

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

THE EVIDENCE OF FULFILLED PROPHECY (I.)

THE REVEREND CHANCELLOR J. J. LIAS
HAYWARD'S HEATH, ENGLAND

THE present age, on *my* side of the Atlantic, has seen the painful sight of cheap and slight "Oxford Text Books," which contrast strangely with the learned treatises by men of mark — not written yesterday I may say — which candidates for Holy Orders used to be required to do their best to master. From these achievements of the twentieth century we learn that the Old Testament miracles have entirely disappeared, while the New Testament miracles are somewhat summarily dismissed. As to prophecy, it expires under the knife of the German operator. Isaiah is sliced up into a congeries of authors of various dates and no names (with the exception of a few fragments assigned to the prophet) on the hypothesis (which, by the way, no attempt is made to establish by argument) that there is, and can be, no such thing as prophecy. That this hypothesis is absolutely unsound can easily be demonstrated by an appeal to facts, even though the German critic tries to bolster it up by attempts to assign some of the Minor Prophets to any period in which it may suit him to place them.

Prophecy, however, is a characteristic of the Old Testament from Moses to Malachi. Prophecies are also recorded in the New Testament; and one book, the last, is a prophecy of things to come. Some reasons have of late been given for doubting the soundness of the German criticism of Gen. i.-iii. The evidence from prophecy will be found to strengthen that doubt. The first prophecy in the Bible is one which clearly dates from a very early epoch. The very vagueness of its form, which differs very largely, for instance, from the form of God's Promise to Abraham, gives evidence of its antiquity. Immediately after the Fall (which consisted, let us not forget, of the resolution of mankind to test God's laws by disobeying them) comes

a remarkable but indefinite intimation given by God to His creatures that the seed of the woman¹ should achieve a victory over the votaries of the Serpent, though not, however, without cost to the Victor. Pass by innumerable centuries and what do you find? A vast and increasing Society, the Founder of which — miraculously born — gave His life for mankind, and thereby purchased to Himself an Universal Church of the Living God by His Own Most Precious Blood. Read your Bible — not as manipulated by the German critic, but as it stands — and you find the early prophecy growing clearer and clearer through the ages, until He is revealed Who by His Death, and even more by His Life (Rom. v. 8-11), has fulfilled the remarkable catena of prophecies to which we shall presently advert. Surely here is a really "scientific" proof of Revelation. Apply it to the widespread evidence of facts in the history of the Church, and you find its fulfillment growing more and more complete day by day.

The Promise made by God to Abraham is found in Gen. xii., and is repeated more than once in the later chapters of that book. Like the Fall, it has been regarded by critics inclined to be overfree in their dealings with the first principles of our holy religion, as a step backward rather than forward in human evolution. The Fall has been thus treated because the animal creation has steadily gone forward, as geological research proves, in the direction of man's physical organization, until it has produced beings possessing all, or nearly all, the physical characteristics of man. But it appears to have been forgotten that the Fall has nothing whatever to do, at least directly, with man's physical organization. Man may not differ in the least from what has been called "Preadamite Man" in the physical structure of his body.² The real moral step forward in-

¹ Herein there lies enshrined a hint of the New Creation (2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. vi. 15. See R. V., marg.) — the miracle of the Virgin Birth.

² The critics of Scripture from the scientific side have strangely missed the profound scientific knowledge possessed by the author of Gen. i. Not only did he know that light existed before the

volved in the creation of man is *his capacity of doing wrong as well as right*. The animals, of any *genus* whatever, cannot disobey the laws imposed upon them by their Creator. It can now be seen by its results that the greatest step forward in the world's history was the *use made by man of the power of resisting God's laws*. Had no such power been entrusted to him, no such thing as moral excellence would have been possible. For innumerable centuries the existence of such a step forward as the Fall might reasonably be disputed. But since the World's Redeemer appeared, the fact of the Fall as a momentous step towards man's perfection has been becoming more and more indisputable, and, it may be added, indispensable.

The same kind of exception may be taken to the Call of Abraham. Instead of being addressed to all mankind, it was addressed to one family only, and thence it became the privilege of a single nation. The Law of Moses was given to that nation, and to no other. It was expressly confined to that nation, and was, and still is, the badge of distinction between it and all other races. But yet "all nations" were to be blessed in faithful Abraham. And the further we proceed in the evolution by the prophets — on the traditional theory, let us never forget — of the principles of Judaism, the clearer the participation of all nations in the promise by Abraham becomes, until the promised "seed of the woman" appeared, Who was destined to fulfill it.¹ Nor is this all. The most rabid opponent of a religion founded on the principle of the supernatural, including miracles and prophecy, cannot deny that Christianity *has already been* a greater blessing to the world than any other religion or school of philoso-

evolution of light-giving bodies, but the remains of the great sea monsters spoken of in the account of the Creation have been found by the geologists in the strata they have discovered.

¹See Isa. xlix.; lx.; Jer. xxxi. 31-34; Ezek. xxxvi. 24-26 (cf. xi. 17-19). That this refers to the spiritual Israel is perfectly clear, from the whole Christian scheme, and the fact that it has purified humanity, and does embrace all nations, as may be seen from the numerous prophecies of which Isa. xlix. and lx. are a type.

phy known to mankind; that the moral and social principles even of its present opponents are largely due to the Christian Revelation; and that a survey of the world's morality, whatever defects it may discover, unquestionably proves that the world, under Christian influences, has long been becoming more orderly and peaceful.

We now come to the last great step which the world made before the Coming of Jesus Christ — the Revelation made to Moses. This revelation, in spite of its admitted defects,¹ is generally allowed to have caused a great advance among mankind in moral and social excellence. And one sign of its value is the fact of its *continuance in existence*. No religion which had not great merits could have survived the dispersion and humiliation of its votaries for nearly two thousand years. And only the Germanizing type of criticism has attempted to dispute the fact that this dispersion, and the hostility displayed to the descendants of Abraham by heathen nations, was distinctly prophesied in the Scriptures which the Jews acknowledge to this day, and prophesied *because of their failure* to observe the precepts delivered *in their Law and by their prophets*. Moreover, if another religion has superseded it, that religion was first promulgated by men who were Jews; so that it is through Abraham's seed that all nations of the world obtained the blessings which Christianity is undeniably conferring at this moment on the world at large. Nor is this all. The fact is also described as prophesied to Abraham that his descendants shall be prepared for their mission by servitude "in a land which is not theirs" (Gen. xv. 14).

The Mosaic Law of Sacrifice, we may next observe, is found to have typified beforehand the Christian dispensation which has arisen out of Judaism in six important points:—

1. There is the *whole burnt sacrifice*, which typifies the fact that atonement for sin and reconciliation with God

¹ See New Testament, *passim*.

arises from the promised Redeemer offering Himself entirely and unreservedly to God, as One consumed by the fire of Love—Love both to Him to Whom it was offered, and to them *for whom* it was offered (Lev. i.).

2. There are the thank or peace offerings, which typify the restoration of harmony between those between whom that harmony had been broken (Lev. iii.).

3. There are the sin offerings, notable for the fact that the bodies of the beasts which were offered were taken *outside of the camp*, and there burned. This was a sign that the sin which placed a barrier between God and His creatures must be utterly *removed and destroyed* (Lev. iv.; also ix. 8–11).¹

4. The Festival of the Passover, which consisted of the *eating of the Paschal Lamb*. This was the token of a great deliverance from cruel captivity and bondage (Ex. xii.).

5. The services of the Great Day of Atonement, which involved the offering of two goats, one of which was offered up to God, and the other sent away into the wilderness. This typified the same truth as No. 3, though in a different manner; and its meaning was that the redemption wrought by the Saviour involved the putting off of the old, and the putting on of the new man, brought about by the work of our High Priest (Lev. xvi.).

6. The eating of the flesh of the Sacrifice by the offerer typifies the fact that the reconciliation between God and the sinner *must involve the feeding by faith by the sinner* on the Flesh of the Slain Lamb, offered to God on the Cross by the Man Christ Jesus as a Propitiation for the sins of mankind (Lev. xvii.).

The symbolism of the Law is the subject of the great Epistle to the Hebrews. The object of the institution of the Last Supper is dealt with by St. John in the sixth chapter of his Gospel, and the general truth is contained in the many passages which—in the original Greek—speak of the Indwelling of the Risen and Glorified Christ in the

¹ Cf. Ex. xxix. 19; Num. xix. 1–10.

souls of those who believe on Him.¹ The truth conveyed in all these passages is that they typified the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ, under all the aspects in which it has universally been presented to His disciples, from the first century to the twentieth. This can only point to a revelation made to mankind, foreshadowed centuries before it came to pass,² and growing more and more definite as time went on. Such coincidences as these cannot be fortuitous, but involve the conclusion that a definite plan of dealing with the human soul was foreordained by Him Who brought it into being, and for its own sake permitted man to fall into sin. The New Testament tells us again and again, that the coming of Christ was foreordained before the creation of the world.³ And it is not unreasonable, but quite the contrary, to believe that He Who made man, and suffered him to fall into sin, would Himself provide the remedy. If there *be* a Creator, and if He *did not* interfere to prevent the evils which would spring from man's bringing sin into the world, He were the wickedest of beings. For then He would have deliberately allowed His creatures to wallow in their own filth to all eternity.

The last point which strikes us in the Law is *the provision made for another revelation*. It will be observed that, just like the mysterious hint handed down throughout the ages, that "the seed of the woman" should "bruise the serpent's head," the hint of a Coming Deliverer is in the Law by no means emphasized. The barest hint that He will come is all that is given (Deut. xviii. 15-19). And this for obvious reasons, as the after history shows. The Israelites were only too ready, as the Old Testament history tells us throughout, to apostatize from the faith of

¹ E.g. Rom. vi. 23 (R. V.); Eph. iii. 17, 19; iv. 15; Col. i. 27; ii. 10, 12; iii. 3, 4; and the Gospel and the First Epistle of St. John, *passim*.

² Even if, with the German critic, we bring the date of these Old Testament passages down to the Return from the Captivity, it makes comparatively little difference to our argument.

³ 1 Pet. i. 20; Rev. xiii. 8; Rom. xvi. 25, 26; Eph. iii. 9-11; Col. i. 26; 2 Tim. i. 9, 10; Titus vi. 2.

their forefathers. Even when the most striking proofs were given that God was with Moses, rebellion recommenced as soon as ever they had escaped from their Egyptian bondage. And the history of the Jews shows us that up to the destruction of their city, they were what they had been described from the first, a hard-hearted and stiff-necked people. What can more clearly show that there has been, and *is*, a Divine Plan for the salvation of the world from the very first? Had plainer intimation been given, every one who was discontented and rebellious would have set up the standard of the promised prophet. But, as Paley has shown us, the expectation of the coming of that Prophet only began to permeate the world shortly before He came. Paley (whose Evidences have been scoffed at chiefly, it would seem, because its treatment of the question is too cogent to be palatable to those who desire to escape from the influence of the Saviour) tells us how two heathen historians of that date testify to a belief which, as they said, pervaded the whole East at the time of the Lord's Coming, that One Who arose in the East would shortly obtain the preëminence. And the most envenomed of his adversaries can hardly venture to deny that no man has ever arisen upon the earth who has attained such power and celebrity, and, it may be added, has worked so salutary a moral influence, as Jesus Christ. Here, again, we have the strongest *ex post facto* evidence, not only for the Divine Plan of salvation, but for the fact that Jesus Christ, and He only, has effected it.¹

It will be unnecessary to enter at length into the way in which the ordinances for leprosy and individual sacrifices, typifying sin as a disease, and a slur or stain on the conscience and character of the individual sinner, are mentioned in the Pentateuch as it stands, beyond remarking that they come quite naturally in the subsequent narratives, and do not appear to be introduced in order to emphasize such *ex post facto* legislation as the German

¹ There is a hint in 1 Sam. ii. 25 of the coming of "another priest" beside those of the Old Dispensation.

theories postulate. They occur too seldom and in too incidental a fashion to be explained by the cumbrous and unworkable theory of the German school, that all the later history has been "worked over" by the incorporation of matter contained in writings from the eighth or ninth century before Christ to the period after the Return from the Captivity, and combined by a series of editors so as to suit the ideas of later times.

At the risk of a short digression, I will briefly pursue this subject of the early date of Joshua and the books immediately following.

The Book of Joshua postulates the existence of the Law of Moses throughout. It is tolerably clear that the most careful and accurate survey of Palestine contained in the Book of Joshua could have been made at no period subsequent to that to which the narrative assigns it, unless in the reign of Solomon. But if this alternative were the true one, we should surely find it assigned to the reign of a monarch of such celebrity and ability. No hint that it is to be ascribed to him is found anywhere in the history. Nor do even the German theorists hint at such a thing. I have already stated that the original Hebrew suggests the care with which the border lines of the tribes are marked out. The Palestine Exploration, undertaken toward the end of the last century, has established the fact that the old Syrian or Arabic names of the villages have, in most instances, been retained from the time of Joshua to our own. The identification, with the aid of the Tell-el-Amarna tablets, of Lachish with the Um Lakis of the present day, has signally confirmed the accuracy of the Book of Joshua on this point. The answers to the correspondence with Lachish found at Tell-el-Amarna in Egypt, were recently found at Um Lakis.

Before we go on to a more detailed survey of the later books, it may be well to state generally that the "working over" of the older histories, alleged by the Germans to have been accomplished by later hands, and to have been

edited and re-edited in the interests of the monotheistic school of divines which arose about the age of Hezekiah, exists simply on the *ipse dixit* of the German school themselves. They do not pretend to bring any evidence for this somewhat difficult attempt to patch the theological inventions of a later date upon the older framework. The English disciples of the Germans, for obvious reasons, do not desire to give any prominence to this theory of their masters. The German flatly denies that there was any difference whatever between the religion of Israel when it invaded Palestine and that of the tribes which dwelt there. The English school usually endeavors to slur over this question.

It involves considerable difficulties:—

1. Their long residence in Egypt would surely have disposed the Israelites in Egypt to accept the religion of their masters, rather than one of which they could have had a very slight acquaintance, for Abraham left Babylon for Palestine, and his grandson left Palestine for Egypt, and their descendants sojourned there some four hundred years.

2. The patchwork narrative which, we are told, is that which has come down to us, states consistently throughout that the religion of Israel was *not* the same as that of Palestine, but as different as could be imagined.

3. There is no sign of any patchwork at all. The historical books all tell the same tale, and there are no gaps or signs of inconsistency—certainly not as far as the *religious* question is concerned. And the later historical books as consistently refer to Jeroboam the son of Nebat as the author of the apostasy of Israel from the Mosaic religion. The whole history of the severed kingdoms is, with the exception of its supernatural portions, as natural and probable as can be imagined. To construct such a patchwork, and show no signs of real contradiction on vital points, is no easy task. And the various authors and editors must inevitably have betrayed themselves over and over again in their most intricate—may I not say impossible?—task. *Some* apparent inconsistencies may

plausibly be alleged. But they are in the byways, not the highways, of the narrative.

The Book of Judges lends as it stands no support to the theory of the "working over" of the history by a later hand. It quotes (Judg. ii. 7-9) the final words of the Book of Joshua in the most natural way conceivable, and by no means after the manner of writers intent on making out a case. It begins with minute details tending to show that the faithful explorer Caleb received the reward he had deserved for his faithfulness in the days of Moses. It gives the ancient names of some of the cities taken by Joshua — a fact which certainly does not indicate a revision after the Exile. When speaking of Jerusalem, it refers (Judg. i. 8, 21) to a time anterior to that of David, when the Jebusites had recovered their hold upon the city. The details in chapter i. (see also iii. 7, 8; vi. 25-32; x. 10, etc.) bear evidently *ancient* testimony to the fact that the Israelites did not carry out the instructions Joshua gave them in regard to the treatment of the inhabitants of Canaan. So that the theory that no differences existed between the Palestinian tribes and their Israelite invaders in religion and morality derives no confirmation from this early passage. The "angel" of chapter ii. was doubtless a prophet. The Hebrew word does not necessarily mean a *heavenly* messenger. The traditional theory, which suggests the prominence of the prophet in Israelite affairs of state, and represents him as handing down the historic records of the state from his own time to future ages,¹ has thus early confirmation. And we hear of "the prophets" as a recognized body of men from the time of Saul.²

The history of Samson mentions the prohibition in Deut. vii. 3 (assigned by the Germans to the reigns of Ahaz, Hezekiah, or Manasseh) to take a wife from any of the heathen nations of Canaan in the most accidental way, as unlike the endeavor of a later writer to insinuate his opin-

¹ See the various references to prophetic historians in Chronicles.

² See 1 Sam. x. 9-11; xix. 20. See also the case of Samuel from 1 Sam. iii. 20 onward; also ii. 27.

ions into the minds of men in later ages as can possibly be imagined. It also mentions the law of the Nazirite in nearly as casual a way. The later chapters of Judges (xvii.-xxi.) are evidently traditions handed down in David's family in Bethlehem, as are the details contained in the Book of Ruth. In the former we find details of the prevalence of image worship in the house of Micah which are not in the least like what the Germans pretend they are, namely, the endeavor of a later writer to introduce his monotheistic opinions. And the horrible crime of the men of Gibeah, and the fierce indignation its breach of the laws of hospitality aroused in all the tribes of Israel are as unlike the behavior of the men of Sodom to Lot's visitors as can be conceived. Yet it hints that the Levite expected some such treatment if he took shelter among the Jebusites (xix. 1, 2). It is explained that in those days the ark of God was at Bethel, and that Phinehas, the son of Eleazar the priest, ministered at it, which, again, does not look like an invention of later days, though the story is clearly written down later, as the explanation shows.

The Book of Ruth, which (i. 1) was clearly written at a later period, gives, as has already been said, a charming description of the life in a Jewish village when the fear of God still subsisted among the inhabitants. No Christian farmer of our own day could surpass the simplicity, scrupulous honesty, and piety which are depicted in the character of Boaz. Oral tradition will account for its faithfulness. Even at the present day, in Oriental countries, traditions are orally handed down for years with the most minute faithfulness. The laws of the Levirate, as it is called, as described in Deut. xxv. (with the extension to nearest of kin, as indicated in Lev. xxv. 25; cf. also Gen. xxxviii.) are mentioned as in existence in this book. If the prohibition of the taking of wives from the Canaanitish nations excites no remark in the Book of Ruth, it is because Moab was not Canaanitish, but akin to Abraham, as descended from Lot.

We may pass by the early part of the Book of Samuel

with the remark that the character of Samuel as it appears in its pages is quite impossible if, as the German critic teaches, the law of Moses were not in existence in his day. We are told that he revived the decaying zeal of Israel for its Law. But the German critic contends that there was nothing to revive. Samuel, however, was either a reformer or he was nothing at all. And while the High Priesthood was in abeyance after the deaths of Hophni and Phinehas, Samuel himself, being a Levite (1 Chron. vi. 27-34), is described as acting as priest. This is quite impossible if the book is a compilation of the time to which the critics assign it. Nor are there any signs of lacunæ such as must be found if the book had been compiled as is asserted. Another point is suggested to those who wish to "give a reason for the hope that is in them." It is the minute agreement of the contents of the history as it stands with what we now know of ancient history from the monuments. In the days of Abraham the Pharaohs of Egypt were more on a par with him than in the days of Moses. The reigns of Thothmes III. and Rameses II., occurring in the intervening period, were those of great potentates and warriors. After the disaster of Merenptah in his pursuit of Israel, the power of Egypt diminished, and that of Babylon and Nineveh had not revived. In the days of Abraham the sons of Heth and the other denizens of Palestine led pastoral lives, and were usually at peace with each other, and uncontrolled by any great powers. By the time of Joshua each Palestinian city had its king. In the days of the Judges, again, no external power seems to have dominated Palestine. The Book of Judges represents the kings of Canaan as the first to dispute the power of Israel. Then came the incursions of savage tribes. And then the Philistines — they had "lords" (Heb. *sarney*) at this time — began to be preëminent, till David and Solomon arose to fulfill the prophecy to Abraham that the Israelite should rule from Mesopotamia to Egypt. Then Egypt, under Shishak, had a brief revival. The Assyrian and Babylonish

preëminence did not begin to display itself till the reign of Ahaz. Thus the history of Israel, as described in the books of Samuel and Kings, becomes possible. Otherwise it would be quite impossible. A writer after the Return from the Captivity would hardly have been able to conceal his ignorance of the period of which he was writing. Both in what it does and what it does not say it is a simple impossibility that the history as it stands could have been written, or even "worked over," in post-exilic times.

Then we have to note the prominence the Ark of God holds all the time from Joshua to David.¹ It is most remarkable how little the Ark is mentioned in Professor Driver's "Introduction." Minute as his perception was for contradictions which suit his case, he scarcely mentions the Ark at all. And yet its prominence all through the Book of Joshua, and the later portions of Judges, in the history of Eli, in the account of the Ark's capture by the Philistines and the marvels its presence wrought among them, David's deep reverence for it, the competing claims of the Tabernacle and the Ark in the eyes of David and Solomon (cf. 1 Kings iii. 4 and 2 Chron. i. 3, 4), until the Ark once more took its place in the Tabernacle — all these show the deep reverence felt for it by pious Israelites. It is surprising how every mote seems of importance to the German critic, while such a "beam" in the history of Israel as the Ark entirely escapes him. Nor is this all. The German critic regards the narratives of Judg. xvii.—xxi. as not "homogeneous," for sundry minute reasons he discovers. But he fails to see what looms largely throughout those chapters in Judges and the Book of Ruth, namely, that they all hinge on "Bethlehem-Judah." Now an expression Bethlehem-Judah, for distinction's sake, obviously could only be found in early history, before Bethlehem-Judah became famous for its connection with the house of David,

¹ Ex. xxv. 10-12; xl. 3, 20; Deut. xxxi. 20. The "testimony" consisted of the two tables of stone with the Ten Commandments on them (see also Num. xvii. 8-10).

after which the other Bethlehems sank into insignificance.¹ The whole of these chapters, including the Book of Ruth, are thus evidently traditions handed down *in the family of David*, but written down later, as the remark, "There was no king in Israel, but every man did that which was right in his own eyes," suggests. It stamps the writer as writing in David's reign, though the oral tradition, carefully transmitted, as Oriental usage was and is, retains the distinctive phrase. The writer did not sympathize with Samuel's view of the kingdom. Then the mention of the Jebusites as having re-occupied Jerusalem is an early touch.² We may also fairly contend that the taking of the Ark from one place to another would not suggest any scruples to Phinehas. He had been accustomed to this in his wanderings in the wilderness. And the taking the Ark to Bethel, to be near to the hostile demonstrations against Benjamin, would not seem the same thing as taking it to a battle with the heathen. Moreover, the Ark does not seem to have been taken out of the Tabernacle, as it was by Hophni and Phinehas. The allusions to "those days" in Judg. xx. 27, 28, must have been added when the oral account was written down. We have already seen that Oriental tradition, even now, is often handed down with scrupulous accuracy by *word of mouth*. The whole of these chapters seems to testify to a disorganization of the tribes which indicates that the "elders which overlived Joshua" had passed or were rapidly passing away.³ The early chapters of First Samuel show that the law of sacrifice, of the peace offerings at least, was already in existence (1 Sam. ii. 13-16). The lamp was kept burning in the Tabernacle (1 Sam. iii. 3), as ordered in the Law. And the women who attended at the door of the Tabernacle were already

¹The other Bethlehem was in Zebulun (Josh. xix. 15). Note also the early name of Ephrath, *which is Bethlehem* (Gen. xxxv. 19). This stamps the verse as early — not a later insertion.

²See Josh. x. 23-26; xv. 63; Judge xix. 10-12, etc.

³Eleazar was dead (Josh. xxiv. 33).

a recognized institution.¹ The order for the lamps to be kept burning is assigned by the Germanizers to P, and P is supposed by them to be postexilic.² Yet we find "the lamp" alluded to here as the rule in the temple, some six hundred years earlier than P. We may also note that the regulations regarding uncleanness were in existence and observed in the days of Saul (1 Sam. xx. 6; cf. Lev. xi.-xv.), though we are given to understand that they were not codified till the Return from Captivity.

It is remarkable how entirely this treatment of an historic subject corresponds with the glaring blunders constantly made during the late war from the preference given by Germans to their own preconceptions, to the lessons suggested by the plainest facts.

There are two allusions to the existence of the Law in First Samuel. One is when Saul refers to the laws about uncleanness, which were "codified," we are told by the German critics, some six hundred years afterwards. It may be noted, as a sign of the astuteness of the German school, as well as in the way it sticks to its own preconceptions, that by its theory it disposes ingeniously, if not ingenuously, of all objections to their view. If a law is shown to be in existence before the "codification," the critic can answer, That does not dispose of my argument, for the codification brought together laws new and old. If any law does not happen to be mentioned in the post-Mosaic history, the contention is that the law in question was not in existence. But no external evidence whatever of this codification is given. Yet surely some allusion to it would have been made in the history if it had occurred. Historians are not usually permitted to "evolve" historical events from "their own moral consciousness" in this way. An allusion is also made to another so-called post-

¹ See Ex. xxxviii. 8. Ps. lxxviii. 12 seems to refer to these. German criticism denies the Davidic origin of any of the Psalms. But the tone of triumph in the earlier ones could hardly be maintained after the secession of the Ten Tribes.

² It is singular that Dr. Driver, in his mention of the regulations in Ex. xxv. 31, makes no mention of the lamp.

exilic institution in 1 Sam. xxi. 4, 5. Is it in the least likely that such an institution would remain uncoded for six hundred years? Nor should we pass over the repeated mention in the remaining historical books of Jeroboam, who "made Israel to sin." This is not a mere "working over" of the history for the purposes of a monotheist party in later times. For it is obviously *the cause of the separation, which was not a mere ordinary revolt.*

This digression may be useful to the diligent student of his Bible. The fact that the Mosaic Law was in existence in the reigns of the later kings is the natural consequence of the settled government which came in with the kingly power. Public recognition was made of the Mosaic enactments, by David and Solomon, to an extent unknown and practically impossible in the unsettled times of the Judges.

We will turn now to the evidence of the Psalms on behalf of prophecy. They are often called the "Psalms of David." But as a matter of fact the greater part of them were obviously written by other persons. This may be clearly seen by the student of the Hebrew, and even by the student of the translations. There are marked differences in style between the early and the later Psalms. And the study of the later ones in the original displays traces of the Exile in the evident unfamiliarity of the writers with the Hebrew of the best days of the language, a feature which also comes out yet more markedly in the prose of the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah. The headings of the earlier Psalms, though no more authoritative than the subscriptions of the dates and occasions of the Apostolic Epistles one finds in the Authorized Version of the New Testament, give very ancient evidences of the fact that the Psalms were ascribed to others besides David. Scholars generally, "traditionalists" as well as others, accept the divisions of the Psalms given in the Revised Version, into five books. The first book (i.-xli.) consists chiefly of those written by David. Those in the second (xlii.-lxxii.) are chiefly by other hands, and are, as a rule, by contem-

poraries of David.¹ The third (lxxiii.-lxxxix.) belongs to the period of the later kings. The fourth book (xc.-cvi.) is either of the time of the latest kings or of the Exile. The last book is entirely exilic, save that Ps. cx. and some later ones are attributed to David. Each book, save the last but one, is marked off by the double Amen. That attached to Ps. cvi. has but one Amen, but is as emphatic as the rest.

We must now go back to the wondrous fulfillment of the ancient prophecies.

Our first point on this question is the way in which David's throne is spoken of as enduring forever.² Can any one deny that for nearly two thousand years a descendant of David has been reigning over the hearts of a continually increasing number of people; that His empire has not merely extended, and *is still extending*, its boundaries externally, but that it is also growing in its influence over the hearts of mankind?

Coming to particular Psalms, we find a striking fulfilled prophecy in Ps. ii. Jesus is believed by hundreds of millions of persons to be the Son of God in a way that no other man is. And now undoubtedly He has "the heathen for his inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for his possession" (ver. 7, 8).³ There has been a vigorous attempt to dispute the statement, indorsed by Jesus Christ, that Ps. cx. was written by David. Yet there are curious resemblances in that Psalm to Ps. ii. (cf. ii. 3, 5; cx. 2, 5, 6). And the rule of the Son of God over the Gentiles is clearly foretold in each of them. In Ps. xvi. there is the famous prophecy, put in the forefront of their teaching by St. Peter and St. Paul, that the Lord will not remain in Sheol (the abode or condition of the departed), and that His body shall not see corruption. This prophecy is ac-

¹The first two books of the Psalms (see R. V.) are said to have come to an end of the "Prayers," or rather Psalms, of David. The note is appended to copies of the LXX, a translation into Greek which was some two centuries before Christ.

²Ps. xviii. 50; lxxxix. 55, 36; cxxxii. 11, 12.

³Not, of course, an *undisputed* inheritance. But there is scarcely a region in the world where ardent believers in Him are not found.

cepted by the Christian church throughout the world as having been fulfilled in Jesus Christ. It is true that the word rendered "corruption" is said to be erroneously so rendered. But it is so rendered in the LXX, made, we must not forget, some centuries before Christ. And though the word has not unfrequently been rendered "pit," yet the rendering adopted in the LXX in times anterior to Christ's coming and accepted by St. Peter and St. Paul, may not impossibly be as near the mark as that of a modern Hebrew scholar. Psalm xxi., again, speaks of a King who enjoys "everlasting felicity" (Heb. "settest him to be blessings forever") and life forevermore. "His kingdom" is spread through the world, and few races of men are found in which He has no subjects.¹ Psalm xxii. prefigures the Christian belief in many striking ways. The Lord uttered its opening words upon the Cross. Those who stood by the Cross, who were personally known to the writers of three of the four Gospels, unless Christ's universal church has been careless enough to hand down forgeries, noted how the Lord's garments were "parted among them," and that for His vesture the soldiers "cast lots," and how His hands and feet were "pierced" when He was nailed to the Cross.² This Psalm also foretells that a people is to "be born" to whom His righteousness shall be revealed. A similar prophecy is recorded in Ps. cii. (ver. 18, "created," R. V.). And a most remarkable prophecy is found in Ps. lxxxvii., which mentions how many will "be born" in various localities who will be reckoned as the chosen of God. We shall return to this subject when we come to the prophecies of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. But we must not pass on without noting how the words of verses 7 and 8 were fulfilled in the utterances of the unbelieving Jews and Gentiles who stood by Jesus as He hung on the Cross. Can all this be a mere congeries of coincidences?

¹ See what has been said above of David.

² A similar allusion in Ps. lxi. 8-21 may be disputed. But it must not be forgotten that the cumulative force of these various fulfillments of prophecy is a factor in the problem.

In Ps. xxiv. we have an imaginative address to "gates" and "everlasting doors" to be ready to receive some famous one who shall pass through them and be glorified. Similar passages are found in Ps. lxxviii. 18 and Hag. ii. 7-9. The fact that in the former of these two passages the gifts He receives are sometimes taken to mean gifts offered to men and sometimes as gifts offered for them does not affect the argument here, which is that they *are* held throughout Christendom to refer to the Ascension of Christ into Heaven. It is for those who deny Christ to be the Divine Son of God to explain away the fulfillment of this prophecy. Can it be lightly assumed that it does not refer to the Lord of the Christian church?

In Ps. xl. there is a passage which is fulfilled in Jesus Christ, and Him alone. It speaks of the futility of the belief that the Jewish and heathen sacrifices could take away sins, a fact to which the Book of Psalms frequently refers (cf. l. and li.). And there is also a reference to the fact that the reproach and agony of the sinner is somehow felt by one who comes to bear this reproach and agony. It is surely an amazing truth that millions of souls have since come to believe in Christ as having borne their sins for them on the Cross. And it is indisputable that the fact of its having been thus predicted ages beforehand is one which must attract the notice of all thinking persons. No one can deny that the Christian scheme of salvation is a genuine reflection of the spirit of this Psalm, or that Jesus is said to have felt a terrible Agony in the Garden and a "horror of great darkness" on the Cross. Does any one dare to say that Jesus pretended to feel it at such an hour, or did He really feel it?

We next come to Ps. xlv. It is an epithalamium of some king's bride who has been married to a prince of ineffable majesty, to whom she is bound to offer obedience and worship as God. The Psalmist, too, addresses this monarch (ver. 6) as God. But Christians worship One who actually fulfills these conditions. He is Man, and yet He is God. He "loveth righteousness and hateth wickedness." He has

been "anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows" (ver. 7). It is an unquestionable fact that a considerable number of persons who were not professed believers in the Divinity of Jesus Christ have spoken highly of His influence and even that of His church upon mankind, and that there are myriads of men in the world now who say with Agrippa, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian." No rational or honest person can deny that Jesus was a greater man than most who have been reputed as great upon earth — perhaps the greatest of them all. And His influence over the world has been great and for good — no one else ever wrought so much good in the world as He. And that influence, inward and outward, in spite of the inconsistency of so many of His disciples, has increased and is increasing. Nor can any one deny that wherever He is accepted as Lord, the standard of conduct — whatever its deficiencies — is far higher than elsewhere, and highest of all where it is most fully recognized. Is there no sign in all this of a Divine method of reconciling all mankind to God, predicted and prefigured beforehand, and ever advancing towards the reign of "peace and good will among men," — towards the blessed state of things when Christ shall dwell by faith in those who accept Him as their Lord, and take them into Heaven to live eternally in that joy and happiness which will exist as soon as all evil-doers shall be banished from His Presence? Is this all a mockery, a delusion, and a snare?

In Ps. lxxii. we have a Vision of the time when this truth shall be fully revealed. Like Ps. xlv., this Psalm takes Solomon as the type of the "King of Glory," hereafter to be made manifest. Who can gainsay the fact, that, in this country of ours, the "poor and needy" are now being cared for as they never were before, and that (ver. 14) their "blood" is more "precious" in the sight of Christian people than it ever was formerly? And can any one prove that it is not the Work of One Who was foreordained to it "before the foundation of the world"?

The only other Psalm that I need mention is Ps. cx.

Like many other Psalms in the later books, it is assigned to David. It has been explained that the statements found in our Authorized Version at the head of the Psalms are not authoritative, and form no part of the Scriptures. But they are found in our copies of the LXX.¹ I have already mentioned the similarity of subject and expression between this Psalm and Ps. ii. I have only to add, that, save on the hypothesis of prophecy, no satisfactory explanation has been given of the extraordinary assertion that any priesthood of the "order of Melchizedek" would, or could, be instituted by God. Zechariah, it is true, does prophesy of one who is to come who will be "a priest upon his throne" (vi. 13). But he goes no further. Moreover, in the New Testament there is an elaborate statement of what is involved in this prophecy, and how it was fulfilled in the Person of Jesus Christ. And the whole Christian church, from the beginning until now, has accepted this view of His Person and Office. That a priest has arisen after this predicted Order is, therefore, an undeniable historical fact. Nor has any difficulty at all in accepting it. What difficulties are connected with the Christian scheme of redemption are not concerned with the fact that the priesthood of Jesus Christ is not the Aaronic priesthood, but is connected with another tribe, that of Judah, which Judaism has never connected with that tribe. And it is most strange that "the priest after the order of Melchizedek" has set apart the eating and drinking of bread and wine as a memorial of His Passion. Thus, for close upon two thousand years, a Priesthood after the Order of Melchizedek has actually been accepted. And he will be a bold man who dares to tell us that the belief in this priesthood is even yet "decaying" or ready to "vanish away," or even that at this moment it displays any immediate signs of disappearing from the world.

¹I speak under correction on this point. I have not seen Dr. Swete's edition of the LXX. Nor do I know what is his view of the headings of the Psalms found in copies of the LXX. Nor can I find any opportunity of doing so.

One Psalm more must come under consideration, but from a somewhat different standpoint. This is Ps. cii. And the standpoint is that of prophecies of desolation and destruction of secular kingdoms. Professor G. A. Smith lays down canons of prophecy which place it on a level with the predictions of shrewd men of affairs, who have foreseen future events from their experiences in the past and the present. And when prophecies of such a kind seem incompatible with his theory, and for no better reason, he assigns them to a different author, and to another and a later period. I have dealt with such *petitiones principii* in other papers in this Review and I need not repeat them here. But prophecies of the fate of great nations and small are frequently found in Holy Writ, and at a distance of time which precludes the idea of these prophecies being due to worldly wisdom, and nothing more. Psalm cii. contains some remarkable indications of date, and in connection with them has prophecies of Sheshbazzar, Ezra, and Nehemiah which no mere political foresight can explain. The Psalm was obviously written when Jerusalem was in ruins. "It pitieth thy children to see her in the dust" (I quote the Prayer Book Version, but the R. V. does not materially differ from it), says the Psalmist, and calls upon Him to have mercy upon her. And then he goes on to say: (1) that the nations will fear the Name of Yahveh when the Lord hath built up Zion;¹ and (2) that when the worship of Yahveh has been restored, then men of other races and tongues will take part in their worship. The final fulfillment of that prophecy is of course connected with the heavenly Jerusalem. But in the account of the Day of Pentecost in Acts ii. we already see its literal fulfillment.

On reading the Psalms of the fifth book again, I am struck with the joyful confidence they display, almost

¹The present and future tenses do not exist in Hebrew, though there is a present participle. Their place is filled by the imperfect; while the perfect, usually referring to past events, also denotes a future certain to be fulfilled.

throughout. It has struck me that the unexpected effect of the chance discovery of the distress of Nehemiah by Artaxerxes has caused this revulsion of feeling. I say Artaxerxes, because the LXX makes Artaxerxes, *not* Xerxes, king of Persia. And the chance words, as they appear to be, in chap. ii. 6, identify *Esther* as the Queen, and Mordecai as the author of the Book which goes by Esther's name. Surely the translators of the LXX would have handed down their tradition correctly. And it explains the absence of the Name of God from the book. It might have been considered bad taste to bring the name of the God of Israel into the book which relates the experience of a Jewish queen.