. IX. p. 459.

³ There are occasional exceptions and inconsistencies. Dr. Alexander maintains that there is an “actual ambiguity or twofold meaning in the פִּיט in Psalm xvi.; which word he considers as derivable both from פִּיט, to sink, thus meaning pit or “grave,” and from פִּיט to corrupt, hence signifying also “corruption.” “The use of the equivocal expression,” he says, “may have been intentional, in order to make it applicable both to David and to Christ”; and, “the ambiguity, or twofold meaning, of the Hebrew word cannot be explained away without embarrassing the interpretation of this signal prophecy.” See his Commentary on this Psalm.

fold truth in the prescience, and creating an aggravated difficulty, and thereby an accumulated proof in the completion."¹ To the same effect but, still more distinctly, the Roman Catholic commentator, Allioli, says that "in the prophetic intention, such events as, gradually taking place in time, together form but one divine act, are represented under one point of view with and in each other," and accordingly "one is communicated in the other and by the other." He terms such events, (e. g. the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world, as described in Matt. xxiv.) "parts of one great God's-deed."

The theory of a "double-sense" is not only open to the charge of being an infelicitous statement of what its best advocates have in mind. It also lacks method, precision, and limitation. "Why not three, seven, ten, or (with the Jewish Rabbies) forty-nine senses?" asks Professor Stuart. What is its basis and principle? The phraseology and whatsoever it would *properly* describe should be discarded. The principle which its more discriminating advocates seem to have had in mind, may be termed,

IV. The theory of a reiterated reference. This view asserts but one signification of the language, but assigns to that one signification repeated applications. It assumes that he who was able to adapt his utterances to one future event, was equally able to adjust them to more than one,—to shape the course of events in the execution of his schemes so that one event shall stand over against another, and both of them shall lie along in the one line of his prophetic word. Those events might lie along in the same level, in which case the fulfilment is a simple repetition; they might be related as members of an ascending series, in which case the fulfilment rises from a lower to a higher sphere. The latter method is that which is most frequently claimed.

The advocates of this view may certainly maintain that it contains nothing out of keeping with the methods of the

¹ Davison on Prophecy, quoted from Fairbairn's Typology, I. p. 130.

² Quoted by Professor Stowe, in Bib. Sacra for 1850, p. 477.

Bible in its non-prophetic utterances. It is not unusual for the language in the same utterance to pass from a lower to a higher range; and for a symbolic expression to stand both for itself and for that which it symbolizes.¹

This view of a repeated reference — an intended application of the same meaning to two or more successive instances, in the same or a higher sphere — may be understood as the view intended by some of the advocates of a double-sense or a deeper sense. Such seems to be the doctrine of Davison, Allioli, and Olshausen, as quoted above. This mode of statement obviates one chief objection to the other theory, that it denies any settled meaning to language. Here may be distinguished :

1. Instances of "double reference." This designation is adopted, and the principle strongly advocated by Professor Stowe, who says that "no one can reject it, without at the same time repudiating the authority of the New Testament writers, as divinely inspired interpreters of the Old."² To give an example, Isaiah xxix. 13, ("This people draweth near me," etc.), is plainly a rebuke of the prophet's contemporaries.³ But in Matt. xv. 7, Christ says to the Scribes and Pharisees around him: "Well did Esaias prophesy of you, saying, This people," etc. Several of the passages which Matthew introduces with the phrase, "that it might be fulfilled" (e. g. ii. 15) had indisputably a previous application. So John xix. 36. In such cases the alternatives before us are these, — to force upon the writers a meaning which (as we have seen) the best modern scholarship repudiates; to deny the correctness of the New Testament exposition, as some have done; or to admit a second reference, and that, too, *connected with the original intent of the utterance*, as that utterance was prompted by the Holy Spirit,

¹ Examples of the first: Whosoever will lose his life for my sake, shall save it; Let the dead bury their dead. Of the second: But the meek shall inherit the earth, Ps. xxxvii. 11; Every one of them in Zion appeareth before God, Ps. lxxxiv. 7.

² Eschatology of Christ, Bib. Sacra, 1850, p. 478.

³ So Henderson. Knobel and Rosenmuller recognize no other reference. Hengstenberg does not include the passage in his Christology.

whether so understood by the original writer and readers or not.¹

It is at this point, — the *intended* and actual reference of the utterance itself, or the fact involved, to the second subject, — that we find the serious defect of the view advocated by Prof. Stuart and Mr. Barnes, after Kuinoel. They say that the utterance *can* be applied to the second case, but had no such original reference;² whereas the writers of the New Testament, according to the best modern scholarship, declare the second application to be a *bona fide* reference of the original statement.

Under this head may be included the theory of *typical predictions*. Of this again there are two forms. The more common view holds, in regard to the larger class of declarations in the Old Testament concerning earlier persons and events which are applied in the New Testament to Christ and the events connected with him, that they were intended for a

¹ To this effect an able writer on prophecy in the Princeton Review, Jan. 1861. "The expressions of certain prophecies were so framed under the guidance of the Spirit, whether with or without the knowledge of the original writer and readers, as to apply with more or less exactness to distinct subjects. The same fact or principle which is represented in the one appears likewise in the other, but in greater perfection; and the prophecy is so drawn as to cover both, in its more limited and lower sense answering to one, in its larger and higher sense, to the other. This may be done not only where both events lie in the future, but where one is already past." — P. 46.

In like manner Lee on Inspiration, p. 309; "The Holy Spirit when inspiring God's servants in former times, had infused a deeper significance into their words than the men who uttered them, or who committed them to writing, perceived. The depth of meaning conveyed could only be apprehended in the fulness of time by those who, like the writers of the New Testament, had the mind of Christ, and who thereby were enabled to unfold the hid ten mystery couched under the earlier form."

² The view is skillfully defended, and its real basis somewhat disguised, in the incidental discussion by Prof. Stuart in the Bib. Sacra for 1852, pp. 460—2, but its true purport emerges in the distinct statements that Hosea xi. 1 was "merely and simply a historical declaration," and that the only fulfilment in Matt. ii. 15, was that "an occurrence took place *like* the ancient one." He states also in the same connection that there was not a fulfilling "in our usual sense of the word 'fulfil,' but in the sense which the *Jews* gave the word." In other words, there was in the original utterance and arrangement absolutely no reference whatever to the case which Matthew says occurred "that it might be fulfilled," and the fulfilment was — a Jewish conceit.

proximate and lower reference to those earlier subjects, but for a higher and ultimate application to the later ones. Thus Adam Clarke speaks of one of the Psalms, (the second,) "The prime subject of this Psalm is Christ; the type, David."

The other mode of viewing a typical prediction, denies a twofold reference of the *language* employed; it finds but one reference of the language, and another reference, so to speak, of the *fact* or subject involved in the language. This is substantially the view which is ably maintained and applied by Fairbairn in his "Typology of Scriptures." The type itself is simply an obscure kind of prophecy,—a pre-arrangement of facts instead of a preintimation in words. He would accordingly view many of the passages which others take in a lower and higher application, as having but one application, the lower—as referring simply to the type. But as the type itself was provided with direct reference to the antitype, that arrangement itself is the prophecy. He insists strongly on "the reality of the connection between the alleged type and antitype,—between the earlier circumstance or object described, and the later one to which the description is prophetically applied. On any other ground such references as those in the one evangelist to Hosea, and in the other to Exodus (Matt. ii. 15, John xix. 36) can only be viewed as fanciful or strained accommodations. But the matter assumes another aspect if the one was originally ordained in anticipation of the other, and so ordained that the earlier should not have been brought into existence if the later had not been before in contemplation. Seen from this point of view, which we may regard as that of the inspired writers, the past appears to run into the future, and to have existed mainly on its account. And the record or delineation of the past is naturally, not by a mere fiction of the imagination, held to possess the essential character of a prediction, embodying a prophetic circumstance or action; it is itself named by one of the commonest figures of speech, a prophecy."¹ This mode of viewing a typical prediction

¹ Typology of Scripture, Vol. I. p. 106

certainly better meets the apparent facts, in some instances, than does the other. But without absolutely deciding the question, we may safely admit that the twofold reference, including typical predictions, should be recognized in our theories of prophecy.

2. But there are also instances of alleged manifold reference. Here again are found different subordinate theories :

(1.) "Generic prophecies" are advocated, "prediction not of individual events, but of a series of events, in each of which they have a separate fulfilment."¹ The same writer from whom these words are quoted, proceeds, — a little wide of the point, as it seems to us, — "they are commonly such as reveal a particular principle in the divine administration, which secures a fixed result from given antecedents. As often, consequently, as the prescribed conditions exist, so often the predicted consequence will follow." He would refer to this class, Is. xl. 3; Joel ii. 28; Deut. xxiii. 18. Of this last he says: "It is generic, contemplating the entire prophetic order culminating in Christ." He also specifies 2 Sam. vii. 12—16. We must doubt both whether all the cases cited belong to the class alleged, and whether the mere enunciation of a principle of government according to which certain antecedents shall secure certain results, is to be called a prediction at all.

More to the purpose is Alford's remark on the citation of Is. vi. 9, 10, which was undoubtedly spoken first concerning the Jews of the prophet's time. But in Matt. xiii. 14 the Saviour asserts that this same declaration of Esaias "is fulfilled" in reference to the crowds then around him; and the same passage is also applied John xii. 40; Acts xxviii. 26, 27; Rom. xi. 8. Alford here understands the phrase "is fulfilled" to signify, "finds one of the stages of its fulfilment, — a partial one having taken place in the contemporaries of the prophet." He takes a similar view of Matt. xv. 7 (quoted from Isaiah xxix. 19), as "one of those deeper and more general declarations of God which shall be ever having their successive illustrations in his dealings with men."

¹ Princeton Review, Jan. 1861, p. 94.

It may be safely admitted that a truth is expressed in this theory, which meets certain aspects of the prophecies concerning Christ's kingdom, and which belongs to a full view of the subject. Here, perhaps, belongs Bacon's well-known remark about those prophecies which "are not fulfilled punctually at once, but have springing and germinant accomplishment, though the height or fulness thereof may refer to some one age."

(2) Far more questionable is the theory of indefinite prophecy, concerning "the pious man in general," or "the ideal person of the righteous one," applicable to all parties who fall within its conditions, and therefore preëminently applicable to Christ. This view was invented, so far as we are aware, by Hengstenberg, to meet the defects of his earlier theory. In his "Christology" he had rigidly adhered to the doctrine of a single reference, and had thereby excluded from his list of Messianic Psalms some whose claims were equally strong with those he admitted, besides encountering practical difficulties in those which he received as Messianic. In his Commentary on the Psalms he therefore swings over to the opposite side; and, with the same vehemence with which he formerly maintained that the twenty-second Psalm in all its parts referred directly and only to Christ, he now declares that it refers to no one in particular, but describes the lot of the righteous in general, as exposed to suffering in an ungodly world, and may be appropriated by every righteous man in proportion "as he embodies in his own person the ideal righteous man;" and he declares that "nothing but ignorance can object to this interpretation that it is arbitrary." He maintains that in this class of Psalms the writer, even when speaking in the first person, "does not speak from his own person, but from the person of every righteous man who finds himself engaged in severe warfare;" that he "is an ideal person, the personification of the whole class;" that such Psalms "do not refer to any individual sufferer; the speaker is the suffering righteous man; there are no individual references whatever."¹ Com-

¹ Hengstenberg on Psalms xxii., xvi., lxix., xi., and others.

posed thus for the use of the church, and in the name of the church (though suggested, he admits, by individual experience), every particular righteous man might expect to realize the hopes expressed in them, so far as his character corresponds to that of the ideal righteous man struggling in a sinful world. And as the most perfect righteousness belongs so necessarily to the idea of the Messiah, "the inference is clear that the Messiah, if a righteous, must also be a suffering one;" and "we infer that this salvation, in the highest and fullest sense, must be the lot of him who should be the first to realize in perfection the idea of suffering righteousness." These Psalms therefore belong to Christ, after all, not by direct reference, but by inference; to him only as to other righteous men, as a general principle fits many cases, and his case perfectly. Dr Alexander, with more brevity and caution, closely follows Hengstenberg in this theory, as in other things, in his Commentary on the Psalms.

This explanation certainly enables Hengstenberg to break over the narrow and arbitrary limits of his former position, and to find a considerable amount of seeming Messianic reference in the Psalms. But equally arbitrary is the position that effusions, many of them so thoroughly stamped with individuality of expression, are vague utterances, whether of or for "the righteous man in general." The Psalms are not written in that mode; they do not deal with possible or "ideal" personages; they are concrete utterances of actual persons dealing with actual facts and characters. And though applicable, more or less closely, to the condition of all righteous men, it is not through vagueness of utterance, but similarity of experience. Furthermore, if it is only as an inference that such Psalms as the twenty-second can be applied to Christ, we question the fairness of pretending that they were *prophetic* of him. We seem to be travelling back toward the old rationalistic region of Messianic hopes and aspirations. We might well question the principle on which it is sought to construct the inference, viz. that suffering in this world must always be in propor-

tion to righteousness. But most especially do we reject the statement that these Psalms are not distinctly individual in their character. We cannot conceive what meaning can be conveyed by the term "individual," special, or personal, which does not attach (for example) to the twenty-second Psalm. If it include utterance in the first person throughout, minuteness of details, specifications of that which is peculiar and unique, and which is also specifically appropriated by Christ and his apostles, all this is found in the Psalm in question. Without pausing to dwell on Christ's prayer of agony, taken from the first verse, and his last words, which are pronounced both by Hengstenberg and Alexander to be an allusion, less distinct, to the last verse (*τετέλεσται* corresponding, as they think, to the Hebrew *הִשָּׁלַח*), consider the "laughing to scorn," the "shaking of the head," with the exclamation "he trusted in God," the seizing or wounding "the hands and feet" (whatever be the reading and rendering of *כַּאֲרֵי*), the "parting of the garments," and "casting lots upon the vesture," the declaration, "I will declare thy name in the midst of my brethren," and other traits equally unique, and distinctly appropriated to Christ; then look at the closing portion of the Psalm (vs. 26—31),—as thoroughly Messianic in its promised results as any of the direct prophecies,—and we must deny the fundamental position of the theory that would ascribe a "non-individual" character to such a Psalm. Indeed, Hengstenberg himself seems to repudiate his own principle when he says (speaking of Psalm xxii.), "it is necessary to observe that the providence of God so directed the circumstances that the *inward* conformity of the sufferer of our Psalm [to the idea] should be *outwardly* visible. The Psalm would have been fulfilled in Christ, even although the passers by had not shaken the head, or the mockers quoted its very words, even although there had been no dividing of his garments or casting lots upon his vesture. But the striking resemblance in these particulars must be considered an *index* pointing out a resemblance of an *inward* character. The same object, subserved by this

secret guidance of Divine providence, Christ also had in view when he borrowed in his first exclamation on the cross the opening words of the Psalm, and referred in his last expression to its closing sentence, thereby impressively intimating that the whole Psalm was now in the way of being fulfilled." Alexander, also, referring to the same quotations made by Christ, says that they bring "the beginning and the end of this remarkable Psalm into connection with each other and with that affecting scene to which there are so many clear and pointed references in the whole composition, thus completing, as it were, the proof, already strong enough, that Christ is the great subject of the Psalm, as being the great type and representative of that whole class to whom it ostensibly relates, but of whom some parts, and especially the last five verses, are true only in a modified and lower sense." How a writer can hold that the Psalm refers to the pious sufferer in general, while admitting that it contains "clear and pointed references" to the peculiar history of Christ, or how he can maintain that "it ostensibly relates to a whole class," when its utterances can be true of that whole class "only in a modified or lower sense," we leave him to determine. We fail to find *any* "ostensible" indication that it relates to a whole class. We believe these Psalms to be not indefinite, but to refer either directly and singly to Christ, as in some instances, or, as in other cases, mediately, — prefigured by a type, or as the chief member of a definite line, — but always specifically.

The theories which have been presented, it will be perceived, contain many true views. But these views, so far as they are true, need to be located in a broader scheme, as parts of a whole. A view has been advanced which endeavors thus to gather up what may be true in the other hypotheses, and to assign it an appropriate relation.

V. It is the theory of an organic connection and correlation sustained by the whole Old Testament economy to

that of the New Testament. Tholuck calls it "organic-typical." It finds one continuous scheme of God running unbroken through the two dispensations, of which the earlier portion sustains a pre-ordained parallelism to the later, being typical, or rather representative, of it. This earlier train of arrangements being not ultimate, but, by the intention of the Holy Spirit, preparatory and representative, points forward, and thus even the language describing them involves a prophecy, while also the utterances that point most distinctly to the distant future not only clothe themselves with the forms of the present, but commonly view that future from the point of view and *through the medium of its present representation.*

Such is the basis of what we believe to be the true and comprehensive view of the case. It is with some diversities of mode, advocated substantially by Fairbairn, Wm. Lee, Ebrard, Tholuck, and others; and is to some extent a return toward the earlier views of English Theologians. Tholuck, however, contents himself with the general basis of such an organic parallelism, while he distinctly denies the complete accuracy of the New Testament writers as expounders of that relation. His views (as found in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, July 1854) are greatly disfigured by the ascription of gross errors in interpretation to those writers. He defends the Saviour himself, and him alone, from "historically erroneous exposition." And among many similarly offensive statements, he says of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that "the defects in hermeneutics which were striking in Paul and the evangelists, appear in this epistle in a yet higher degree."¹ Very different from this is the tone of Ebrard: "The Holy Scriptures of the old covenant testify of Christ, not merely because particular prophecies pointing to Christ are to be found here and there in them. The entire history of the revelation of God in the Old Covenant is one grand pre-intimation of the future Messiah; and this *fact-revelation* and *fact-prophecy* formed the condition and

¹ See *Bib. Sacra*, Vol. XI., pp. 600, 601, 606.

the basis of the particular *word*-prophecies which God gave in a supernatural manner by his special instruments. It is wrong to overlook this unity of basis; but it is equally so to attempt to derive these particular word-revelations as developments from that basis, and to overlook their purely supernatural character."¹ Fairbarn and Lee hold the general theory in connection with the strictest views of the inspiration of the New Testament writers.

A postulate indispensable to any satisfactory theory in the matter, is the ultimate unity of authorship in the scriptures. If we set aside the inspiration of the New Testament writers, and their perfect qualification to interpret the older scriptures and the designs of God in them, the whole subject is hardly worth discussing. And when we once admit an actual correspondence of facts, divinely pre-arranged, and in any degree pre-intimated, we may as well concede the supernatural disclosure of God's plans after Christ as before. The pre-arrangement and the subsequent interpretation belong together.

The first main position of the present view is the real oneness and continuousness of the fundamental system contained in the two Testaments. The church of the New Testament is one with that of the Old Testament, only purified and enlarged,—the old olive-tree with the wild olive-tree grafted in; the true Israel continued; the kingdom of God on earth. Its requisitions are the same,—faith in God, working by love, and obedience—worthless except as originating in the heart. Its true members in each case a spiritual seed. Its issue and triumph is in each case to be found in the triumph of the one Great Anointed. *Towards this one issue and consummation all its arrangements and prophecies are looking.*

The other main position of the view is the pre-ordained parallelism of the earlier to the later portion of the system. This parallelism stands directly related to the continuousness of the scheme and its prospective reference to the great final issue. The perfected condition of the scheme has an actual

¹ Introduction of his Commentary on Hebrews.

though imperfect living representation in its earlier and immature condition, and *the lines of representation run down through its whole history*. Before the advent of him on whom the whole scheme depended for its realization, it was the wisdom of its author, in various modes, closely to connect the present with that future, as a constant reminder and pledge of the consummation. The ceremonial of the early church was symbolical in its character; the outward history of the chosen people in their sufferings and deliverances was made expressive of the distant future relations of God's people to their foes; and still more closely were the two periods interwoven by means of certain eminent and chosen personages, whose experience and relations remarkably foreshadowed those of the great Anointed, some of whom also stood in direct lineal connection with him.

Several phenomena thus arise. Often a prophecy of near deliverance ends with a sudden glance to the great final triumph. Or predictions which respect that ultimate future are clothed in forms borrowed wholly from the present. Again, the prophecy runs down the whole continuous line, in language which covers both the earlier and the later stages of fulfilment. Or again, the utterance which seems to expend itself upon the present is interpreted by a later messenger of God as containing, at least in the fact involved, a real reference to the future.

The typical or representative parallelism is that portion of the theory, perhaps, which calls more especially for proof. Of course its existence became, from the nature of the case, far more distinctly visible after Christ than before. Still, that earlier economy was not absolutely destitute of intimations of it. There is not only the general air of expectation which forms, as Archer Butler has ably argued,¹ the inward spirit of the whole Old Testament, and the manifest incompleteness of the daily gross offerings with which those believers were directed to approach a God representing himself to them with attributes most intensely spiritual. There

¹ Sermon xiv. First Series.

are here and there distinct intimations of a repetition of the past in the future, which the Jews interpreted only too literally. Moses promised that "a prophet like unto me shall the Lord your God raise up." Ezekiel promises (xxxiv. 23) a return of the person and times of David. Zechariah (vi. 12, 13) connects with the rebuilding of the literal temple a more glorious rebuilding by "the Branch." Malachi (iv. 5) predicts the second coming of Elijah. The monarch of the future was to be (Ps. cx. 4) "a priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedek." Joshua, the high-priest, and his fellows are pronounced (Zech. iii. 8) to be typical men, אֲנִישֵׁי הַנֶּזֶף — "for behold I bring forth my servant, THE BRANCH." The whole series of predictions connecting the Messiah with the royal house of David; the continual transitions of prophecy from the nearer deliverances and triumphs of Israel to the greater ones in store; all the promises of an extended Jerusalem and exalted Zion, — were calculated to awaken, and did awaken, in the Jewish mind, a sense of the close relation of their present condition to the higher and better future. They erred in expecting a repetition too exact in kind, differing only in degree.

When the New Testament and the Old both lie before us, we read at a glance many obvious marks of parallelism well fitted to awaken deeper inquiry. Without alluding to the natural similarity in phraseology, nor even to the remarkable borrowing of thought and expression which makes such a book as the Apocalypse almost a transcript of the older prophets; there are singular correspondences of fact, not to be wholly overlooked by the cursory reader. In the earlier dispensation there were remarkable births, one of them at least entirely out of the common course of nature, — the God-given Isaac prefiguring the birth of the greater gift of God, his lineal descendant. Angelic visits and promises connect these births, and the two dispensations themselves. The song of Mary is largely a repetition of the song of Hannah, and in her mouth alone do the words receive their full significance. The infant lawgiver of Israel like the infant Saviour narrowly escaped a monarch's vengeance. His

history, too, was through a course of opposition, unbelief, and sometimes desertion by the members of his own household. He also had a kind of transfiguration, when his face shone so from communion with God, that the people could not look upon him. The inspiration of the seventy elders was an earlier pentecostal scene. As Moses and Elias and Christ stand upon the mount together, we remember that each of them had in their lives been sustained forty days without mortal food. Various earlier acts of healing, even to the leprosy, paralleled the multitudinous healing miracles of Christ. The conversion of water into wine, the feeding of the multitudes, were foreshadowed in the healing of the waters of Jericho, the multiplication of the widow's oil and meal, and Elisha's feeding of the hundred men. Elijah, shutting and opening the windows of heaven, preceded him who controlled the wind, the waves, and the storm. The restoration to life of the children at Zarephath and Shunem reminds us at once of the scenes at Nain, Capernaum, and Bethany. The ascension of Christ was heralded under the patriarchal and Mosaic economies by those of Enoch and Elijah. The position of Daniel before Nebuchadnezzar was as much like that of Peter and John before the magistrates, as was the deliverance of both by the angel of God. It was in harmony with the peculiar office-work of Christ that the miracles of vengeance in the old economy in but few instances found a parallel in the new; while the abundant castings-out of evil spirits by Christ stand almost without a prototype.

We admit that these and many other such things are but superficial; and yet the outward correspondence might properly hint the deeper coincidence, which rests on the express testimony of Christ and his apostles. It is idle for the rationalist to talk of erroneous conceptions in the writers of the gospels and epistles. The assertion of a broad and deep foreshowing of Christ through the whole body of the Old Testament scriptures stands on the authority of the Lord Jesus himself. The evangelist and writers of the epistles only followed where he went before.

The Saviour speaks as though he were the chief subject of the whole Old Testament. "Search the scriptures . . . they are they which testify of me;" "Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me," John v. 36, 46. On the way to Emmaus, "beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself," Luke xxiv. 27. And to make it clear that he found this testimony running through the whole volume, he specifies the threefold division then current,— "all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the Psalms, and in the prophets concerning me;" Luke xxiv. 44. And this general view he applies in detail. He declares that in John the Baptist appeared the predicted Elijah, Matt. xi. 14. He also intimates that the violent opposition encountered by Elijah was a typical prediction of the treatment of John — "Elias is indeed come, and they have done unto him whatsoever they listed, *as it is written of him,*" Mark ix. 13. On this passage Tholuck inquires, "in what other than a typical sense can this be said?" and Hengstenberg takes the same view.¹ Furthermore, by his application of Mal. iii. 1 to John the Baptist (Luke vii. 27), our Lord identifies himself with the angel of the Covenant of the older dispensation.

In accordance with this general view our Lord denominates his own body the temple of God, John iii. 19; speaks of the serpent in the wilderness as prefiguring the lifting up of the Son of Man, iii. 14; of the manna as bread from heaven, but of himself as the true bread from heaven, vi. 33; and twice of the sign of Jonas as about to reappear in him, Matt. xii. 40; xvi. 4. Still more explicitly does he say of the passover: "I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God," Luke xxii. 16.

Intermediate between these references and the more clearly direct prophecies, quoted and appropriated by the Saviour, is another noticeable class of passages which he applies to

¹ Christology, Vol. III. p. 351.

himself and his circumstances with the phrase *ὡς πληρωθῆναι*. Thus John xiii. 18 appropriates Psalm xli. 9. In like manner John xv. 24 applies Psalm lxix. 4, the same remarkable Psalm of which he quotes the first and, as some say, the last verses upon the cross. In John xvii. 12 it is generally conceded that he refers to Psalm cix. 8, the passage which Peter also applies to Judas, Acts i. 12. Equally explicit in the application, though more difficult of location in the Old Testament, are the several statements of the Saviour concerning the circumstances of his betrayal and death, Matt. xxvi. 24, 54, 56, which he affirms took place thus "that the scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled." His references to Psalms viii. and cxviii. in Matt. xxi. 16, 42 are less conclusive, though quite noticeable when taken in connection with the use of the same Psalms in Heb. ii. and 1 Peter ii. 6, 7. Christ also said that in his contemporaries "is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias" (vi. 9), though the prophecy certainly referred first to the contemporaries of the prophet. In Matt. v. 12; xxiii. 34, 35, he describes the labors, sufferings, and successes of his disciples (wherein they shared the fate of their master) as but a continuation of the experience of the old prophets. In the choice of twelve apostles and seventy special messengers we may read his design outwardly to indicate the inward connection of the two economies.

Christ's quotations of direct Messianic prophecy¹ require no special comment. Nor is it quite to the purpose to notice how, as in the temptation and on other occasions, the language of the Old Testament was the natural method of his utterance. But in view of his entire use of the scriptures, we are authorized to say with Tholuck: "He regards the Old Testament with its institutions, in its history and in its single expressions, predominantly as typical."²

The evangelists and authors of the epistles follow in the same spirit and method. The coming up of Israel, the chosen seed, from Egypt prefigured the return of the greater

¹ Luke iv. 21; xxii. 37; Matt. xxii. 42—45; xxvi. 31.

² Bib. Sacra, Vol. XI. p. 590.

seed of promise, Matt. ii. 15. The blow that was dealt by Nebuchadnezzar, within the territory of Rachel's favorite son, at the welfare of the chosen people, anticipated the more ruthless blow of Herod at the great hope of Israel, in sight of Rachel's tomb, ii. 18. Christ's residence in Nazareth stood in symbolic relation to the prophecies, ii. 23. His healing of diseases was the symbolic beginning of his great work of salvation (viii. 17) and was in partial accomplishment of the prophecy (Is. liii. 4) which was completely met when he hung upon the cross, 1 Pet. ii. 24. His discoursing in parables (Matt. xiii. 35) was "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, I will open my mouth in parables" — the Psalm quoted (lxviii. 1) being a record of events in the history of Israel which Paul (1 Cor. x. 1-6) alludes to, as being *τύποι ἡμῶν*. In Matt. xvi. is recorded, in connection with the fulfilment of a direct prophecy, the minute care with which the Saviour made even the outward and symbolic action conform to the prophecy of Zech. ix. 9. Similar minute fulfilments are recorded (Matt. xxii. 9, 35) concerning the thirty pieces of silver and the parting of the garments. The preservation of the Saviour's limbs from violence is declared (John xix. 36) to be a fulfilment of the directions concerning the paschal lamb, as we are elsewhere told that "Christ our Passover was slain for us," 1 Cor. v. 7. The piercing of his side is referred to the prophecy of Zech. xii. 10. The more clearly direct prophecies quoted by the evangelists do not require special allusion.¹ A most remarkable series of scripture applications, mingling direct and typical prophecies, is that which was made by the disciples when they were fresh from our Lord's own teachings on the subject (as recorded in Luke xxiv), to which Fairbairn thus calls attention: "We find Peter (Acts i.) applying without hesitation or reserve what is written in Psalm cix. of the persecutions of Jesus and the apostasy of Judas; again, in chapter ii. ap-

¹ Matt. i. 22; iv. 14; xii. 17-21; John xii. 38, 40; xix. 24, etc. The first of these some have considered a typical prediction, but the more common view now holds it to be direct prophecy.

plying in like manner what is written in Psalm xvi. to Christ's speedy resurrection; Ps. cx. to his exaltation to power and glory, and Joel ii. 28—32, to the gift of the Spirit; in chapter iii. affirming Jesus to be the prophet that Moses had foretold should be raised up like unto himself; in chapter iv. speaking of Jesus as the stone rejected by the builders, but raised by God to be the head of the corner, as written in Ps. cxviii. (an application that had been already indicated, at least, by Christ in a public discourse with the Jews, Matt. xxi. 42) and along with the other apostles describing Christ as the anointed king against whom the heathen raged."¹

Without following in detail the citations of Paul, it is important to observe how he interprets the promise of God to Abraham as containing a high and spiritual meaning, and, in that sense, fulfilled, not to all the patriarch's lineal descendants, but to his spiritual lineage, Rom iv. 11—16; ix. 6—3. Yet that pregnant meaning is certainly wrapped up in the form of a temporal good. And in Gal. iii. 16, 27—29, he still more carefully states the case, that the promise was not to all the lines of that posterity, but to the one seed, the collective unity, *CHRIST*, including all who are Christ's.² It should be observed, too, that the Saviour had declared the same truth to the Jews with a slight variation of form; he admits (John viii. 37), that they are "Abraham's seed," but denies that they are his "children;" they sprang from him, but had no family likeness and affiliation to him. In Gal. iv. 22—26, Paul further declares the two sons Ishmael and Isaac to be representatives of the merely literal and of the spiritual seeds. And in his allusion to the ejection of

¹ Typology, Vol. I. p. 393.

² We do not understand Paul as giving in verse 16th merely a grammarian's criticism on the Hebrew word *בְּרִית*, but an apostle's authoritative interpretation of the scope of the promise. As Windischmann (in Alford) well says: "The argument of the apostle does not depend on the grammatical form, by which here Paul only puts forth his meaning in the Greek, but on this, that the spirit of God, in the promise to Abraham and the passage of scripture relating to that promise, has chosen a word which implies a collective unity, and that the promise was not given to Abraham and his children," nor to all his lines of offspring, but to one peculiar line, of which Christ is the representative.

the one from the inheritance of the other (verse 30), he had been again anticipated by the Saviour, John viii. 35. The apostle also declares various transactions of the Exodus (1 Cor. x. 1—6) to have been *τύποι ἡμῶν* — of us “the spiritual as distinguished from the literal Israel” (Alford). The passage is a reference to Psalm lxxviii., in which the whole journey is set forth in detail.

The writer to the Hebrews takes up this last-mentioned topic, and declares (chap. iii.) that the rest which was promised by God to his ancient people was something more than the attainment of the earthly Canaan, though couched under that form of speech. In chap. xi. 9—16 he tells us that those ancient believers to whom the promise was made, sought a “better country, even an heavenly.” Indeed it is the aim of the book to show how the whole history and sacred rites of the covenant people point forward to a more perfect realization in and around Christ. The high-priest calls for a greater Priest, of whom Melchisedek was the type; the sacrifices prefigure the great atoning sacrifice; the tabernacle foreshadows the more perfect tabernacle not made with hands, while even the parts of it are invested with a spiritual significance; and the high-priest’s entrance once a year looks to the absolute redemption, once for all, through Christ.

Such are some of the indications, running through the New Testament, of that close typical parallelism between the two economies, or rather of that real unity whereby the earlier was the imperfect *representative* of the later, — which has compelled the assent not only of unlettered Christians, but of scholarly men like Olshausen, Ebrard, Tholuck, Henderson, Fairbairn, Alford, Ellicott. Even De Wette lived to speak these remarkable words; “Christianity sprang out of Judaism. Long before Christ appeared, the world was prepared for his appearance; the entire Old Testament is a great prophecy, a great type of him who was to come, and has come. Who can deny that the holy seers of the Old Testament saw in spirit the advent of Christ long before he came, and in prophetic anticipations, sometimes more, sometimes less clear, described the new doctrine.

The typological comparison of the Old Testament with the New was by no means a mere play of the fancy; nor can it be regarded as altogether an accident that the evangelical history in its most important particulars runs parallel with the Mosaic. Christianity lay in Judaism as leaves and fruits do in the seed, though certainly it needed the divine sun to bring it forth."¹

From this point of view—the continuous organic unity of the system, whereby the earlier portion, as a constituent part and but a part of the same whole, is not only the appointed, but the fit representative of the later portion and of the whole—we are enabled to comprehend the method of Messianic prophecy and its several phases, and to combine whatever is true in the partial theories we have noticed. References to the Messianic future may be found, and the influence of this fundamental unity and parallism exhibited, in the threefold mode: direct prophecy, typical transactions, and typical and representative predictions. Let us briefly view the relation of the fundamental principle to these several cases.

1. Direct Messianic prophecies take their form and method from this ground principle.

(1.) Predictions concerning the distant future are clothed in forms borrowed from the present, and that future appears as an exalted and glorified present. Thus, even in the Apocalypse, the abode of the redeemed is the New Jerusalem, magnificently built and gorgeously furnished; the redeemed themselves are the sealed of the twelve tribes; and Sodom, Egypt, and Babylon all reappear. In the Old Testament, however distant the scene of prophecy, God's people are Israel, their home is Canaan, and Jerusalem or Zion is the scene of God's immediate presence. The enemies of his people are known by their ancient names, Egypt, Edom, the Assyrians, Moab, and Ammon, even when those nations had already ceased to be. The conversion of the

¹ "Charakteristik des Hebraismus." Quoted in Fairbairn's *Typology*, Vol. I. p. 45.

Gentiles in gospel times is predicted under the image of their flocking to mount Zion, erecting altars, offering incense, keeping the Jewish festivals, even coming to Jerusalem to the new-moons and Sabbaths "out of all nations, upon horses, and in chariots, and in litters, and upon mules, and swift beasts" (גְּרָמָיִם, dromedaries) Is. lxvi. So, all manner of blessing was promised under the pregnant phrase, "inherit the land."

From disregarding this important feature of prophecy come the schemes of literalism, among them that of the literal return of the Jews. But here the literalists inconsistently retain a part of the imagery and reject the rest. The simple fact is, that the present images forth an *exalted* future; not a repetition, but a consummation. Precisely so John the Baptist was predicted as Elijah, and Christ sometimes as David (Ezek. xxxiv. 23; Hos. iii. 5.), and commonly as a glorious monarch. The Jews, who took these things literally and sensually, were on the same plane of interpretation with those who look for a literal regathering of all the Jews to Palestine.

(2.) Another feature of the case is that even the direct predictions seldom stand isolated, but usually as the terminal scene of intermediate events, — as the great deliverance back of all other deliverances, the grand consolation in the deepest present distress, or the great crowning joy and mercy. Everything looks forward to the consummation; and these inferior manifestations of God are but preparatory to the supreme. And that distant glory, that lies down far beyond these earlier events, is evermore abruptly flashing through. Throughout the prophets instances are too abundant to require citation. Isaiah continually turns from terrible threats (e. g. iv. 2) to Messianic consolations. Promises of deliverance from Assyrians and Babylonians are rounded off with visions of the greater deliverance by the Messiah; and the certain coming of Immanuel seems even to be made (chaps. vii. and viii.) the pledge of present succor. In Zechariah the rebuilding of the literal temple suggests the true temple (chap. vi.); and the rescue of Jerusalem from

the fear of Alexander (chap. ix.) terminates in a view of Christ's triumphal entry.

(3.) It is another natural consequence that direct prophecies, viewing the Messianic state of things as terminal, also commonly view it in its perfected condition. Some have applied the term "apotelesmatic" to this characteristic of the predictions.¹ The Messianic times are thus usually contemplated by the prophets in their consummated and glorious condition — a state of peace and harmony and holiness, victory, prosperity, and blessedness. The period of struggle and conflict is merged in the view of the triumphal issue.²

2. Typical transactions form another portion of the system of preintimation, directly related to the organic unity and parallelism of the scheme. That the Jewish ritual stood to Christ and his work in the relation of type to antitype is, as we have seen, abundantly asserted in the New Testament. How far this may have been understood or conjectured by the devout Jew we cannot determine. It was arranged by God, and in due time interpreted by his inspired servants. The reflecting Jew certainly must have understood that those ritual observances were not in themselves an end, nor even an efficient means. For he was constantly warned that these things were valueless alone, and the true sacrifice and circumcision were of the heart. And as he was constantly reminded of the intense spirituality of God, while yet all these ceremonials were rigorously required, it is at least not incredible that he may have dimly understood these things to be typical in reference to God's arrangements, as they were symbolical in reference to the worshipper's condition. It will be remembered, however, that many other things besides the ritual observances were typical.

The type is treated in the New Testament precisely like a verbal prediction, and introduced with the same formula,

¹ Prof. Stuart uses it differently. *Bib. Sacra*, IX. 462. Dr. Noah Webster recognizes neither signification.

² Thus, *Is.* ii. 2, 3; xi.; xxv.; xlix.; lv.; lx., etc.; *Jer.* xxiii. 4—7; xxxi. 31—35; *Psa.* ii.; lxii.; *Zech.* vi. 12, 13; ix. 9, 10.

e. g. John xix. 36. But the concealment of its reference was much more complete; and in the case of isolated types that concealment must have been so decided that only their completion could suggest the previous arrangement of God. The type has accordingly been defined by Davison as "a concealed prophecy which only the completion explains." And it should be added that in the case of persons and events standing detached from certain great lines of connection, only the express testimony of the inspired writers can authorize us to suppose them typical.

But it is noticeable that nearly all the typical characters, events, and localities do stand gathered into certain related groups around some certain central lines of persons. And this brings us to one of the most important exhibitions of the organic unity and parallelism.

3. Typical and representative predictions. We refer to that large class of cases in which the word of God fixes expressly upon certain prominent persons and their relations, and makes these characteristic individuals stand as representatives of a whole future series. The prophecies then traverse these established lines, take their shape in accordance with them, and enwrap a pregnant reference to that future in the utterance concerning the representative; while the history of that representative is so adjusted in the counsels of God as to be prefigurative, and even the record of that history is treated as prophetic. And by virtue of the central appointment the group of adjacent circumstances becomes significant,—as the enemies of David, the wives of Abraham. In this way are to be explained that difficult class of prophecies which have been variously described as having a double sense or a reiterated reference, as being typical predictions, or as describing the ideal righteous person.

We call the earlier objects not merely types, for usually they are more. Frequently, they not only prefigure future persons and events, but are themselves constituent members of the line or series, and *represent* the series both as being vitally connected with it, and, for the time, its best embodi-

ment. Thus it was with Isaac, Jacob or Israel, and David. It will be found that the great mass of prophecies concerning the Messiah and his times are of this description; and that those which are specially noted in the New Testament, for the most part, traverse four main lines. These lines are successively subordinate, shooting forth from within, like the growths of an endogenous tree. There was the primal prophecy concerning the seed of the woman; the promise to Abraham and his seed; the more full and definite limitation in Jacob or Israel; and the assurance of the perpetual kingdom of David. Each of these promises includes a collective unity.

(1.) The opening line of Messianic prophecy is found in the promise concerning the "seed of the woman," which should bruise the serpent's head. Most interpreters have referred this to Christ alone. Hengstenberg understands it more broadly of Eve's believing posterity as a body, citing Rom. xvi. 20 in proof. We would include both, — the church as a body, and preëminently Christ its head. Not only is this the method of the other chief lines of Messianic prophecy; but this reference is particularly confirmed in the New Testament. The conflict of the church with Satan is alluded to in various passages; and Christ himself is specially designated as waging the warfare and gaining the victory.¹

The earlier economy furnishes no clear type or representative in this broader line, unless we understand Noah to be so designated.² But in this first prediction was laid the foundation for Christ's chosen title, "the Son of Man," though the form of it may have come through the eighth Psalm and the seventh chapter of Daniel. He is also "the last Adam," "the second man," 1 Cor. xv. 21, 45, 47. Here is found the explanation of the argument of Heb. ii. 5-9,

¹ Rom. xvi. 20; Eph. vi. 11, 12; Rev. xii. 17; Luke x 17, 18; Heb. ii. 14; 1 John iii. 8; John xii. 31.

² In Gen. ix. the original promise of dominion is renewed to Noah and his seed; and in the obscure passage 1 Peter iii. 21, baptism is described as the *ἀντίτυπον* of the water wherewith Noah and his family were saved. If Noah, the "preacher of righteousness," be viewed as a typical person, it may have some bearing on the greatly controverted passage, 1 Peter, iii. 19.

and the quotation 1 Cor. xv. 27, applying the eighth Psalm to Christ. That Psalm is not to be understood, with some, as referring exclusively to Christ, nor with others as having no reference to him. It is an utterance concerning MAN, but true of man only as inclusive of Christ, and finding its completion only in and through him. Intended, therefore, by the Holy Spirit to have its fulfilment in him, the use of it in the epistles is not an accommodation. The obvious reference of the Psalm to the original dominion of man as still retained, cannot be mistaken. But that dominion, as the apostle shows, belongs to him through Christ and preëminently in Christ, — “that MAN who is the constituted head of man’s nature, the second Adam, who has more than recovered all that the first Adam lost.” Very noticeable is Christ’s own quotation of this Psalm upon his triumphal entry into the holy city, Matt. xxi. 16; while various incidents in his history, including his control over “whatsoever passeth through the paths of the seas,”¹ remind us of the dominion there asserted over nature.

The first temptation in the wilderness carries us back to this promise, as well by the attack and defeat of Satan as by the form of Christ’s reply, identifying himself with the human race, — “*man* shall not live by bread alone.” Similar allusions to the promised conflict and victory are found in John xii. 31; xvi. 11; xiv. 30; Matt. xii. 28; and, according to Auberlen, Fairbarn, and others, the “man-child” of Rev. xii. that warred with the “serpent,” is this promised seed, the Son of God, born of the “woman,” or Old Testament church. The prophecy in Daniel vii. 13, 14, written some four hundred years later than the eighth Psalm, combines with the appellation “Son of Man,” which took shape in that Psalm, the fuller prophecy of a kingdom in this world. The Saviour’s declaration John v. 27, seems to refer to this form of the prophecy.

(2.) Another more specific and more prominent line traversed by this class of prophecies, is found in the promise

¹ Luke v. 4; Matt. xvii. 27; John xxi. 6. The coincidence is worthy of attention.

to Abraham and his seed.¹ This is often referred to in the Old Testament, sometimes by mere allusion to the "God of Abraham;" while the terms of the promise are frequently quoted in connection with other forms of Messianic prophecy.² On these promises, the Jews founded their estimate of themselves as the favorites of God.

But the New Testament writers declare that these promises, in their fulness, were made to the natural offspring of Abraham only so far as they possessed the same spiritual traits with him; and that they included all persons who were like Abraham in faith, whether his descendants or not, Rom. iv. ; ix. ; Gal. iii. In the last-mentioned passage, Paul shows that the promise of a seed culminated in Christ, and included all that are Christ's, — the promised seed being an organic unity, of which Abraham and Isaac were only *representatives*. The same general truth is affirmed by the Saviour, John viii. 39 and Matt. viii. 11, 12; and by Paul, Phil. iii. 3.

Paul also makes Ishmael a representative of the rejected seed as Isaac was of the accepted; and furthermore, Sarah typifies "Jerusalem which is above, the mother of us all," and Hagar "Jerusalem which now is."³ And still further, Canaan the inheritance plainly represented or typified a higher blessing. The conclusion is almost inevitable, that if the promised seed were more than a literal offspring, the inheritance is more than an outward Palestine. So the scriptures interpret. Even before Christ, the phrase "to inherit the land" rose into a higher plane of meaning (Ps. xxiv. 12; xxxviii. 11, 29); and the Saviour (Matt. v. 5) adopted it as the terminology of his kingdom. The writer

¹ Gen. xii. 3, 7; xvii. 7, 8; xxii. 17, 18.

² Ps. xxi. 6; lxii. 17; xxii. 27; Jer. xxxiii. 22.

³ Olshausen here remarks: "It is not the women *per se* who are here used as types, but Abraham's wives. According to the scriptures, the typical character seems confined to some few chief persons, who are, as it were, central characters. To these Abraham especially belongs, as the ancestor of the people of God. What happens to him and about him admits of a prefigurative acceptance, and so do his wives and children, but by no means every wife and child." Comp. Gal. iv. 25.

to the Hebrews (xi. 13, 16) ascribes to the patriarchs such expectations, and shows by a course of scriptural argument that the true "rest" or resting-place promised to God's ancient people, and which certainly was expressed under the form of the land of Canaan,¹ was not that to which Joshua brought them. Paul also identifies the promised inheritance of Abraham's seed with the hopes of Christians, when he closes the discussion thus: "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs (κληρονόμοι) according to the promise," Gal. iii. 29. But for possible collateral questions, we might call attention also to Paul's assertion that Abraham's promise was that "he should be heir of the world" (Rom. iv. 13) in connection with the promise to Christ (Ps. ii. 8), "I shall give thee the heathen for an inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession."

(3.) A still more prominent line of Messianic prophecy is that in which it passes through Jacob, or Israel. The sacred writings not only identify the patriarch with his posterity, but they envelope references to the church of the future and to its great Head, under cover of utterances, whether openly prophetic or historic, concerning "Israel."

In the message that Moses conveyed to Pharaoh, God described the collective whole of Jacob's descendants as "Israel, my son," and the name Israel or Jacob became a common appellation of that people as a unity. At the same time the distinction of the true and the false Israel, so clearly stated by Paul (Rom. ix. 6), is as clearly brought out in the Old Testament. It is found not alone in a few scattered statements like Psalm lxxiii. 1 and xxiv. 6,² but in requisitions, warnings, and rebukes, and in the constant turnings of God's word from an Israel sinful and perverse to an Israel full of holiness, about to fulfil God's will, and to be crowned with blessings (Is. xlii. 1—7; xlix.; lxi.).

¹ Dent. xii. 9; Ps. xcvi. 11. Compare Dent. i. 35; Num. xv. 23.

² "They that seek thy face are Israel." So, substantially, Rosenmüller, Hengstenberg, Tholuck, Alexander, De Wetts. Gesenius differs.

Many of the latter passages are plainly descriptive of Messianic times. The whole church of the future is often described under this phraseology, and the New Testament, in a great variety of passages and forms, adopts the same view.¹ The pervading idea of the New Testament concerning the Gentiles is that they are to be gathered into the purified Israel, — grafted into the ancient and good olive-tree.

In this connection the principle of representation finds place somewhat in the same manner as in the case of Abraham and his seed, but much more extensively. The "Israel" of the Old Testament is either the patriarch, or the whole nation, — his descendants; and while the chief ruler of this people in his songs of praise sometimes so identifies himself with the whole people as to speak in their name (Ps. xxv. 22), so also do the New Testament writers represent the chief history and experiences of the earlier Israel, — the unity, as prefigurative of Christ and the latter days.

Christ's allusion to the vision of Jacob as realized in himself (John i. 51) may perhaps be called a simple figure of speech. But other references require us to understand that the New Testament writers viewed the main experiences of the Israelitish nation as typical and representative, — as having an intended correspondence to future events. Thus the connecting link between Matt. ii. 15 and Hos. xi. 1 is found in Ex. iv. 22, 23, where God calls the whole nation of Israel "my son, my first-born," and commands, "Let my son go;" the summons of the earlier first-born from Egypt prefiguring that of the greater seed, — the only-begotten Son. The figurative language which described the cruel stroke aimed at the earlier Israel is quoted by Matthew as "fulfilled" in the still more cruel blow aimed by Herod at the whole hope of Israel in all time.

But there was one great group of transactions standing out with remarkable prominence in the history of Israel, which the New Testament declares in many ways to have

¹ See Gal. vi. 16; Rom. ix. 6; John i. 47; Matt. xix. 28; Luke xxii. 30 Rev. xxi. 12; Rom. xi.

pointed forward. We refer to the exodus and journey to Canaan, to the institutions then established, and the events then occurring. The "rest" or resting-place in view foreshadowed another rest "that remaineth for the people of God." Very many things foreshadowed him who should procure that rest, and their relation to him. Christ was typified in the passover, and the sacrifices, and the priest who made the offering. The heavenly manna and the miraculous supply of water that refreshed them on the way, the brazen serpent that healed their deadly wounds, all represented him, the true bread, the living water, the resurrection and the life. And there seems to be no valid reason to doubt that other features of the journey, not distinctly specified, were equally significant.¹ The identity of the names Joshua and Jesus is not to be regarded as accidental.² The rescue at the Red Sea is so blended with the deliverance of the future church from the great world-power, that the song of victory is to be "the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb," Rev. xv. 3. And all the final joy and glory of the redeemed is symbolized under the forms of Jerusalem, Zion, the temple, and the tribes.

As Israel is thus one continuous whole, so the threats against his enemies or hypocritical friends cover the whole class in all time, who are alike in character and doom; and hence those prophecies of reiterated reference, quoted Matt. xx. 7; xiii. 14, and elsewhere.

(4.) The fourth great channel into which the current of Messianic representative prophecy was restricted, was the family and the kingdom of David. The original prophecy, of which several Psalms are expansions, is found in 2 Sam. vii. 11—16. Here again the promised offspring is often

¹ Fairbairn has well shown the unsatisfactoriness of the position that absolutely *nothing* must be viewed as typical except what the New Testament expressly declares to be so. *Typology*, Vol. I. p. 48 sq. The error inclined to the safer side — caution.

² We need not remind the reader that *Ἰησοῦς* is the Septuagint form of Joshua, nor allude to the confusion introduced into Heb. iv. 8 by its not being so translated.

viewed as an organic whole, and the kingdom commonly as an unbroken continuity, of which the king never dies.¹ The line of monarchy culminates in the great Messiah who came to "sit on the throne of his father David," and to fulfil all the predictions concerning that kingdom which "the God of heaven shall set up." The inferior monarchs are viewed as members of that line, and precursors of the Great Monarch. Especially is this the case with David, the founder of the line, and its noblest human specimen, who not only stands as representative of the *monarchy*, but often also in his sonship and headship as a type of its greatest *king*.

In the great compass of that kingdom, and the diverse quality of its headship, is found occasion for some variety of representation. Often that kingdom is viewed in its complete and triumphant state, as in Daniel ii., vii., and its monarch the great and final sovereign in his glory, as in Ps. ii., xlv., lxii., cx.; at times in a struggling and depressed condition, with a glorious future still in prospect. In like manner, some of the utterances concerning its monarchy apply only to the human and sinful portion of that one royal line, as is the case with one noted verse of the original promise: "If he commit iniquity I will chasten him with the rod of men," 2 Sam. ii. 14. Other declarations apply to the whole line alike. A consideration of the varying condition of that kingdom and of the mixed character of its monarchy alone enables us to solve the seeming incongruities of these prophecies.

But there is another aspect of the case. David, the founder of that line, is not only a representative of the whole monarchy, but is singled out to be preëminently a type of Christ — the first monarch, of the last. As a favored son and servant of God, as the embodiment of Israel, the chosen seed, in his conflicts, sufferings, faith, and victories, he prefigured his great successor, who was to pass

¹ See this whole subject ably discussed by Professor Barrows in the *Bib. Sac.*, Vol. XI. 306—328. For the views here expressed the writer is much indebted to that Article.

through obedience, faith, and suffering to his triumph. His experience was made not only in general, but sometimes with special peculiarity, to correspond to that later experience, and often the language in which it was set forth was made singularly and circumstantially descriptive of the history of Christ. To this class of predictions belong many of the most remarkable Psalms, such as the sixteenth, twenty-second, fortieth, forty-first, sixty-ninth, and others less prominent, including the class of which Hengstenberg and Alexander find the subject to be the ideal sufferer and the ideal righteous man. They are concrete and typical predictions, — utterances of the Psalmist, the son and servant of God, descriptive of his own experience, but that experience prefigurative of the greater son and servant, and the very language in which it was couched so shaped as exactly to meet the peculiar circumstances of Christ, — the betrayal and desertion, the mockings, the wounding, the parting of garments, the resurrection. In a few instances (as in Ps. xl. 12) we are met by a confession of sin. The difficulty it creates is not peculiar to this theory, but is relieved by it. The acknowledgement of sin may be understood to belong simply to the type, or perhaps as a personal burden in the type, designed to represent the official burden of the antitype. All the utterances concerning enemies are, in accordance with the fundamental principle, freely applied to the enemies of Christ, and especially to Judas.

Such are the chief lines of representative prediction. It will be found, we believe, that nearly all the typical personages and transactions of the Old Testament are grouped around these lines. The typical men are usually prominent individuals in these lines — heads of the series, princes, prophets, priests, and those closely connected with them. And thus, from this point of view, the organic connection and pre-ordained parallelism of the Old and New Testaments, we are enabled to interpret the citations of the one from the other, without repudiating its authority or forcing its language.