

SWEETGOSPELHARMONY.COM

PART I

THE
GOSPEL IN THE LAW;

A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF THE CITATIONS
FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE NEW.

BY

CHARLES TAYLOR, M.A.,

FELLOW OF ST JOHN'S COLLEGE,
AND CURATE OF ST ANDREW'S THE GREAT, CAMBRIDGE.



CAMBRIDGE:
DEIGHTON, BELL, AND CO.,
LONDON: BELL AND DALDY.
1869.

101. e. 196.

PREFACE.

THIS work purports not to exhaust the deep subject of Citation from the Old Testament in the New, but to deal, in a manner more or less intelligible to the general reader, with select citations of pronounced critical and theological interest.

I am sensible that not a few of the questions herein discussed are, and must remain, inconclusively dealt with, owing to their intrinsic difficulty: some of the earlier chapters in particular leave ample room for renewed investigation: while, of points discussed later, the Symbolism of Sacrifice has been dismissed with less of elaboration than I could have desired.

Of works on the Citations Mr Grinfield gives a list in his *Apology for the Septuagint*, pp. 142 sqq. Certain of the treatises there mentioned, and, in addition, those of Surenhusius, Gough, and Turpie have been consulted. I have made much use of Hengstenberg's *Christo-*

logy: more of Kidder's *Demonstration of the Messiah*. I am further indebted to the labours of Poole (ed. 1669-76), Rosenmüller, Gesenius, Bengel, Alford, and Wordsworth: not to mention the *Concordances* of Tromm, Fürst, and Bruder; the *Grammar* of Winer; with various special commentaries and other works of less generality referred to in due place.

Lastly, my best thanks are due to my friends who have revised the proof sheets; and to the Reverend the Master of Jesus College for several valuable suggestions received from him while those sheets were passing through the press.

ST JOHN'S COLLEGE,
May 12, 1869.

CONTENTS.

CHAP.	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	ix
I. I WILL HAVE MERCY AND NOT SACRIFICE	I
II. DAVID HIMSELF CALLETH HIM LORD	16
III. THE PROPHECY OF IMMANUEL	28
IV. LOCAL COINCIDENCES	49
V. THE SUFFERING MESSIAH	74
VI. THE SURE MERCIES OF DAVID	128
VII. HE GAVE GIFTS UNTO MEN	167
VIII. A BODY HAST THOU PREPARED ME	176
IX. THE ALLEGORY OF HAGAR	187
X. THE APOLOGY OF ST STEPHEN	207
XI. THE IMPRECATIONS OF PSALM LXIX.	224
XII. THE IMPRECATIONS OF PSALM CIX.	244
XIII. CHRISTIAN AND JEWISH ETHICS	260
XIV. THE SYMBOLISM OF SACRIFICE	280
XV. THE LXX. AS A MEDIUM OF CITATION	306
XVI. MISCELLANEA	324
APPENDIX	341
INDICES	348

ERRATA.

Page 53, line 24, for Matt. iv. 18, read Matt. ii. 18.

„ 139, „ 12, „ Michtab, „ Michtam.

„ 186, Note C [iii.], for the κενοδοξα άνθρωποι, read idols.

INTRODUCTION.

*Πᾶς γραμματεὺς μαθητευθεὶς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν ὁμοίως
ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδεσπότη ὅστις ἐκβάλλει ἐκ τοῦ θησαυροῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ
καὶ παλαιά.*

S. MATT. xiii. 52.

THE ministers of the New Covenant have approved themselves as good stewards of the great Householder by bringing forth out of His treasure things new and old. Sometimes the new supplements the old, and answers to the needs of a fuller growth. Sometimes the newest is identically the oldest, and supersedes that which by dint of use had come to be regarded as the old, while yet 'from the beginning it was not so.' And still, to the scribe instructed unto the kingdom of heaven, the old is ever new, and the new old; for the old lives in the new, as the new is rooted in the old; and old with new successively reveal one Truth, as the shifting seasons measure a world's cycle about its sun. The formal connection of new and old is not indeed peculiar to the Christian economy; for 'all nations who have ancient writings have endeavoured to read in them the riddle of the past.' But with the sacred writers this connection is not, as in the case of heathen authors, merely external; for 'the Old Testament looks forward to the New, as the New Testament looks backward to the Old;' and the New sees itself the more truly mirrored in the Old, as the Old, gazing ever fixedly on the New, is 'changed into the same image from glory to glory.'

I. *Preliminary Remarks.*

1. The relations of the new to the old are various ; and the analysis of but few citations from the Old Testament in the New, clearly shews the great difficulty of harmonizing the citations and their originals in accordance with any of the preconceived theories which have been, from time to time, hazarded. What has been well said on another subject, Inspiration¹, has its application to this :—‘ In the outset let it be said that we heartily concur with the majority of our opponents in rejecting all theories of Inspiration, and in sweeping aside all those distinctions and definitions which, in only too many cases, have been merely called forth by emergencies, and drawn up for no other purpose than to meet real or supposed difficulties. The remark probably is just, that most of the current explanations err more especially in attempting to define what, though real, is incapable of being defined in an exact manner.’ And again :—‘ It seems pretty generally agreed among thoughtful men at present, that definite Theories of Inspiration are doubtful and dangerous².’ Definite theories of citation have proved scarcely less fruitful in controversies, and have tended to multiply the difficulties which they were devised to obviate. Nor, on the other hand, could any solid results be expected to accrue from *a priori* theories, which might not, at least as safely, be attained by a patient and unpretentious following of the inductive method. Let the passages cited be first scrutinized in the light of their original contexts, and without reference to the fact of their citation : let the true meaning of the citation be elicited, so far as may be, without reference to the original : and then, from a comparison or contrast of the separate results, as much, assuredly, may be gathered as from any theory on the mutual relations of the New and the Old : for so far as the

¹ *Aids to Faith*, Essay IX.

² *Ibid.*, Essay VII.

theory is sound, it must be borne out by the detailed investigation; and then, inasmuch as the same results might have been obtained independently, the antecedent theory is declared superfluous. But more often it is found partial, and applicable to few cases only; and thus, so far as it is acquiesced in, it bars the progress of enquiry, and forms a nucleus for accumulations which turn aside the natural current of healthful thought.

2. It is soon found upon examination that, as the formal correspondence of the citations with their originals varies from literal identity to ambiguous allusion, so their inner relation may be that of prophecy and fulfilment, of type and antitype; or it may consist in adaptations which are calculated to render the new more acceptable or more intelligible, as presented in the garb and semblance of the old. Between these extremes, all shades of variation in the mode and purport of citation are admissible. And herein lies the difficulty of the present investigation: this it is which renders a full discussion of all the citations which occur, or can be recognized, so lengthy and voluminous as to be well nigh impracticable. The plan then which will be adopted is to discuss more or less fully a select number of citations, each involving critical or theological questions of peculiar moment, and each suited to become a centre around which others of like nature, but involving less special difficulty, may be grouped. For the details of the plan, it is unnecessary to do more than refer the reader to the *Table of Contents*, and to the various *Indices*; and thus much being premised we proceed at once to the enquiry, commencing with a brief notice of the Formulæ of Citation.

II. *Formulæ of Citation.*

The formulæ of citation are of various degrees of definiteness, and their variety exhibits itself in a twofold way; for a

reference to the Old Testament may or may not carry with it a seeming declaration of authorship ; and, independently of this, there is the difficulty of determining whether the words cited are adduced by way of illustration, or as evidence of a predictive purpose. The former of these difficulties is noticed on pp. 132 sqq. : the latter calls for some remark, as having occasioned much controversy, and still remaining undetermined.

There is an appearance of definiteness in such formulæ as *ἵνα πληρωθῇ, τότε ἐπληρώθη*, and the like, which is not always easy to reconcile with the phenomena of individual citations ; for the events to which Old Testament passages are applied in the New would seem oftentimes not to have been contemplated when the passages were written ; and if so, the reference to such events would scarcely be direct and primary. Some accordingly have regarded the primary and historical allusion as typical of greater issues in the future, or have interpreted the disputed formulæ as implying that a prophecy, though fulfilled by contemporary events or in the immediate future, may yet have waited for its *completion* or perfect fulfilment till the Messianic time. Some again have allowed that the requirements of such formulæ as *τότε ἐπληρώθη* may be satisfied by accommodations of prophecy, while yet claiming for *ἵνα πληρωθῇ* a definite predictiveness. Others regard the *ἵνα* as frequently ecclastic or final, rather than causal ; and Schleusner observes, ' *tironum causa*,' that the two classes of formulæ are alike ambiguous, and to be interpreted, in each case, by the context. Dean Alford so far agrees with this view as to hold, that ' we must not draw any fanciful distinction between *τότε ἐπληρώθη* and *ἵνα πληρωθῇ*, but rather seek our explanation in the acknowledged system of prophetic interpretation among the Jews, still extant in their Rabbinical books, and now sanctioned to us by New Testament usage ; at the same time remembering, for our caution, how little even now we understand of the full bearing

of prophetic and typical words and acts.' The particular passage¹, in connection with which these remarks occur, is said to be, 'apparently an accommodation of the prophecy in Jer. xxxi. 15, which was originally written of the Babylonish captivity... None of the expressions of this prophecy must be closely and literally pressed.' And yet with regard to the meaning of *ἵνα* no ambiguity is admitted. 'It is impossible to interpret *ἵνα* in any other sense than *in order that*... And of course these remarks apply to every passage where *ἵνα* or *ὥπως πληρωθῇ* are used. Such a construction can have but one meaning. If such meaning involve us in difficulty regarding the prophecy itself, far better leave such difficulty, in so doubtful a matter as the interpretation of prophecy, unsolved, than create one in so simple a matter as the rendering of a phrase whose meaning no indifferent person could doubt².'

The distinctions between the various New Testament formulæ are especially insisted upon by Surenhusius, who compares them with those employed by Rabbinic writers. 'But' writes Dr Owen³ 'when we find the very same quotations, expressed in the same words, and brought to prove the very same points, are introduced by different *formulas* in the Gospels, we can pay but little regard to such an opinion. It seems to be the chief, if not the sole, intent of these *formulas*, to apprise the reader that the words annexed are either taken from, or have some reference to, the books of the Old Testament. And the variations observable in them may sometimes arise from the nature of the subjects, and sometimes from the cast or turn of the discourse; though more frequently, if I mistake not, to the Modes of speaking currently used at those times, and to the imitation of former writers. For the historical books of the Old Testament abound in forms similar to

¹ Matt. ii. 17.

² Alford, on Matt. i. 22.

³ *Modes of Quotation*, Sect. II.

those which occur in the Gospels, and all subservient to the same ends.'

Without assuming beforehand that the above view is correct, we should at least contemplate the possibility of its being so. In other words, it is well to enter upon an analysis of the citations, not indeed with the assumption that the introductory expressions are indefinite, but with a disposition to allow that they may be, and to give due weight to any arguments from special contexts which may seem to bear upon the point. But it may be remarked in passing that, if formulæ like *τότε ἐπληρώθη* are to be tested by the Rabbinic standard, they do not of necessity imply predictive purpose, but might even be retrospective, as the subjoined remark of Rashi well illustrates. Referring to builders of the tower of Babel, and to their fear of being 'scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth,' this commentator affirms, that *in them was fulfilled* what Solomon said (Prov. x. 24). 'The fear of the wicked, it shall come upon him¹.'

But the chief difficulty lies in such formulæ as *ὡς ἔφη πλῆρωθῆναι*, which frequently introduces what may be styled provisionally a circumstantial agreement. It denotes sometimes the fulfilment of a definite prophecy in the same sense as that in which it was consciously uttered by the Prophet. Or it may introduce a result which would be recognized as the sole exhaustive fulfilment of a prophetic utterance, while the Prophet's mind may be conceived of as having contemplated what was in effect a partial accomplishment. But there are other cases in which some would see no more than an external coincidence, while yet the same formula of citation is used; and hence the question, How is this indiscriminate application of such formulæ to be accounted for?

There is indeed one principle on which *ὡς ἔφη* may have the

נתקיים עליהם הוא שאמר שלמה¹ given by Le Clerc in connection with
מגורת רשע היא תבואנו This is the Greek quotations of Note C, p. 72.

causal sense, while *ἡνα πληρωθῇ* yet remains indefinite; the principle viz. that there is no room for chance in the Divine economy, but that all events are foreseen, and accommodated to the general plan. Thus the *final* and the *causal* are merged into one, by the assumption that, in Revelation as in nature, every *result* implies *design*. 'Known unto God are all His works from the beginning of the world' (Acts xv. 18). And if it be granted that, of any two series the whole and each particular were predetermined and foreknown, it would follow that all contingent coincidences are included in the general plan. On this broad principle then a formula may be said to argue design while yet it by no means follows that the design was intended to be exhibited—at least in such a way that the human mind should argue *a priori* to the coincidence. The fact would still remain that the phenomena are diverse, and demand classification at the hand of the observer before any more specific theories on the relations of Prophecy to fulfilment can be safely formed. We might still have to distinguish between fulfilments which are of evidential or argumentative value, and those coincidences which stand in an imperfectly understood relation to a recondite plan.

III. *On traditional Exegesis.*

It is not to be assumed arbitrarily, that what to the modern critic appears to be no more than illustrative was devoid of argumentative importance to an ancient Jew; but allowance should rather be made for differences as regards precision of ratiocinative *expression*, corresponding to differences of development in successive stages of language. 'It were mere dogmatism' urges Dr Lightfoot¹ 'to set up the intellectual standard of our own age or country as an infallible rule...Analogy, allegory, metaphor—by what boundaries are these separated the one from the other? What is true or false, correct or incorrect, as an analogy or an allegory? What argu-

¹ *Galatians*, Ed. 2, p. 197.

mentative force must be assigned to either? We should at least be prepared with an answer to these questions before we venture to sit in judgment on any individual case.'

But, whether or no any absolute standard could be discovered for apportioning to the several methods their exact 'argumentative force,' it is at any rate inconsistent to judge by one standard a system which tacitly claims to be judged by another. The true meaning of a document may be said to be a joint function of the meanings conveyed thereby to its author on the one hand, and to his hearers or readers on the other; and hence arises the importance of traditionary interpretations, so far as they exhibit approximations to the modes of thought current when the document to be interpreted was written. An analogy may be drawn from language. To interpret an ancient document, it is necessary to become acquainted with the language in which it was written, and to follow implicitly its laws and idioms, however arbitrary and illogical they may seem to minds which have been trained in another school. And as each language has its laws and idioms, there may be, so to say, laws and idioms no less various of thought itself. Such laws it would be needful, as in the former case, to determine and follow implicitly, despite their possible semblance of arbitrariness; and this principle, be it remarked, is peculiarly applicable to the case of Messianic interpretations, which will next be considered.

IV. *Messianic Interpretations of the Old Testament.*

The views of modern Jewish commentators are more or less influenced by polemical bias against Christianity, and their trustworthiness is thus proportionately diminished. But their ante-Christian interpretations are of special value as expository of views actually held, even if in some cases they should seem to have been illogically evolved. The so-called Christian interpretations of the Old Testament are in many

cases adopted from ancient Jewish theology, and have come at length to be regarded as non-Judaic, only because Judaism has abandoned the position which it once held with respect to them. Rashi's oft-quoted saying on the Messianic interpretation of the second Psalm should be here adverted to. The antiquity of such an application is granted ; yet *to refute the heretics*, or Christians, it is well (urges he) to interpret it literally of David¹. But to view the matter generally, and apart from the consideration of special passages, there is the phenomenon in ancient Rabbinism of a widespread Messianic hope, derived professedly from the sacred writings, and entwined inextricably with the nation's political and religious life. And unless this phenomenon be taken into account, we can expect to arrive at none but a very meagre and partial understanding of the sacred writings wherein these Messianic anticipations centered.

Not a few of the partial and inadequate interpretations of Holy Scripture, which are accepted as the results of the highest criticism, are due in a measure to the refusal to treat the Bible like any other book : they arise in fact from the undue pressing of *a priori* theories, and an indisposition to allow due weight to the circumstances and modes of thought of those *by* and *for* whom its several parts were in the first instance composed. If the Messianic hope is altogether repudiated, as a natural consequence the Messianic element becomes imperceptible. But, on the other hand, if an all-pervading Messianic hope existed, it could not fail to suggest itself at every turn to those who lived under its influence ; and that, through the medium of words, symbols, and imagery, which in default of such anticipations might have conveyed a simply naturalistic meaning. And, as to a child or uneducated per-

רביתנו דרשו את הענין על מלך¹
המשיח ולפי משמעו ולתשובת המינים
נכון לפותרו על דוד. The clause itali-

cized (in the text) has been expunged in some later editions. [See Phillips *in loc.*] In the copy which I have before me the word המינים is crossed out.

son no more than a description of natural scenery may be apparent in an allegorical writing, where to one who lives in a higher sphere of thought a higher meaning is seen not only to exist but to have been designed ; so it is at any rate conceivable that to an ancient Jew, breathing an atmosphere of Messianic ideas, higher and 'non-natural' interpretations might be continually presenting themselves—interpretations albeit of which a later and unhistorical criticism could take no cognizance. Moreover, it would be difficult to limit the application of this principle ; nor were it fairly matter of surprise if each lesser stream should flow down to the main current of national thought.

In interpreting the writings say of a Greek dramatist, we should be prepared to admit the possibility of a new light being thrown by some freshly-discovered tradition upon a word or phrase which had occasioned no grammatical difficulty, and of which the full meaning had been supposed known : whereas in fact the *allusion*, and with it the secondary and yet principal meaning of the word or phrase, may have lain buried in oblivion, to be exhumed only upon the revival of the tradition, which gives the peculiar combination of circumstances and the state of feeling to which allusion is made. Nor would it be difficult to find sayings and turns of expression now in vogue which exercise a real influence in the present, but would lose at once their chief and indirect meaning, if their traditional explanation were forgotten ; while yet perhaps remaining grammatically intelligible, and appearing to convey no more than their surface meaning. Let a like principle be applied to the Old Testament Scriptures, and it would be granted, that even if such and such utterances should seem exactly correspondent to, and fulfilled in, contemporary events, they may yet have conveyed to the existing generation a further Messianic reference. If moreover it should appear, on the same principle, that the secondary reference may have been more or less directly contemplated

by the Prophet from whose mouth the utterance proceeded ; can we rightly affirm that the barely grammatical rendering is alone true and sufficient ? Would it not be more rational to allow for the potential existence in the past of some *idiom of thought* which is unrecognized by a later criticism ? Such considerations oppose themselves to negative *a priori* theories, and make it seem more reasonable that an interpreter should first make some attempt to enter into the spirit of the traditional exegesis, rather than at once cast aside its results without duly appreciating the methods by which they were attained. And be it added, that the idiosyncrasy of ancient Judaism was unique and unprecedented ; its theology in great measure self-interpreting : its hopes for the future of unexampled strength, and unlike those of any other nation which the world has seen. Their sacred writings were the nucleus of their hopes : these and those act and react on one another : and in some cases where their interpretations of Holy Scripture are especially forced, the very grotesqueness of the interpretation may testify to the strength of the antecedent conviction, whereof the origin remains to be accounted for.

Thus much on the importance of the older Jewish traditions, on which however it is not the aim of the present work to enlarge. The medium of citation will next be considered. Are the citations drawn always or in general from the Septuagint Version, with or without an invariable reservation in favour of the original ? Or are they drawn at times from the Hebrew, and at times independently from the Greek ?

V. *On Citation from the Septuagint.*

I. It is soon found that the citations are for the most part no exact transcripts from the LXX., with which however their language has the greatest affinity ; neither are they independent literal renderings of the Hebrew in all cases in which the LXX. fails to represent the meaning of the original.

It is the discovery of no late age, but has been explicitly stated by Christian Hebraists of old, that the Apostles refer in general to the purport of the passages adduced, rather than to the separate words of the original, or to any authorized and accepted version of it. Thus St Jerome: 'Et hoc in omnibus Scripturis sanctis observandum est, Apostolos et Apostolicos viros, in ponendis testimoniis de Veteri Testamento, non verba considerare, sed sensum, nec eadem sermonum calcare vestigia dummodo a sententiis non recedant.' In exceptional cases, it is true, that slight verbal discrepancies may give rise to disproportionate variations in the sense; but for the most part, it might be anticipated—and the comparison of extant versions will bear out the surmise—that a oneness of general meaning is consistent with a palpable variety of detail. 'The nature and teaching of prophecy may be collected from any tolerable version: and therefore the Apostles, guided from above, did not perplex the Gentiles by discussing the differences between the LXX. and the Hebrew text, but wisely used and sanctioned the use of that Greek Version, which they found providentially prepared¹.' The neglect or insufficient appreciation of the phenomena which the above quotations recognize, goes hand in hand with a trifling and unsound exegesis whereby the weightiest matters are postponed to a formal agreement in minutiae. There is in fact a more or less clearly defined tendency sometimes observable, to regard that as the most complete harmony, wherein the maximum number of separate words are forced this way or that into an outward correspondence, while the spirit of the original may be altogether missed. But the wide divergence from Hebrew and Septuagint alike which is found in no few of the New Testament citations from the Old, is in itself (may we not affirm?) the source of no insuperable difficulty; for such divergence (as has been well remarked) is no

¹ *Aids to Faith*, Essay III.

sure sign of unfamiliarity, but is consistent with the fullest comprehension of the writings quoted. A writer drawing illustrations from works in a strange and unfamiliar language would be the more careful to transcribe with accuracy, in proportion to his consciousness of liability to err and misrepresent; and thus his very exactness might argue the insecurity or limitation of his knowledge, by shewing the necessity that he is under of taking heed to his goings at every step. The like may be said of writings which are not indeed in a strange language, but are more or less imperfectly understood. And conversely the verbal inexactness of a citation, or the bold abruptness of an adaptation, may be due to the just licence of a minute and comprehensive knowledge. The least direct allusion testifies to the firmest grasp and appreciation of a subject; and a writer must have made a predecessor's thoughts his own, before he can subtly interweave the old with the new, combining harmoniously in one texture their diverse and distinct lines of thought and argument. The casual mention of a name may imply an acquaintance with the history of a period: a single word may be the embodiment of a thought which ages have toiled in vain to define and comprehend. Inexactness of citation would seem then to carry with it no sure proof of unfamiliarity with the documents or the subject matter alluded to, but might in some cases even point to a directly opposite conclusion.

2. But it may be asked further, to what extent the LXX. is authorized and approved by its frequent use as a medium of citation from the Hebrew Scriptures: and to this it may be answered that, so long as the question is one of grammar and philology alone, there would seem to be no reason for the assumption that the LXX. rendering of a passage is to be pronounced accurate on the ground of its having been adopted by Apostles or Evangelists. Much less are we compelled to think the general exactness of the LXX. Version guaranteed by the frequent occurrence of Septuagintal citations. Further

remarks on the LXX. will be found in Chapter xv. Meanwhile we proceed to notice some points which affect the purity and preservation of the Hebrew text.

VI. *On the Preservation of the Hebrew Text.*

The absolute purity of the Masoretic text is not asserted even by so stout a champion of the *Hebraica Veritas* as the author of the *Anticritica*—the younger Buxtorf. Nor is perfection claimed by the Masora itself, as is shewn by the appearance in our Hebrew Bibles of various readings; though in most cases, it is true, the variations are of slight magnitude, not to say infinitesimal. But there is evidence that the text has been guarded with a singular scrupulosity, the extent whereof may perhaps be gathered from the minute directions to the copyist which are found in the notes of the Masora. Not only the verses of the several books, but the very letters would seem to have been counted¹. Some traces of this numbering of the letters still remain. Thus the elongated *Vau* of Lev. xi. 42 is characterized in a note as the middle letter of the Pentateuch; and it is further remarked in the Talmud, that the suspended *Ayin* of Ps. lxxx. 14 is the medial letter of the Book of Psalms. More than this, there is extant a metrical composition, attributed to Saadiah², which gives the number of times that each letter of the Hebrew alphabet occurs in the Bible.

Particular letters again are written larger or smaller than the average; while some are suspended (as already exemplified), and others inverted, or marked mysteriously with dots: nor does the Masora omit to chronicle these and other the most minute peculiarities. What was originally intended by these typographical eccentricities does not now appear; for although there are diverse floating traditions upon the various

¹ Buxtorf quotes from *Qiddushin*,
I. 30 a derivation of the name *Sopherim*
from this numbering of the letters.

לפיכך נקראו ראשונים סופרים שהיו
סופרים כל אותיות שבתורה:

² Buxtorf, *Tiberias*, Cap. XVIII.

points, these might well have been invented to solve the mystery. What (we might ask) is the meaning of the small *He* in Gen. ii. 4: 'These are the generations of the heavens and the earth *when they were created*'? What again of the diminutive *Yod* in Deut. xxxii. 18: 'Of the Rock that begat thee thou art unmindful'? The one signifies that all created things must wane and perish; or, perhaps, that they must be *dissolved*, seeing that the letter ך is discontinuous. The other signifies, 'ut vix exigua illius Rupis memoria in populo extaret;' and further points to the 'decem tribuum defectio,' *ten* being the numerical value of the letter *Yod*! But others have conjectured that these peculiarities are connected with the numeration of the letters; a view which is in a measure borne out by two facts above mentioned, that an elongated letter marks the middle of the Pentateuch, and a suspended letter the middle of the Psalms.

From the above it might be conjectured, that the Hebrew text was likely to enjoy a comparative immunity from accidental corruption after the Masoretic recension, and that its chief presumed blemishes must have been contracted at some earlier period. But it may be urged with much plausibility that accidental errors were unlikely to insinuate themselves during the Christian era, and before the great recension, which would seem to have been a product of the activity of the time preceding. It has been argued in the first place that the Masoretic precautions were of high antiquity, and not devised for the occasion; and as evidence of this Buxtorf refers to the context of the passage above cited from *Qiddushhn*, where the middle letter, word, and verse of the Pentateuch, together with the middle verse and letter of the Psalms, are mentioned; these precautions being declared ancient in comparison with the Talmud itself by the terms in which scribes who used them are referred to¹.

¹ They are called ראשונים. See *Tiberias*, p. 44.

These facts have been thought by some to make the risk of accidental corruption very remote ; but it should be added, that at the period now in question the attitude of Rabbinism was signally controversial, as against Christianity, and that this would naturally tend to an increase of vigilance, which would still further remove the probability of accidental deterioration in the text of the Hebrew Scriptures. On the other hand, there are some considerations which militate against the hypothesis that changes were introduced wilfully, with controversial aim.

(1.) The arguments of Christians were drawn mostly from the Septuagint, which would seem to render a change in the Hebrew text, so to say, unnecessary for the purpose of refutation. (2.) The great care bestowed upon the text was the sign of a real though often misapplied reverence for the very letters of Holy Scripture—a reverence which affords a strong argument against the hypothesis of wilful corruption. ‘There is not in the Law a single letter whereon great mountains depend not ;’ and ‘if thou subtract or add a letter, thou art found to destroy the whole world.’ But (3), the singularity of the methods by which the scribe was trained to evolve unsuspected meanings from the sacred page, is perhaps the most striking evidence of the stability of the text itself : and more than this, the probability that alterations would be made deliberately, is inversely proportional (might we not say?) to the facility wherewith any desired or conceivable meaning could be extracted from the text as it stood. Some of these methods we proceed to notice.—

VII. *On some Cabbalistic Interpretations.*

1. What more pregnant with idle fancies, while yet testifying to an anxious custody of the literal text, than the principle of numerical equivalence? Each letter in Hebrew, as in Greek, represents a number ; every word, viewed as the sum of its constituent letters, has a numerical value : and for

any word may be substituted one of equal value¹. Thus the *one* language of Gen. xi. 1 becomes the *sacred*² tongue. On the same principle we may read, not: 'Rebekah *his* wife conceived' (Gen. xxv. 21), but 'Rebekah conceived *fire and stubble*,' *i.e.* *Jacob and Esau*; for is it not said that 'the house of Jacob shall be a *fire*...and the house of Esau for *stubble*' (Obad. 18)? The words 'till *Shiloh* come' (Gen. xlix. 10) refer, still on this principle, to the *Messiah*.

Two other methods of substitution, which will next be considered, have been thought to occur in the writings of Isaiah and Jeremiah respectively.

2. According to one of these methods, the letters of the alphabet, taken in their natural order, are divided into two sets of eleven, and any letter out of one set may be interchanged with that which holds a corresponding place in other. Thus *Aleph*, the first letter of the alphabet may be interchanged with *Lamed*, which begins its latter half: *Beth*, the second letter of the alphabet, with *Mem*, which follows *Lamed*: and so with the remaining letters taken in order. This method, which is styled *albam* (a word containing the four letters specified, and thus representing the principle on which the interchange proceeds), is thought to have been used in Is. vii. 6, as a cipher-writing; the name *Tabeal* becoming *Remaliah*³, if treated by this method.

3. By another species of substitution, *athbash*, Babylon is thought to be disguised under the form *Sheshach* (Jer. xxv. 26; li. 41). This method is of the same nature as the preceding; the difference being, that the letters in the two halves of the alphabet are numbered in opposite directions, *viz.* from the extremities to the centre. Thus the central letters, *Caph* and *Lamed*, are interchangeable: the first letter, *Aleph*, may

¹ Compare the cipher-writing of 'שפה אחת' valet 794. Totidem לשון Rev. xiii. 18. 'הקדש.' But אחת=409=הקדש.

² Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.*, p. 447, states 'רמלא', not the Biblical form 'רמליהו'. He writes: 'רמליהו'.

be interchanged with the last, *Tau* ; the second, *Beth*, with the last but one, *Shin* ; and so on, as the name *athbash* is designed to intimate. But whether this method of cipher-writing was or was not used by Jeremiah, there is a palpable extravagance in the following application of it. In Ex. vi. 3, God thus speaks to Moses : ' And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God *Almighty*, but by my name *JEHOVAH* was I not known unto them ;' the truth of which statement is mystically represented by the circumstance, that if the word formed by combining the last letters of the names Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, be transformed by the process *athbash*, there results the name, *Almighty*¹, by which God revealed Himself to the three patriarchs.

4. Sometimes again a single word is resolved into several, each of its letters being taken to stand for an abbreviation of a word. And very often a new meaning is imported into a verse or phrase by a change of pointing ; which is not however to be viewed as an alteration of the text, but as a way of extracting from it a collateral meaning, over and above that which is its acknowledged primary meaning. Such changes are perpetually occurring. Does the Scripture say, ' The *lambs* are for thy clothing ' ?—Read not *lambs* but *secrets* ; and the meaning will be, that the mysteries of the universe should be for thy clothing, *i.e.* for thyself alone, and not to be discussed before many people². And again, to him who joins heartily in the response *Amen* the gates of Paradise are open. ' Open the gates ' writes Isaiah ' that the righteous nation which keepeth *the truth* [read *Amens*] may enter in ' (Is. xxvi. 2). Such examples might be multiplied indefinitely ; but the preceding are enough to illustrate the Jewish Doctor's versatility in extracting desired meanings from the sacred page,

¹ אֱלֹהִים *i.e.* becomes אֱלֹהִים. Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.*

² Bernard's *Maimonides*, p. 93.

and to diminish the plausibility of the hypothesis which has been hazarded, that the Hebrew Bible has undergone considerable changes at the hands of perplexed and daring controversialists.

VIII. *Further Remarks on the Preservation of the Hebrew Text.*

Thus far we have considered the probability of a deterioration in the text since the commencement of the Christian Era. But yet another question presents itself, viz. What was its previous condition? What was the state of its preservation at the coming of CHRIST?

It may be suggested in reply, that our LORD does not charge the Jews with any lack of care as regards the letter of Holy Writ, but credits them, on the contrary, with an excessive zeal in all the externals and minutiae of religious duty. They had not openly neglected the lively oracles, but had overlaid them with their traditions. One expression from amongst many deserves special notice. 'Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, *one jot or one tittle* shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled' (Matt. v. 18). 'And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one *tittle* of the law to fail' (Luke xvi. 17). The *jot* or *yod* is the smallest letter of the Hebrew alphabet, and the expression *tittle* alludes to the almost infinitesimal variations which distinguish certain of its consonants from others. The meaning intended to be conveyed is indeed a spiritual one; but its expression is comparable with extant Rabbinic sayings¹ whereby the need of accuracy in transcription is inculcated upon the scribe. And thus our Lord would seem to testify to the scrupulosity with which the text was then preserved, and to reassure such as doubted

¹ See p. xxiv.; and Lightfoot on Matt. v. 18.

of His purpose, by expressions which carry the thoughts at once to the form of the original Hebrew. To that text then lay the ultimate appeal: nor is it unreasonable to infer from our Lord's expressions, (1) that the Jews of that age were zealous custodians of the letter; and (2) that the text at that time was not replete with gross inaccuracies. The same truth which He inculcates might have been expressed had the Hebrew text been corrupt and the scribes indifferent; but it may at least be doubted whether the form actually used would have been chosen to express it. But however this may be, it appears that the Hebrew Scriptures have been guarded with an altogether unprecedented care, which must be taken into account when the accuracy of its readings is called in question. We now proceed to consider certain methods and principles applicable to the interpretation of the Old Testament.

IX. *On some Principles of Interpretation.*

Passages of the Old Testament are sometimes applied in the New with an apparent disregard of their original contexts; and although the citations which exhibit this phenomenon present many special and peculiar features, there are certain general principles of application, which must not be left unnoticed. Words of the Old Testament, which were spoken originally with a special reference, may be found not unfrequently applied in the New, with no very obvious traces of an allusion to the circumstances with which they were in the first instance conjoined. And not only so, but they seem to be credited with a true argumentative force in contexts the most diverse from those in which they originally stood. Argument and instruction for the future is found, where, at first sight, no more than a simply historical reference was discernible: the buried past is resuscitated: and words that were spoken of and to the men of one age are said to find their fulfilment in the history of another.

1. Under this head may be classed the whole scheme of prelusive 'types' (1 Cor. x. 11)—to retain a word which, from quasi-technical usage, has lost no little of its primitive vitality, and associates itself spontaneously, in some minds, with the idea of fanciful misapplication. And, in close connection with the preceding, may be mentioned the method of higher and spiritual applications, which, though natural enough with those who use it rightly, is shunned by many for its supposed taint of mysticism. In accordance with this method, a precept for guidance in common matters is claimed as an exponent of the highest mysteries—a process which, with unskilful handling, may lead doubtless to extravagances of exegesis, but which, if judiciously applied, will seem arbitrary and unsound only when the true relations of the higher and the lower are overlooked.

2. The propriety of citation without reference to the original context is sufficiently obvious in certain cases; when for example the words cited contain a statement of a general principle, which is applied indeed to special circumstances, or exemplified therein, but in no wise restricted to that or any one occasion. An example of this is found in the Gospel narrative of our Lord's temptation:

'And when the tempter came to Him, he said, If Thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread. But He answered and said, It is written, *Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God* (Deut. viii. 3). Then the devil taketh Him up into the holy city, and setteth Him on a pinnacle of the temple, and saith unto Him, If Thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down: for it is written, *He shall give His angels charge concerning Thee: and in their hands they shall bear Thee up, lest at any time Thou dash Thy foot against a stone* (Ps. xci. 11, 12). Jesus said unto him, It is written again, *Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God* (Deut. vi. 16). Again the devil taketh Him up into an exceeding high mountain, and shew-

eth Him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them; and saith unto Him, All these things will I give Thee, if Thou wilt fall down and worship me. Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve* (Deut. vi. 13). Then the devil leaveth Him, and, behold, angels came and ministered unto Him' (Matt. iv. 3—11; Luke iv. 3—13).

(a) The first of the above citations is an extract from a passage in which allusion is made to the forty years in the wilderness, the circumstances whereof were calculated to generate a spiritual frame of mind in the Israelites, and to wean them from overmuch reliance upon the things of sense. 'And He humbled thee, and suffered thee to hunger, and fed thee with manna, which thou knewest not, neither did thy fathers know: that He might make thee know that *man doth not live by bread only, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the LORD doth man live*' (Deut. viii. 3). The isolation of this general principle from its special context is too obviously natural to need more than a passing notice.

(b) The citation from Ps. xci. describes in general terms God's care for the ideal Righteous One; and over against it our Lord sets another citation from the book of Deuteronomy, detached, like the former, from its original reference; or rather, as it would be more correct to say, He *applies* the words there spoken (plurally) to an individual case. In the original it is said: 'Ye shall not tempt the LORD your God, *as ye tempted Him in Massah*' (Deut. vi. 16). This application likewise occasions no difficulty, for it is sufficiently obvious that the principle enounced, being general, will bear isolation from any special context in which it may occur. In the originals we find special exemplifications of general principles, and the attendant circumstances exhibit concretely, or are 'types' of, abstract truth. 'All these things happened unto them for examples: and they are written for our admo-

nition, upon whom the ends of the world are come' (1 Cor. x. 11). (c) The citation from Deut. vi. 13 calls for notice only in respect of a slight verbal alteration (*worship* taking the place of *fear* or *reverence*), which is adopted as more closely correspondent to the form of the temptation, to 'fall down and *worship* me.'

3. The conversion of history into prophecy commends itself very readily to the thinking mind; for, if from an actual occurrence a law or principle can be gathered, it is needful only to assume the stability of the law or principle, in order to predict the same or like results when an analogous combination recurs. Thus, the inspired writers argue, not seldom, from a circumstance to a principle, and thence to a recurrence, seeing that with God 'is no variableness, neither shadow of turning' (James i. 17).

4. As general results are thus gathered from special facts, so they may be gathered likewise from special precepts. Thus St Paul does not hesitate to generalize particular provisions of the Mosaic system, which might have been supposed to stop short at their special primary applications: and more than this, the higher application is put forward as axiomatic, with those at least who are well versed in Holy Scripture and its interpretation. To take for instance what has been denounced as a perverse misapplication, St Paul writing to Timothy quotes from Deut. xxv. 4: 'Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn' (1 Tim. v. 18); and in this precept sees a Divine authority for his injunction: 'Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour' (1 Tim. v. 17). The same precept is quoted elsewhere, and with an explanation which, though brief, is enough to justify the whole system of such higher applications. 'Who goeth a warfare at any time at his own charges? who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereof? or who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock? Say I these things as a man? or saith not the law the same also? For it

is written in the law of Moses, *Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn* (Deut. xxv. 4). Doth God take care for oxen? Or saith He it altogether for our sakes? For our sakes, no doubt, this is written: that he that ploweth should plow in hope; and that he that thresheth in hope should be partaker of his hope. If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things?' (1 Cor. ix. 7—11). It is sufficiently obvious that a single provision, like that in question, may evince the general tenour of the legislation, and serve as a 'type' of something which transcends itself, or be spiritually applied as by St Paul; nor that, without the sanction of Him who forearms His disciples against their coming trial, with a 'Fear ye not, therefore, ye are of more value than many sparrows' (Matt. x. 31; Luke xii. 7).

5. The method of spiritualization is analogous to that of teaching by Proverbs, which, though they may be propounded with limitations, are intended for guidance in all cases to which they can be applied. Nor is it necessary that sayings which differ from such proverbs in having been originally conjoined with an actual, and not merely conceivable, contingency, should, unlike the proverbs, be restricted rigorously, each to its special case. The precept quoted (*supra*) by St Paul serves to illustrate this remark, seeing that it is, in a manner, converse to the proverbial saying, that 'A righteous man regardeth the life of his beast' (Prov. xii. 10). The Precept, providing for external matters, manifests the benignity of the Legislator: the Proverb, presupposing a benignity of temperament, describes the form of its manifestation under special circumstances. This inversion is of course incidental, and not essential to the comparison between precept and proverb which it is adduced to illustrate. The main point to be observed is, that the Proverb sets forth a general principle by means of a particular manifestation, while an analogous special Precept serves for the groundwork of a like generality.

6. The spiritualization of history is analogous to the method of instruction by Parables, which are quasi-historical illustrations of principles. A significant historical narrative might be used as the groundwork of a parable: nor again would the generality of a parable be diminished by the supposition, which the uneducated sometimes make, that its externals are historical. From a narrative of facts, rightly interpreted, an underlying principle may be gathered: while, on the other hand, the parable undertakes to set forth the working of a principle by a special combination of facts and circumstances. The parable is commonly said—nor that wrongly—to be in a special manner the exponent of a *spiritual* truth; but we have preferred the more general term *principle* advisedly, seeing that it is the main characteristic of parables to compare spiritual things with natural, and to shew that one and the same principle is applicable to the twofold scheme of Nature and Grace. Parables are in fact arguments from analogy, and presuppose one Author and one *principle* in things natural and things spiritual.

The form of the Parable must be, as above assumed, quasi-historical; *i. e.* the circumstances and events described must be such as might exist or have happened, although it is not necessary that they should actually have occurred. Thus *e. g.* with the Parables of the Sower, the Ten Virgins, the Good Samaritan. But the expression *quasi-historical* must be taken in a broad sense, as relating not merely to the actions of men, but as including other and lower manifestations of natural laws. The growth of the Mustard-seed, and the working of the Leaven must not be omitted; nor can the animal creation be rightly passed by in the definition of a Parable. The 'proverb' quoted in 2 Pet. ii. 22, is implicitly a Parable; and Solomon's allusion to the ant (Prov. vi. 6) contains the two elements of a Parable, seeing that it is true to nature, and is the groundwork of a spiritual lesson. Perhaps then the PARABLE might be defined as *a natural illustration of a principle*, with special refer-

ence in all cases to the highest application of that principle ; or, if it be desired to *express* rather than to *imply* this main characteristic, we might modify the above form and say, that

A PARABLE is a natural illustration of a spiritual truth.

7. In the cases which have been considered, the link between the lower and the higher is a common principle—in type and parable ; in precept or history, and their spiritualized or mystical applications. One more principle of interpretation should not be left unnoticed. While the heathen poet dealt more especially with fiction, or looked back upon an imaginary golden age, the Prophet set his ideal in the future, and trusted to see his highest aspirations realized in the MESSIAH and Messianic times. Borrowing his imagery from the world around, he delineates, progressively with the vicissitudes of national life, the ideal SAVIOUR of the race ; and this conception, once grasped, could not fail to permeate and leaven the national thought, to an extent which could never be duly estimated by the mind into which the conception has not been infused. Once in existence, it must gather into itself all lesser thoughts, and lend a higher meaning to ceremonial and to life itself. Its influence is felt when common things are described in words that transcend the occasion : it is found a stumblingblock to the purely negative or naturalistic expositor : it has fostered in other schools the theory of a discontinuous ‘Double Sense.’ But how, humanly speaking, were spiritual ideas to be expressed, unless concretely, and with the aid of natural types ? How indeed does common language express mental processes, if not by metaphors and typifications, which assume an abstract form only when their origin has been forgotten ? And, again, if formal anachronism was to be avoided, how could prophecy but be embodied in the surroundings of the present ? Thus the seen and the unseen are blended harmoniously into one ; and the present becomes the germ which develops without let or pause into

the infinity of the future ; or the base and groundwork on which the higher thought is reared.

Thus much as regards general principles. We have next to address ourselves to the task of examining critically the several Citations from the Old Testament in the New ; and in doing this, we shall attempt to insulate each passage considered, with intent to determine the primary meaning of the Old and of the New, each without reference to the other. Sometimes indeed the original or the citation may involve an ambiguity which makes it necessary to view one of them in the light of the other, rather than to determine the meaning of each separately. But it more frequently happens that the separate conclusions are obtained with less difficulty, and that the most complex task is that of harmonizing the two conclusions. This the present work does not profess to do invariably ; nor is it involved in the conditions of our 'Critical Examination.' And thus, difficulties may sometimes be developed, and left unsurmounted : a received theory may be discredited : a common solution disturbed, and no conclusion surely established in its stead. But the development of objections is the first step towards their removal, and nothing is less conducive to the lasting settlement of a controversy than a too ready acquiescence in wavering theories. If then the investigation on which we now enter should threaten, in this or that detail, to disturb received conclusions, such an issue is neither to be wondered at, nor yet too hastily to be deprecated ; for do not reason and experience proclaim with consentient voice, that perturbations for a time inexplicable may be found at length to harmonize with the laws which they seemed to defy ; thus serving to develop our true but un-matured conceptions of truth, and guiding to the discovery of new worlds of thought ?

τελος νομου χριστος
πληρωμα νομου η αγαπη

*τί γάρ ἐστιν ὁ νόμος; εὐαγγέλιον προκατηγγεμένον.
τί δὲ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον; νόμος πεπληρωμένος.*

Novum Testamentum in Vetere latet :
Vetus Testamentum in Novo patet.

CHAPTER I.

I will have mercy, and not sacrifice.

Matt. ix. 13; xii. 7; Hos. vi. 6.

THE words ἔλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν are susceptible of two interpretations. In the one the mercy spoken of is divine; in the other human. The meaning may be either that God delights in the exercise of mercy, and 'willeth not the death of a sinner, but rather that he may turn from his wickedness and live;' or, that He delights to see in men a charitable consideration for their brethren's trials and infirmities, and that such a disposition is pleasing in His sight rather than the strictest conformity with outer law. It may indeed be said that the general principle which underlies the statement admits no less the second application than the first; but a closer investigation is desirable, for the words do not only link together the old dispensation and the new and express the inner meaning of all divine legislation, but have been applied by our Lord Himself to a special controversy which the lapse of eighteen centuries has failed to deprive of either interest or importance.

I. The saying is first quoted in Matt. ix. 13.

'And it came to pass, as Jesus sat at meat in the house, behold, many publicans and sinners came and sat down with Him and His disciples.

'And when the Pharisees saw it, they said unto His disciples, Why eateth your Master with publicans and sinners?

‘But when Jesus heard that, He said unto them, They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick.

‘But go ye and learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice: for I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance.’

The ‘mercy’ here spoken of, if human, must be the mercy of the publicans and sinners, or the mercy of the Pharisees, or lastly that of Christ regarded as subject to the law and exemplifying its complete fulfilment.

It cannot be the first, for it is obviously foreign to the Saviour’s purpose to describe those ‘publicans and sinners’ as other than truly sinners that have need to be called to the way of righteousness. He does not say ‘these publicans, though failing in outward observance, are yet your equals or superiors in mercy, that weightier matter of the law.’ He does not credit them with moral piety as a ground of acceptance despite their ritual deficiency, but implies that because they are sinners He calls them to repentance.

It cannot be the mercy of the Pharisees, unless, as seems improbable, the words are designed merely to silence the objectors, and have no bearing on the mutual relations of the sinners and their Guest. He does not say: ‘If you had understood the service wherein God delights the most, you would have sought to please Him by meekness and by mercy; by charitable judgment rather than by sharp censure of your brethren:’—for the words, thus meant, would contain a dismissal of the Pharisees with a reproof of their ignorance and self-righteousness, but would contribute nothing to the answer of the all-important question ‘Why eateth your Master with publicans and sinners?’

Against the third view, that the mercy is that whereby Christ in His humanity fulfils the Law, it may be urged that He is set forth in the context as an independent worker rather than as subject to ordinances. He is the great Physician, whose function, voluntarily chosen, is one of mercy. Sinners are those with whom He would associate. Their very sickness constitutes their claim.

The interpretation which makes the mercy spoken of divine seems most appropriate. The Pharisees are surprised that one claiming to be an exponent of the divine will should thus mingle with the outcasts of society, rather than leave them to the contempt and ruin which seemed most consonant with the purpose of the law. It was thought that the evil consequences which flow from the breaking of God's law must in themselves be well pleasing to the Lawgiver, and it had not occurred to the objectors that such consequences might be remedial. In the answer, mercy is fitly contrasted with sacrifice, and it is declared that God delights in 'showing mercy' and pity,' rather than in the exaction of pain and suffering, which are merely retributive. This then explains why the divine Healer should have risked, as it seemed, the defilement of evil companionship, and set before Him as His worthiest aim the calling of sinners to repentance.

Two remarks may be added in confirmation of the above. The first arises from a consideration of the context. The question 'Why eateth your Master with publicans and sinners?' being disposed of, 'then came to Him the disciples of John, saying, Why do we and the Pharisees fast oft, but thy disciples fast not?' or in the phraseology of St Luke (v. 33), 'but thine eat and drink.' The sequence is a natural one, on the supposition that the answer to the first question has direct reference to the divine purpose in the recovery of the lost. Why eat with publicans and sinners? Because 'I will have mercy.' But why eat at all? Why elect a social life in contradistinction to the asceticism of John? This second difficulty has respect to outward observances, and would have been in a measure anticipated by the commonly received solution of the first. If, however, the first answer has no direct bearing on the like outward observ-

¹ Stier contends for this application of *ἔλεος*, but dwells upon a different aspect of *θυσία*. God delights to show mercy: to give grace rather than to receive oblations. For other usages of

sacrifice compare Ps. li. 17; Is. xxxiv. 6. 'The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit.' 'The Lord hath a sacrifice in Bozrah, and a great slaughter in the land of Idumea.'

ances, then the second question follows as a natural supplement to the first.

Lastly, there is a significant omission of the Greek article, which has been dwelt upon by Stier, but is unrepresented in the Authorized Version. Not *saints but sinners* would be more exact than our English rendering, I came not to call '*the* righteous but sinners' to repentance. The article before *δικαίους* would imply that there were some to whom the term righteous was applicable or applied. The article before *ἀμαρτωλούς* would imply that there were some to whom the term sinners was inapplicable. Its omission seems at variance with that '*ironica concessio*' which our Lord's answer has been thought to convey.

By SS. Mark and Luke the citation is omitted. 'They that are whole need not a physician; but they that are sick. I came not to call *the* righteous but sinners to repentance' (Mark ii. 17; Luke v. 31, 32). There is first a statement of a well-known proverb, and next a spiritual application. It is the sick that have need of a physician: therefore to call sinners is the purpose of my coming. St Matthew records the answer more at length. The sick have need: it is the divine will that mercy should be shown those who need: and this explains why the divine Healer should be found with those whose souls are sick with sin.

II. The citation recurs in Matt. xii. 7, in answer to the charge that the disciples did that which it was not lawful to do upon the Sabbath day, when they 'were an hungred, and began to pluck the ears of corn, and to eat.' It is shown by the example of David, that such apparent illegalities were not invariably condemned by those self-same Pharisees, and further it is proved by words of Scripture that the disciples were guiltless and the Pharisees ignorant of the law.

'Have ye not read what David did, when he was an hungred, and they that were with him;

'How he entered into the house of God, and did eat the shewbread, which was not lawful for him to eat, neither for them which were with him, but only for the priests?

‘But if ye had known what this meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless.’

‘If with all their searching into the Scripture, all their busy scrutiny of its letter, they had ever so entered into the spirit of that law whereof they professed to be the jealous guardians and faithful interpreters, as to understand that Scripture, they would not have blamed them in whom no true blame can be found¹.’

The interpretation which makes the mercy spoken of that charitableness whereby the Pharisees should have sought to please God—‘rather than in the way of sharp and severe censure of their brethren’—but ill accords with the implication that the disciples were absolutely guiltless. A second interpretation, which attributes the mercy to the disciples, has indeed a direct bearing upon the legality of their conduct, the real point at issue:—‘If you had truly understood what God asks of men, what service of theirs pleases Him best, you would have understood that my disciples were offering that, who in true love and pity for perishing souls had so laboured and toiled as to go without their necessary food, being thus obliged to satisfy the cravings of a present hunger; you would have owned that their loving transgression was better than many a man’s cold and heartless clinging to the letter of the commandment¹.’ But to this it may be objected that it gives undue prominence to the disciples’ previous conduct, and thus mars the applicability of the historical parallel, wherein David’s act is viewed by the light not of his previous conduct but of his present need. ‘Have ye never read what David did, when he had need, and was an hungred, he, and they that were with him?’ (Mark ii. 25).

It remains to regard the mercy as God’s mercy; an application which seems to satisfy the general requirements of the passage, and well suits the immediate context of the citation.

¹ Trench, *On the Miracles*.

‘But if ye had known what this meaneth, I will have mercy, and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless.

‘For the Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath day :’

Where the last verse is a conclusion from the saying, quoted only by St Mark,—

‘The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath’ (ii. 27).

That the Sabbath should thus be for man, not man for the Sabbath, is a single exemplification of the truth that God wills mercy and not sacrifice :—that man’s well-being is the purpose of God’s law. He delights not to exact the penalty of non-fulfilment, nor to accept as meritorious the bearing of arbitrarily imposed burdens. But His delight is to show mercy, and He requires obedience as a means no less than a condition of the subject’s well-being. If then it should seem that a fulfilment of Divine law is at variance with man’s highest good, we may rest assured either that the seeming evil is not real, or that we have misinterpreted the law and wrongly judged that such and such sacrifices are required. A conclusion here specially applied, but universal in its bearing, which cuts at the root of all blind self-sacrifice, and shows that God’s laws are not mere aimless and arbitrary enactments, even though to beings of a finite capacity they should so appear.

A clause peculiar to St Matthew has yet to be considered.

‘Or have ye not read in the law, how that on the Sabbath days the priests in the temple profane the Sabbath, and are blameless ?

‘But I say unto you, That in this place is one greater than the temple’ (xii. 5, 6).

These verses seem to comprise in themselves an argument altogether distinct from that which is founded upon

the example of David, and unconnected with the principle enunciated in the following verse :—

‘I will have mercy and not sacrifice.’

If the priests engaged in the temple service may profane the Sabbath and be blameless, how much more these disciples ‘in their appointed following of Him who is greater than the Temple, the true Temple of God on earth, the Son of Man.’ The whole passage thus presents an example of that introverted parallelism so congenial to the Hebrew style; the sixth and seventh verses corresponding respectively to the fifth and fourth. Allusion is first made (v. 4) to the act of David, and next (v. 5) to the priests in their public ministrations. The sixth verse follows as a sequel to that immediately preceding, and the seventh enunciates a general principle having a special application to the example recorded in the fourth. ‘But if ye had realized that God’s laws are made in mercy and not arbitrarily, and in particular that the Sabbath was designed to be not a burden, but a benefit, ye would not thus have condemned the guiltless.’

The disciples were doubly right. As David’s act was justified by his absolute need, without reference to any service in which he was engaged, so the disciples were right in acting as they did, because ‘they had need and were an hungred,’ and that without reference to the service of Christ wherein they were engaged. And secondly, as the priests were authorized and required to disregard the general law of the Sabbath so far as might be necessary for the temple service, the disciples in like manner were justified by the exigencies of Christ’s service, independently of any wants incidental to themselves.

The exception in favour of the temple service might have been viewed as an exaltation of ritual requirements above the general law of the Sabbath; and this is in a manner confirmatory of the opinion that no direct contrast

between the ritual and the spiritual, between 'Charity and Churchgoing',¹ is intended.

It may be added that the argument as above expounded, far from being apologetic or deprecatory, contains an uncompromising assertion of the disciples' innocence, and may therefore be the more fitly coordinated with such arguments on the same topic, elsewhere recorded, as

'My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.'

'I must work the works of Him that sent me while it is day.'

'Is it lawful to do good on the Sabbath day or to do evil? to save life or to destroy?'

III. The original context of the saying, 'I desire mercy, and not sacrifice,' will next engage attention.

The words, 'Come and let us return...', which in the Authorized Version commence the sixth chapter of Hosea, are best read, as by the LXX, in close connexion with the last words of the fifth.

'For I will be unto Ephraim as a lion, and as a young lion to the house of Judah: I, even I, will tear and go away; I will take away, and none shall rescue him.

'I will go and return to my place, till they acknowledge their offence, and seek my face: in their affliction they will seek me early, *saying*; (v. 14, 15)

'Come and let us return unto the Lord: for He hath torn, and He will heal us; He hath smitten, and He will bind us up.

'After two days will He revive us: in the third day He will raise us up, and we shall live in His sight.

'Then shall we know, if we follow on to know the Lord: His going forth is prepared as the morning; and He shall

¹ Pusey on Hosea vi. 5.

come unto us as the rain, as the latter and former rain unto the earth' (vi. 1—3).

Where God is represented—under the figure of a lion carrying off prey to his den—as having decreed the punishment of His people till such time as, in their affliction, they should reason one with another ;

'Come and let us return unto the Lord: for He hath torn, and He will heal us; He hath smitten, and He will bind us up.'

As the passage which follows is of considerable difficulty, it may be well first to state the received interpretation, and next to consider whether another be not in some ways preferable.

The third verse precedes the address:

'O Ephraim, what shall I do unto thee? O Judah, what shall I do unto thee? for your goodness¹ is as a morning cloud, and as the early dew it goeth away.

'Therefore have I hewed them by the prophets; I have slain them by the words of my mouth: and thy judgments are as the light that goeth forth.

'For I desired mercy, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt-offerings.'

The 'mercy' spoken of is that essential piety² which God prefers to outward worship. The unstedfastness of Ephraim and Judah was the sole cause of the evil that had come upon them. And seeing that they were not unwarned, but all kinds of severe discipline had been tried in vain, the justice of God's judgments would be clear as the light of day. 'Thy judgments, *O my people*, shall be as the light that goeth forth:' or, with the reading of the LXX, 'My judgment³ shall go forth as the light.'

¹ *חֶסֶד*, or mercy, is here taken in the secondary sense of moral goodness.

² 'Uti et Chaldæus expressit: *nam iis qui pietatem exercent magis delector quam sacrificiis.*'

³ *משפטי אור* for *משפטי כאור* There is a reading *σου*. See Holmes and Parsons' edition of the Septuagint.

Exception is taken to the received reading on account of its sudden trans-

The following is an alternative rendering, which will afterwards be considered in detail.

God has been represented as awaiting the time when in their affliction Ephraim and Judah should seek Him early¹, with the full confidence of finding Him. 'His going forth is certain as the dawn's'; and He shall come unto us as the rain, as the latter and former rain unto the earth.' But while sure as the dawn, their opportunity would soon pass away.

'O Ephraim, what shall I do for thee²? O Judah, what shall I do for thee? for *your mercy*³ (or proffered grace) is as the morning cloud, and as the dew that early goeth away.

'Therefore have I smitten the prophets⁴; I have slain them by the words of my mouth; that thy impending judgments might be manifest, *might go forth*⁵ light.

'For I desire mercy (towards thee), and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings.' (vi. 4—6.)

That the saying 'I desire mercy' may indicate God's gracious disposition towards men rather than his requirements from them, is shown by the recurrence of the combination in Micah vii. 18, where the context clearly defines the meaning.

'Who is a God like unto Thee, that pardoneth iniquity, and passeth by the transgression of the remnant of his heritage? He retaineth not His anger for ever, because He delighteth in mercy⁶.'

The mercy then which God declares by Hosea that He desires, may be that which He would bestow upon His people. And again '*your mercy*' (vi. 4) may be the mercy of which you are the objects, in strict accordance with the analogies

'They that observe lying vanities forsake *their own* mercy.'
Jonah ii. 9.

itions in person and number. 'Your goodness is as a morning cloud. Therefore I have hewed them by the prophets. Thy judgments are as the light that goeth forth.'

¹ See Note 1, p. 13.

² See Note 2, p. 13.

³ See Note 3, p. 13.

⁴ See Note 4, p. 13.

⁵ See Note 5, p. 15.

⁶ הוֹאֵל חַסְדִּיךָ כִּי יִשְׁלַח אֶת הַלְּוִיִּם, ὅτι θελήσῃς
ἐλέους ἐστίν.

‘For as ye in times past have not believed God, yet have now obtained mercy through their unbelief :

‘Even so have these also now not believed, that through *your* mercy they also may obtain mercy.’ Rom. xi. 30, 31.

The disputed passage would thus signify that every means had been tried to warn Ephraim and Judah of their danger, and so turn them from their evil ways ere yet their day of grace had passed. ‘Therefore did I smite the prophets; I slew them by the words of my mouth; I spared them not, but sacrificed them for thy warning, that thy impending judgments might be as clear as day. All this because I desired mercy and not sacrifice; because I sought to recall thee to the knowledge of God rather than exact the full penalty and expiation of thy sins.’

This smiting of the prophets may be interpreted in diverse ways.

The word of the Lord¹ is ‘like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces’ (Jer. xxiii. 29), and the smiting may be that of lying prophets for encouraging a false security; or secondly, such a smiting of truthful prophets as when ‘the Spirit of the Lord began to smite’ Samson, or when Daniel ‘was grieved in his spirit in the midst of his body, and the visions of his head troubled him.’ Or again, the divine commission may have proved indirectly the destruction of the prophets, by exposing them to the fury of the people whose sins they denounced; as for example, when ‘the Spirit of God came upon Zechariah...and they conspired against him, and stoned him with stones.’ 2 Chron. xxiv. 20, 21.

The last interpretation developes a striking parallelism between Hos. vi. 4—6, and the Saviour’s lament over Jerusalem :

‘Wherefore, behold I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes : and some of them ye shall kill and crucify ; and some of them ye shall scourge in your synagogues, and persecute them from city to city.

¹ Compare Heb. iv. 12.

'That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias¹ son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar.

'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!' Matt. xxiii. 34, 35, 37.

The knowledge of God, viewed not as a qualification required of man, but as a blessing bestowed upon him from without, is well suited to stand in parallelism with the mercy which God desires to bestow. 'This is life eternal, that they may know Thee the only true God' (Joh. xvii. 3). And 'it is elsewhere promised as a great privilege of Christ's kingdom that then they should *all know the Lord*; and as a great blessing that He would *give them an heart to know Him*.'²

The same 'mercy' and 'knowledge' serve in an earlier chapter of Hosea for complementary expressions of God's grace³; 'And I will betroth thee unto me for ever; yea, I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness, and in judgment, and in *loving-kindness*, and in mercies.

'I will even betroth thee unto me in faithfulness: and thou shalt *know* the Lord.' (ii. 19, 20.)

The dew moreover (vi. 4) most fitly represents that divine grace, which had already been compared with 'the latter and former rain,' and is now likened, for transitoriness, 'to the early dew that goeth away.' The first comparison is tacitly approved, but the emphasis is on the supplementary consideration of evanescence. I will indeed be as the dew to Israel (xiv. 5); as the early dew that goeth away. The same figure is used in xiii. 3, of the destruction of idolaters; 'Therefore shall they be as the morning cloud, and as the early dew that passeth away:' and if a similarity of application, here and in vi. 4, be

¹ See Note 6, p. 15.

² Pococke on Hosea vi. 3.

³ Stier on Matt. ix. 15—17. See also Note 7, p. 15.

presupposed, an argument, not indeed to be pressed, arises, for understanding the 'mercy,' in the latter passage, of transitory *opportunities*. 'So as that they were passive, not active, therein, and that mercy from God to them was by their fault hindered, and removed, and made ineffectual, as a morning cloud or dew dispelled or dried up by the sun endureth not.'

The three passages which predicate God's preference of mercy to sacrifice having now been considered separately, it has been seen that there are reasons for concluding that in each case the mercy is that which He would show to man, not that which He requires from man. There is, however, no necessity for concluding *a priori* that if this be the true interpretation in one case it must be so in the remaining two: for if God wills mercy absolutely, He will both act mercifully and regard with favour such human mercy as is the reflection of His own attribute. From either of these applications, through the intervention of the general principle, might well have been deduced the other.

NOTES ON CHAPTER I.

¹ 'In that last verse of the fifth chapter God saith, In their affliction **ישחרני**, *they will seek me early*, or, *in the morning*; and here they say His coming forth to them shall be prepared **בשחר**, *as the morning*, which well allude one to the other. They shall seek for Him as they that seek or desire the coming of the morning, and He will come to them as the morning, as certainly and as readily as the morning.' (Pococke.)

² **לך** to thee for thy good, as in Is. v. 4, 'What could have been done more to my vineyard (**לכרמי**)'

³ Stier notes a parallelism between *your* mercy and *thy* judgments, both of the possessive affixes being taken objectively.

⁴ This construction of **תצבתי** with the following **ב** had occurred

as worthy of *consideration*, and been applied as in text, before the writer had discovered that there was authority for adopting it. The LXX read in like manner, ἀπεθέρισα τοὺς προφῆτας ὑμῶν.

Pococke commends the exposition that to smite and slay by the prophets was to denounce judgment and destruction by them as messengers: 'yet because there are others backed with great authority both by Jews and Christians, it may not be inconvenient to give some account thereof; and that is of such who either taking no other notice of the preposition ב than as serving only to the construction of the verb without signifying anything, render it, *I have hewed the prophets and slain them by the words of my mouth*; or else so as to denote *in* or *among*, i. e. *some of* or *among* the prophets (קצת הנביאים, Aben Ezra); and so look not on the people but on the prophets as those whom he saith he had hewed; and those, either the true prophets, as some will (Kimchi), *viz.* to signify that he had put them to much trouble and labour in sending them to call upon them again and again, and that he had by so incessantly employing them even worn them out to death, yea, more than so, might be said really to have slain them, according to the known examples of Zachariah and Uriah, with others. Such may he be said to have slain by the words of his mouth, because they died for those words: or else, secondly, the false prophets, as others will, that so the meaning should be that it might not be to them for a pretence in their evil doings, that therefore he had cut off from among them those false guides, whom, saith Aben Ezra, because they had lied, and spake the words of their own mouth, God saith that he slew with the words of his mouth, if so be the Israelites would be converted, and not be any more seduced by such.'

The preposition ב may be used after verbs of striking, to denote the object or thing struck. The niphal of חצב is thus construed in Job xix. 24, Would that my words יִחַצְבוּן בַּצֵּיּוֹר, *might be graven into the rock*; and אִישׁ חֲצַב בְּהָר (2 Chron. ii. 1) should perhaps be rendered quarrymen, literally, *hewers into the mountain*.

With few exceptions חצב is followed by a simple accusative, and means to *form by hewing* rather than to smite destructively. The latter meaning may perhaps be appropriated to חצב construed with ב.

If the smiting be *by* the prophets, it may still be by way of warning, and the interpretation of חֲסֵד (vi. 6) as God's mercy may be retained.

⁵ **וּמִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ אֹר יָצָא**. The verb agrees with the singular 'light' by attraction. Another rendering is possible. 'All means have been tried to warn thee, *seeing that thy judgments shall go forth light*:' where the impending judgments are compared with the full, enduring day, in contradistinction to the grace which being neglected was so soon to be lost; 'seeing that your mercy is as the morning cloud, and as the early dew that goeth away.'

⁶ Dean Alford, commenting on the parallel passage in Luke xi. 49—51 (*Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡ σοφία τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶπεν.....ἐκζητηθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης*) remarks that 'the whole saying is a reference to 2 Chron. xxiv. 18—22. The words in our text are not indeed a *citation*, but an amplification of ver. 19 there—a paraphrase of them,—giving the true sense of what the wisdom of God intended by them.' The word *ἐκζητηθήσεται* refers to the **שׁוֹרֵר** of the original: 'The Lord look upon it and *require* it.' The LXX have, less exactly, *κρινάτω*.

The same commentator would thus account for the occurrence of *νίου Βαραχίου* in St Matthew's Gospel. It 'does not occur in Luke xi. 51, and perhaps was not uttered by the Lord Himself, but may have been inserted by mistake, as *Zacharias the prophet* was son of Barachiah. See Zech. i. 1.'

⁷ The declaration *ἔλεος θέλω...καὶ ἐπίγνωσιν θεοῦ* may be paraphrased in St Paul's words *πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωθῆναι καὶ εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν*. 1 Tim. ii. 4.

In His application of *θυσία* our Lord has been supposed to have regard to the ultimate significance of sacrificial offerings. Compare the use of *baptism*. Luke xii. 50.

CHAPTER II.

David himself calleth Him Lord.

Matt. xxii. 44; Mark xii. 36; Luke xx. 42; Ps. cx. 1.

THERE is a passage of Ezekiel which may be applied to remove the indefiniteness still clinging to some portions of the hundred and tenth Psalm; and less directly, to indicate the substratum of its imagery in the clause which has given occasion for perhaps the greatest divergence in critical exegesis and application, 'The dew of thy birth is of the womb of the morning.'

But first what is meant by that *rod of thy power* which the Lord should send out of Sion; and by the concluding verse, 'He shall drink of the brook by the way: therefore shall he lift up his head?'

The phrase 'rod of thy power' assumes at once that definiteness which at first it seems to lack, if the royal object of Jehovah's care be conceived of as a vine that *sends out* its boughs unto the sea and its branches unto the river; or as a stately tree planted by the water-side, whose leaf shall not wither, and 'whatsoever he doeth it shall prosper.' (Ps. lxxx. 11; i. 3.)

This *rod of power*¹ is then primarily a strong healthy shoot, but not to the exclusion of the meaning sceptre; for in

¹ An attempt should be made to preserve the double reference. Perhaps some such rendering as the subjoined might express it: 'The Lord make the sceptre of thy might to branch forth from Zion.'

Hebrew a word or phrase may be used not merely to convey its own proper and most obvious meaning, but at the same time more or less plainly to give intimation of a second. In the present case this idiom is well illustrated by the subjoined passage from Ezekiel, wherein the same phrase¹ is used expressly with this double meaning ;

'Thy mother is like a vine planted by the waters: she was fruitful and full of branches by reason of many waters.

'And she had *strong rods* for the sceptres of them that bare rule, and her stature was exalted among the thick branches, and she appeared in height with the multitude of her branches.

'But she was plucked up in fury: her strong rods were broken and withered; the fire consumed them.

'And now she is planted in the wilderness, in a dry and thirsty ground.

'And fire is gone out of a rod of her branches, which hath devoured her fruit, so that she hath no strong rod to be a sceptre to rule' (xix. 10—14).

As this vine was fruitful and full of branches, and her stature was exalted, by reason of many waters; so the tree in the Psalm was to be developed by an exuberance of moisture; it should drink of the brook by the way, and so flourish, and lift up its head on high².

The same image suggests an interpretation of the difficult third verse:

עַמָּךְ גִּדְּבַת בְּיוֹם חֵילְךָ •
בְּהִדְרֵי קֹרֶשׁ מִדָּחַם מִשְׁחָר
לְךָ טַל יִלְדָּתְךָ

The royal priest is depicted as on the day of the marshal-

¹ מַטֵּה עֵץ, strong rod, lit. rod of power.

² רֹאשׁ may be the top of *anything*, e.g. of the tower of Babel (Gen. xi. 4).

³ 'In the day of thy power:' i. e. of

חֵילְךָ, the mustering of thy *forces*. is in parallelism with יִלְדָּתְךָ, thy youth (an abstract noun to be understood concretely).

ling of his host. His people are a free rain¹ that comes copious and unbidden. 'In saintly glories' his youth around outshine the dew that glistens upon the herbage in the rising sun. He himself, the tree, is besprinkled with them as with the rain and dewdrops, which are, here and elsewhere, emblematic of lasting freshness and prosperity. Thus: 'My root was spread out by the waters, and the dew lay all night upon my branch. My glory was fresh in me, and my bow was renewed in my hand.' (Job xxix. 19, 20.)

The whole Psalm consists of a divine effatum alternating with utterances which are appropriated by the sacred writer. It is the latter who dwells expressly on the vision of slaughter; while to suppose that Jehovah again breaks silence in the last verse seems to add to the sublimity of the peaceful conclusion².

I. That Davidic authorship is claimed for the Psalm is allowed to be among the first and most natural inferences from our Lord's argumentative citation of its first verse. Is the balance of testimony in favour of this conclusion, or does it drive us to reconsider the justice of our inference?

The Psalm may well have been written from amid the glory and prosperity of David's reign, and there is a lack of internal evidence for a later date. Its age is limited in the other direction by a local allusion, from which it has even been inferred, and with some probability, that the occupation of Zion was still fresh in the memory of the writer. Thus much being granted, it would remain to consider whether the Psalm could have been spoken of David, and whether David could have spoken it. He could not have answered truly to the aspirations of the psalmist, whose praises if ascribed to

¹ נדבֹת parallel with טל. Compare נשם נדבֹת, Ps. lxviii. 10; בַּהֲתַנְדֵּב עָם, Jud. v. 2. See Mendelssohn's rendering, quoted by Phillips.

There is doubtless an allusion to their multiplicity as well as to the splendour of their array. Another com-

parison of a host to dew is supplied by Hushai's advice to Absalom, viz. 'that with his forces he should light upon David like the dew, and so surprise and overwhelm him.' 1 Sam. xvii. 12.

² See Note A, p. 26.

him would have been not merely hyperbolic in degree, but strange in kind; for there is force in the objection that priesthood, not to say eternal priesthood, could not have been predicated of David, while but slight evidence has been adduced for an opposite conclusion. He is said indeed to have offered burnt-offerings and peace-offerings on the procession of the ark to the tabernacle (2 Sam. vi. 13, 17), but in no other sense it would seem than did *all the congregation of Israel* that were assembled unto king Solomon before the ark (1 Kings viii. 5, 62—64). Such expressions do not necessarily exclude the ministrations of the regular priesthood, no more in fact, than Solomon's own building of the temple (ver. 19) was to exclude the intervention of artificers. Saul sinned in taking upon himself a priestly function, and on David devolved *the same office* as on his predecessor. 'And Saul said, Because I saw that thou camest not within the time appointed, I forced myself therefore, and offered a burnt-offering. And Samuel said to Saul, Thou hast done foolishly: thou hast not kept the commandment of the Lord thy God, which he commanded thee: for now would the Lord have established thy kingdom upon Israel for ever. But now thy kingdom shall not continue: the Lord hath sought him a man after his own heart, and the Lord hath commanded him to be captain over his people, because thou hast not kept that which the Lord commanded thee' (1 Sam. xiii. 11—13).

Whilst the king might not usurp this most characteristic of sacerdotal functions, it seems unnatural that there should be attributed to him another and a higher priestly office. If so the Psalm can contain no mere address to David personally¹. But can he, on the other hand, be conceived of as appropriating the utterances of the Psalm?

As a first, and that no extravagant postulate, it would have to be laid down, that David must be admitted to have embraced a more or less clear Messianic hope; having its starting point in the trust that his house would continue for ever before the Lord: 'For thou, O Lord God, hast spoken it:

¹ See Note B, p. 16.

and with thy blessing let the house of thy servant be blessed for ever' (2 Sam. vii. 29), and finding a loftier expression in his obscure 'last words,' which reflect so truly the unique imagery of the Psalm.

The *last words* (2 Sam. xxiii. 1—7) and the Psalm are oracular declarations', the latter of Jehovah, the former 'of David the son of Jesse, the man who was raised up on high, the anointed of the God of Jacob, the sweet psalmist of Israel.' Both alike refer their origin to the supreme source: 'The Lord said;' 'The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and His word was on my tongue.' Both enounce an immutable decree; 'He hath made with me an everlasting covenant, ordered in all things and sure;' 'The Lord hath sworn and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchizedek.' The God of Israel had promised him a righteous Ruler, the Rock of Israel had spoken. Like morning's light should He, the Sun, arise; nay in greater splendour than raindrops glistening at sunrise on the grass¹; more glorious than the dew from the womb of dawn².

Thus far we may not unnaturally think of David as the author of the Psalm. Nor would it be hard to account conjecturally for its most distinctive feature still remaining—the allusion viz. to Melchizedek.

Some have thought, for example, that in the bringing up of the ark to the tabernacle which he had prepared for it on Mount Zion, we must look 'for the secret impulse of David's song;' and that when he offered burnt-offerings and peace-offerings and blessed the people in the name of the Lord, he 'thus, though but in a passing and temporary manner, prefigured in his own person the union of the kingly and priestly offices.' The solemnities of such a time may have revived the august traditions of the site, and 'thus have helped David to understand how the true Ruler, Priest as well as King, should be Priest not after the ancient and venerable

¹ נאם.

² מִנְּחָה מִמֶּלֶךְ דָּוִד בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה. 2 Sam. xxiii. 4.

³ מִלְּפָנֶיךָ יְהוָה. Ps. cx. 3. Supply

לפניך.

order of Aaron, but after the order still more ancient and venerable of Melchizedek.' If however David 'offered' not in person but mediately, can he be said to have prefigured any joint discharge of regal and sacerdotal functions? In contrast with his own disabilities, rather than by way of comparison, he may have described the transcendent dignity of One to come.

II. David's twofold relation to the Messiah involves a difficulty which Christ thus propounds to his already baffled assailants.

'What think ye of Christ? whose Son is He? They say unto him, The Son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in Spirit call Him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool? If David then call Him Lord, how is He his Son?' (Matt. xxii. 42—45.)

The very natural inference that our Lord here introduces David as the actual speaker is not indeed invalidated by the hypothetical form of St Matthew's statement, but neither is it established by the *prima facie* directness of the parallel passages in SS. Mark and Luke (xii. 36, 37; xx. 41—44). If then the Davidic authorship be not directly affirmed, the implied sanction claimed for any theory on such a point must be evolved from the exigencies of the argument.

That King David in the Psalm addresses the Christ as Lord must have been granted by Christ's adversaries as undeniable; for how else could their silence be interpreted? But it has been doubted whether Christ himself does more than argue on the received hypothesis, and thus dismiss them with a more embarrassing dilemma than their utmost ingenuity had contrived for Him. We may deny, with Neander, that it would consist with the dignity of Christ to put questions with no higher aim than this; but that such an aim might well find place is made clear by a conspicuous example: 'And Jesus answered and said unto them, I also will ask you one thing, which if ye tell me, I in like manner

will tell you by what authority I do these things. The baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven or of men? And they reasoned with themselves, saying, If we shall say, From heaven; he will say unto us, Why did ye not then believe him? But if we shall say, Of men; we fear the people; for all hold John as a prophet. And they answered Jesus, and said, We cannot tell. And he said unto them, Neither tell I you by what authority I do these things' (Matt. xxi. 24—27).

With the question about John's baptism He was thus pleased to silence His opponents; and with like intent the question of the Messiah's lordship may have been propounded. Had His sole purpose been to silence gainsayers, our Lord's authority could not be claimed for the Davidic authorship. *They* even might be supposed to have harboured doubts upon the point which they were unwilling to discuss before the multitude. The last-mentioned hypothesis is made incredible by external testimony; but the exact nature of their difficulty is obscured by its very magnitude, which precluded all attempts to grapple with and overcome it: for 'no man was able to answer him a word, neither durst any man from that day forth ask him any more questions.'

The view that the authorship of the Psalm is left undetermined, although Christ looked far beyond the captious criticism of the moment, is a view that finds an advocate in the above-named commentator:

'Even though it be proved that David was not the author of the Psalm quoted, Christ's argument is not invalidated thereby. Its principal point is precisely that of the Psalm; the idea of the theocratic King, King and Priest at once, the one founded upon the other, raised up to God, and looking with calm assurance for the end of the conflict with His foes, and the triumphant establishment of His kingdom. This idea could never be realized in any *man*; it was a prophecy of Christ, and in Him it was fulfilled. This idea went forth necessarily from the spirit of the old dispensation and from the organic connexion of events in the old theocracy; it was

the blossom of a history and a religion that were, in their very essence, prophetic. In this regard it is matter of no moment whether David uttered the Psalm or not. History and interpretation perhaps may show that he did not. But whether it was a conscious prediction of the royal poet, or whether some other, in poetic but holy inspiration, seized upon this idea, the natural blossom and off-shoot of Judaism, and assigned it to an earthly monarch, although in its true sense it could never take shape and form in such a one—still it was *the* idea by which the Spirit, of which the inspired seer, whoever he may have been, was but the organ, pointed to Jesus. The only difference is that between conscious and unconscious prophecy. And if Christ really named David as the author of the Psalm, we are not reduced to the alternative of detracting from His infallibility and unconditional truthfulness, or else of admitting that David really wrote it. The question of the authorship was immaterial to His purpose; it was no part of His Divine calling to enter into such investigations; His teachings and His revelations lay in a very different sphere.'

Such is the opinion of Neander, who holds that the ascription to David is without significance: that Christ used the common title of the Psalm as 'the one to which His hearers were accustomed.' But if the Messiah's true dignity be deduced in the Gospel from His relation of superiority to David, it is far from obvious that the allusions to King David may be classed with things indifferent. Moreover, it is not certain that our Lord's aim is 'precisely that of the Psalm:' to present viz. as a portraiture of the Messiah what 'could never be realized in any man.'

Some thought one-sidedly of the Christ as 'the Son of David.' Others looked for such a predominance of the supernatural as was incompatible with the conditions of humanity; and against the latter it may have been no less his purpose to assert his claim to Messiahship, which they were indisposed to grant: 'We know this man whence he is: but when Christ cometh no man knoweth whence he is.' (Joh. vii. 27.)

It seems best to conclude that He purposed simultaneously to embarrass His opponents and to combine the current half-views of Christ in one harmonious whole. In so doing He goes beyond the scope of the Psalm, and assumes on other grounds that the Christ is David's Son. To perplex His opponents it was enough to assume, without sanctioning, their premises; but for His other purpose the authorship would seem to be a matter of no slight importance. Christ was David's Lord, and therefore higher than the highest of human kind. And, again, how can Christ be David's Lord and yet his Son? The argument would fail unless Christ be proved thus superior to *David*, and for the direct proof of His superiority it is essential that the words cited should have been used by David¹.

III. A Messianic reference is assumed in Heb. i. 13, where the Psalm is quoted as containing a direct address of Jehovah to Christ, and thus establishing His precedence of the angelic hierarchy: 'But to which of the angels said He at any time, Sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool? Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?' The same original has lent its form to the declaration in 1 Cor. xv. 25, that 'Christ must reign till He hath put all enemies under His feet,' although it is another Scripture (Psalm viii. 6) that is referred to for a direct authorization of the statement. In Heb. x. 12, 13, the finality of Christ's sacrifice is gathered from His undisturbed session at the right hand of God: 'But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God. From henceforth expecting till His enemies be made His footstool.' In Acts ii. 34, 35, St Peter cites the first verse of this Psalm at length, and makes the argument depend upon David's express admission that the Messiah's exaltation is superior to his own. 'For David is not ascended into the heavens: but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right

¹ See Note C, p. 26.

hand, until I make thy foes thy footstool.' St Peter stamps the Psalm as a prophetic utterance of David. Such is the reader's first impression; and it increases the difficulty of explaining it away to note as a characteristic of St Peter's method, that he presents to the Jews his hearers, 'rather the facts than the doctrines of the new dispensation; and insists not so much on the miraculous nature of those facts, as on their agreement with what he elsewhere calls the *more sure word of prophecy*' (2 Pet. i. 19); for in proportion to the logical effectiveness of an illustration is the strictness with which the words that introduce it are to be interpreted.

The fourth verse is quoted in Heb. vii. 21—28, where the superiority of Christ's priesthood to the Levitical is argued from the greater solemnity of His inauguration: 'For those priests were made without an oath; but this with an oath by him that said unto him, The Lord sware and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec;' and again from the unchangeableness of His office, for 'this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood....For the law maketh men high priests which have infirmity: but the word of the oath, which was since the law, maketh the Son, who is consecrated for evermore.' Christ's superseding of the Aaronic order was in harmony with the divine purpose; for that order was but appointed for a time, and as 'no man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron. So also Christ glorified not himself to be made an high priest;' but He who in the hundred and tenth Psalm thus addresses Him¹, 'Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.' (Heb. v. 5, 6.)

The meeting of Abraham and Melchizedek (Gen. xiv. 17—20) is referred to at the commencement of Heb. vii., and from the transactions of the occasion the typical pre-eminence of the latter is deduced. He blessed Abraham: to him Abraham, and Levi by implication, gave tithes of all: He was King of righteousness and King of peace: without

¹ See Note D, p. 27.

father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life ; but, made like unto the Son of God, he abideth a priest continually.

On the significance of his being without genealogy (*ἀγενεαλόγητος*), it may be remarked, that a certain mysteriousness is here claimed for Christ, the lack of which is declared, in a passage already quoted, to be fatal to His claims to the Messiahship. That 'when Christ cometh no man knoweth whence he is,' was one element in a popular conception of His advent ; but whether the writer here originates a corroborative inference or stamps with his approval a familiar argument, is a question which we must still leave undetermined.

NOTES ON CHAPTER II.

A. Other renderings leave the king toiling wearily after his enemies ; 'and in order to keep up his strength till he had fully accomplished his purpose, he quenches his thirst from the brook, as occasion may require.' (Phillips.)

Compare the description cited from Grotius by Rosenmüller:

... qui dum hostes persequitur, non quærit diversoria ut vino se refoveat, sed aqua contentus est, quam obiter et raptim sumit ex quovis, quem reperit, non fluvio tantum, sed et torrente.

B. David might be addressed as priest *representatively*, if the Psalm were mediately Messianic. Compare Bishop Horsley's note on Psalm xvi. 'The whole is uttered *in the character of the High-priest*. But with what propriety could David speak in that character, otherwise than prophetically ; in the hope of that priesthood which was to come into his family, in the person of his descendant ?'

C. David might thus have used the words even if they had been addressed in the first instance to himself. Nor would there be anything unnatural in such a transference, if the Psalm be supposed

to have been composed with a Messianic reference, and to have borrowed its form only from the circumstances of David.

To complete the cycle of hypothesis it may be added, in the words of Bishop Horsley, that of the Psalms 'the far greater part are a sort of dramatic ode, consisting of dialogues between persons sustaining certain characters;' and that the hundred and tenth Psalm may be a composition of some unknown inspired writer, who attributes the Psalm in general to David, in the same way that the Psalm attributes certain declarations to Jehovah. David's relation of inferiority to the Messiah is thus portrayed, and the argument in the Gospel may be supposed to assume that the words of the citation were by the Holy Spirit thus *put into the mouth of David*.

Interpretations which stop short with David or any temporal sovereign are excluded by considerations advanced in the text. The simplest solution is afforded by that interpretation which makes the words strictly David's. For the general question of Messianic reference, see *Introduction*.

D. An intervening reference to the second Psalm has been omitted: 'So also Christ glorified not himself to be made an High-priest; but he that said unto Him, *Thou art my Son, to-day have I begotten thee*. As he saith also in another place, Thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.' Compare the subjoined extract from Dean Alford's commentary:—

'It must be carefully observed that the writer does not adduce this text (Ps. ii. 7) as containing a direct proof of Christ's divine appointment to the High priesthood: that follows in the next verse: nor again does it merely assert without any close connexion that the same divine Person appointed Him High-priest, who said to Him, *Thou art my Son*: but it asserts that such divine appointment was wrapped up and already involved in that eternal generation to the Sonship which was declared in these words.'

CHAPTER III.

The Prophecy of Immanuel.

Isaiah vii. 14 ; Matth. i. 23.

IT is a perplexing task to assign the exact relation of the prophecy of Immanuel to contemporary history ; for that history has to be constructed from scattered notices wherein points of resemblance are so intermixed with points of difference, that commentators have not yet agreed whether to appropriate some of the most closely corresponding portions of the narrative to consecutive or to simultaneous events. We may, with some, regard the narrative of 2 Chron. xxviii. 5 as identical in its subject matter with the record of the second book of Kings (ch. xvi.) : or we may see pictured to us in the latter a combined action of Rezin king of Syria, and Pekah son of Remaliah king of Israel ; and in the former, distinct and independent inroads of the Israelite and Syrian monarchs. Perhaps the fact that either history claims to be supplemented by the other (2 Kings xvi. 19 ; 2 Chr. xxviii. 26), and the brief allusion (2 Kings xv. 37) to a commencement of Judah's troubles in the preceding reign, may suffice to establish at least a slight presumption that something more than one solitary onslaught may have taken place in the reign of Ahaz. But amid the overwhelming difficulties that beset the exact apportionment of times and seasons, it may be possible and sufficient to grasp somewhat of the circum-

stantial appropriateness of the prophecy, though we abandon the hope of assigning accurately the temporal order of events.

The youthful king was one that 'walked in the ways of the kings of Israel, and made also molten images for Baalim. Moreover he burnt incense in the valley of the son of Hinnom, and burnt his children in the fire. He sacrificed also and burnt incense in the high places, and on the hills, and under every green tree. Wherefore the Lord his God delivered him into the hand of the king of Syria. And he was also delivered into the hand of the king of Israel, who smote him with a great slaughter' (2 Chron. xxviii. 1—5). A knowledge of the way in which king and people bore themselves beneath the calamities that had come upon them, will be regarded as no unnecessary prelude to the right understanding of Isaiah's words: if at least it be assumed that each prophetic announcement was adapted to the circumstances of those to whom it was delivered.

The prophet, speaking as it seems of the collective Holy Land, records (ix. 13) that the people turned not to Him that smote them, neither would they seek the Lord of hosts; and he looks forward to the time when 'the remnant of Israel, and such as are escaped of the house of Jacob,' should 'no more again stay upon him that smote them' (only as an instrument), but should 'stay upon the Lord, the Holy One of Israel, in truth' (x. 20). The history, which had declared the troubles of Ahaz to be a retribution for his evil practices, states also that 'in the time of his distress did he trespass yet more against the Lord. For he sacrificed unto the gods of Damascus which smote him: and he said, Because the gods of the kings of Syria help them, therefore will I sacrifice to them, that they may help me' (2 Chron. xxviii. 22, 23). It can scarcely be imagined that Ahaz was first drawn to worship the Syrian idols (2 Kings xvi. 10) when they had been found powerless to protect 'the riches of Damascus.' It is more probable that, before obtaining assistance from Tiglath-pileser, he had striven to make his peace with them, and so by their help to escape the evils that he feared. He

had ceased to trust in the Holy One of Israel, and so refused to ask a sign or 'tempt the Lord' (Is. vii. 12).

If the sign was at length given in his despite, we may expect to find in it no merely consolatory assurance or confirmation of the already promised deliverance from Rezin and Pekah. We are prepared in fact by the very circumstances to reject the familiar rendering¹ of ver. 16.

"For before the child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest *shall be forsaken of both her kings.*"

But before entering upon a direct explanation of the whole passage, it may be well to add that grammatical considerations alone prove the above-mentioned rendering to be erroneous. The two words translated *shall-be-forsaken* and *of* never actually occur in immediate connection with one another; and *if* they were so to be taken in this passage, the only meaning possible would be that the land was to be forsaken, not *by*, but *before the face* or in the presence of those two kings: that the inhabitants would flee or be destroyed on the kings' approach, not that the kings themselves would forsake the land. More than this, the word *abhorrest* should in accordance with analogy be construed with the word translated *of*². Thus: 'the land shall be forsaken, *of* whose two kings *thou art afraid.*' The construction recurs in Ex. i. 12; Num. xxii. 3, 'But the more they afflicted them, the more they multiplied and grew, And they were *grieved because of* the children of Israel.' 'And Moab was sore afraid of the people, because they were many: and Moab was *distressed because of* the children of Israel.'

The way is thus prepared for a more exact adjustment of the prophetic utterances of Isaiah vii. viii. The seventh chapter contains a prophecy of Rezin and Pekah's discomfiture (4—9), and a prophecy of the great Assyrian invasion

¹ And with it the proposal to identify Immanuel with Isaiah's son Maher-shalal-hash-baz (viii. 1—4), whose birth prognosticated ruin to the two kings.

² *Poli Synopsis*, III. 80 b. 'Desolabitur terra cujus ob duos reges tu es anxius.' See note A, p. 46.

(17—25). The eighth predicts the birth of Maher-shalal-hash-baz, as a sign of ruin to Damascus and Samaria (1—4). Their spoil was to be taken away before the same Assyrian invader (ver. 4), who should sweep like a flood over the land of Judah too. 'He shall pass through Judah; he shall overflow and go over, he shall reach even to the neck; and the stretching out of his wings shall fill the breadth of thy land, O Immanuel' (viii. 8). The prophecy of Immanuel stands midway between the first and last prophecies of the seventh chapter, and is usually read in connection with the first of them. Reasons, however, will be assigned for connecting it rather with the latter, and referring it implicitly indeed to a deliverance from Rezin and Pekah; but to such a deliverance only as was involved in the common ruin of Judah and its oppressors.

I. It is important to bear in mind that the Biblical narrative is often at variance as regards its arrangement with the order of events.

Thus the 'writing of Hezekiah king of Judah, when he had been sick, and was recovered of his sickness' (Is. xxxviii. 9), precedes the question (ver. 22) whereby he seeks for an assurance of his yet future recovery, 'What is the sign that I shall go up to the house of the Lord?'

A like inversion may be observed in Is. vii. The first verse states with the utmost brevity that the confederates Rezin and Pekah failed to accomplish all that they had purposed. The following verse describes the alarm of the house of David before the issue of the combination was made known. 'And his heart was moved, and the heart of his people, as the trees of the wood are moved with the wind.'

Isaiah, with his son Shear-jashub, thus accosts the king: 'Take heed, be quiet, neither be fainthearted. Thus saith the Lord God, It shall not stand, neither shall it come to pass. For

The head of Syria is Damascus,
And the head of Damascus is Rezin.

And the head of Ephraim is Samaria,
And the head of Samaria is Remaliah's son.'

The invading kings shall soon shrink back within the limits of their own domains; and more than this, 'within threescore and five¹ years shall Ephraim be broken, that it be not a people' (vii. 4—9).

'If ye will not believe, *surely ye shall not be established*,' is the warning sequel to this prophecy of hope. [Unless, indeed, it be more correct to read the clause in connection with the subsequent offer of a sign, thus: "Will ye not believe, *because ye, be not confirmed*" (sc. by a sign) *in your belief*?] Then spake the Lord again unto Ahaz, saying, Ask thee a sign of the Lord thy God; ask it either in the depth, or in the height above." In his next words Isaiah gives the heaven-sent sign, and prophesies of Immanuel's birth.

So far is it from necessary to suppose that the latter prophecy (ver. 14) was a mere sequel to the consolatory prediction of the seventh and following verses, that we might assume an indefinite interval to have elapsed between the prophecy of Immanuel and that of the invaders' discomfiture. The eighth chapter might well be regarded as parallel rather than consecutive to the preceding. The one contains the Lord's words to the prophet; the other, the announcements of the prophet to the king. In the one, the spoiling of Damascus and Samaria is marked off from the flooding of Immanuel's land, by the interposition of the formula (ver. 5): 'The Lord spake also unto me again.' In the other, a like formula interposes at ver. 10. And the supposition that the great prophecy, though containing the germs of a distant hope, was for the immediate future a denouncement of overflowing wrath, will be found to harmonize entirely with the circumstances of its delivery and the subsequent unveiling of its mysteries.

II. But be this as it may, the proffered sign is refused, and scornfully² perhaps, though with a semblance of respect.

¹ See Note B, p. 46.

² See Note C, p. 47.

³ Referring, *nicht ohne Spott und Ironie*, to Deut. vi. 16, 'Ye shall not tempt the Lord your God.'

'I will not ask, I will not tempt the Lord.' It may be that Ahaz, trusting in strange gods, exceeded in incredulity those that would not believe without a sign; and even went so far as to doubt the prophet's power, by any sign to dissipate his unbelief.

The answer of the king¹ calls forth a sharp rebuke. 'Hear now, O house of David; Is it a small thing for you to weary men, but will ye weary my God also? Therefore the Lord Himself shall give you a sign.

'Behold the virgin pregnant² and bringing forth a son, and she shall call his name Immanuel.

'Butter and honey shall he eat, that³ he may know to refuse the evil and choose the good⁴.

'For before the child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good, the land shall be desolated, before whose twain kings thou shrinkest' (vii. 14—16).

In this prophecy we *expect* to find a denunciation of instant woes; for it is both ushered in by words of reproof, and followed without a pause by an account of the coming desolation, which may naturally be regarded, both from its position and its form, as designed to contribute a solution to the enigma of the prophecy. The Lord would bring upon him days that have not come from the day that Ephraim departed from Judah. He would shave by a razor that is hired, by them beyond the river, by the king of Assyria. The depopulated country was to afford rich nourishment for flocks and herds, so that '*butter and honey* shall every one eat that is left in the land.' The enclosures were to be over-

¹ The house of David is rebuked. There seems to be no good reason for making such a distinction as some have done, between the *house of David*, who were to be comforted, and the *king*, who was to be punished for his 'stubbornness.'

² הרה an adjective, of which the construct form occurs in Jer. xx. 17, הרה עולם.

³ See Note D, p. 47.

⁴ 'For every one that useth milk is unskilful in the word of righteousness: for he is a babe. But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil.' Heb. v. 13, 14. Compare Deut. i. 39; and for other formulæ describing infancy, see Is. viii. 4; Jon. iv. 11; 1 Kings ii. 7.

run with thorns and briers, and used for hunting grounds. The choicest vineyards—on 'all hills that are cleared with the mattock, that no fear of briers and thorns should thither come'—shall be 'a place for the sending forth of oxen, and for the treading of lesser cattle' (vii. 17—25).

III. The difficulties that beset the interpretation of the expression *the land* (ver. 16) will in great part vanish if regard be had to the logical sequence of the clauses. Immanuel, it is said, shall be fed in his infancy with butter and with honey, *because* 'the land' shall be left desolate, and so yield butter and honey in abundance. Butter and honey shall he eat; *for* the land shall be desolate. 'The land' must therefore be that of Immanuel, for otherwise its devastation could scarcely be thus described in connection with the infant's fare.

It might at first be thought that this land of Immanuel is defined by the parallelism in viii. 8 to be the land of Judah: but this inference is not very obviously necessary. The arrangement may express a climax. He shall *pass through* Judah; he shall overflow and *go over*; till the stretching out of his wings shall fill the full breadth of the collective Israel, 'Thy land, O Immanuel.' And even if the two clauses be strictly parallel, rather than in a manner consecutive, it still does not follow that Immanuel's land is to be restricted to Judah proper. This *Judah* may, on the contrary, represent the whole land of '*Israel*,' of which it forms a part; and it is, in any case, as well suited to stand in parallelism with the collective Israel, as is the last clause of viii. 14, '...for a gin and for a snare to *the inhabitants of Jerusalem*;' to stand as it does in parallelism with the more broadly expressed declaration which precedes, 'And he shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offence to *both the houses of Israel*.'

As the answer of Ahaz was fair-seeming, so was it with the prophecy. A land 'flowing with milk and honey' was the 'glory of all lands' (Ezek. xx. 6). The image was not one that would suggest in the first instance desolation. But the birth

of the infant whose name should be called 'Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace,' was most strangely to be the signal for the depopulation of his realm. Milk and honey were to be the produce of its ruined villages. And though, late in time, a remnant should return (x. 21), and the throne of David be set up for ever (ix. 7), yet the distant restitution could give no comfort to the unbelieving king. Some indeed, dwelling on prospective laudations of the land of promise, as a land which flowed spontaneously with milk and honey, have imagined that in ver. 22 one ray of light shoots suddenly across the dark picture. But a return in aftertime to its natural condition involves a devastation of the land.

We are accustomed, it may be added, to regard Israel and Judah as rival states: but with prophets and apostles, and sometimes even with historians, the 'Israel of God' (Gal. vi. 16) is a sacred name that unites the scattered and divided family. Isaiah speaks of Israel as a whole, including within itself two factions. The names of Ephraim, Zebulun, Naphtali, are cast aside, and he speaks, as we have seen, of One that shall be 'a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence to *both the houses of Israel*' (viii. 14). Such language has its counterpart in 2 Chron. xxviii. 19, where it is written, 'For the Lord brought Judah low because of Ahaz king of *Israel*, for he made Judah naked, and transgressed sore against the Lord.' The prophet predicts (vii. 16) a common ruin; and foresees a common restoration of the tribes. 'Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim;' but one Branch from the worn out stem shall shelter all; and 'shall stand for an ensign of the people; and His rest shall be glorious' (xi. 10, 13).

IV. *Is the prophecy of Immanuel Messianic?*

The prophecy itself describes certain events that are to take place in connexion with Immanuel's birth, and growth

¹ *Lacte et melle vesci*, Jes. vii. 15, bus vastatam, agri frugibus carentes.—
22: de his qui terram habitant ab hosti- Gesen. *Thesaur.* 486 a.

to years of discretion. His nature and office, except so far as they are symbolized by the name itself, are to be gathered from other passages wherein mention is made of Him.

To pass by for a time the descriptive titles of ix. 6, we may gather something of His transcendent dignity from the general terms in which the restoration is described.

As the former season humbled¹ Zebulun *to the ground*; and Naphtali *to the ground*; so the after time hath glorified² them. That whole sea-lying tract, once humbled, is made glorious. The power of the great deliverer is felt far and wide: 'Beyond Jordan, in Galilee of the nations. The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light; they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined.' Thou hast multiplied the nation, whose³ joy Thou hadst minished: they have waxed joyous as with men's joy in harvest; as they rejoice when they divide the spoil. 'For thou hast broken the yoke of his burden, and the staff of his shoulder, the rod of his oppressor, as in the day of Midian.' All the military gear⁴ and blood-reeking garments shall be food for flames. 'For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon His shoulder: and His name shall be called, *wonderful Counsellor, mighty God, Father of eternity, Prince of peace*. Of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon His kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgement and with justice, from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this.' (ix. 1—7).

The titles of ver. 6 demand special notice. The parallelism suggests the propriety of connecting the words *wonderful* and *Counsellor*, as the LXX. have done. The words would mean literally, *marvel of a counsellor*. The collocation is borne out by an expression in xxviii. 29: 'This also cometh

¹ Lit. *made light*, i. e. *despicable*. grievously afflict.' See 2 Cor. iv. 17.
Not 'lightly afflicted.'

² See note E, p. 48.

³ Lit. *made weighty*. Not 'did more

⁴ LXX. *πᾶσαν στολήν*.

from the LORD of hosts, which *is wonderful in counsel*¹, and excellent in working.' Others, as Delitzsch, prefer to regard the two words in question as separate titles: *Mystery, Counsellor*. Even as the angel, when asked by Manoah, 'What is thy name,' replied 'Why askest thou thus after my name, seeing it is Secret?' (Jud. xiii. 18)—indicating thereby His divine nature; a nature incomprehensible to mortal man—'so here the God-given Ruler is also *Secret*, a phenomenon lying altogether beyond human conception or natural occurrence. Not only is this or that wonderful in Him; but Himself is throughout a wonder—*παράδοξασμός*, as Symmachus renders it.'

Of the remaining titles, the first is defined by its recurrence in x. 21. 'The remnant shall return, even the remnant of Jacob, unto *the mighty God*.' The second, *Father of eternity*, in any case declares eternity to be an attribute of Immanuel; and it has been compared with such expressions as 'Father of all mercies.' Some stop short at this meaning, and make the phrase equivalent to, *possessor of eternity*. Others, as Luther, expound it of One 'Who at all times feeds His kingdom and church, in whom there is a fatherly love' without end.' *The latter view*, adds Hengstenberg, *is to be preferred unconditionally*. The last title declares the great aim of His mission; announcing Him as *Prince* and independent Giver of the divine gift, peace² (Ps. xxix. 11; cxlvii. 14).

IV. The ascription of royalty to Immanuel would, of itself, justify the rejection of all non-Messianic interpretations that have been propounded; with one exception, which we proceed to consider.

It is demonstrable *by clear proofs*³, writes Kimchi, that Immanuel is not *Hezekiah*.

¹ הפליא עצה.

² And he shall be a father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and to the house of Judah.—Is. xxii. 21.

³ Hengstenberg, *Christology*, i. 84, would make Shiloh mean (etymologi-

cally) this same *Peaceful One*.

⁴ בראיות ברורות. *Sepher Shorashim*, under the root עלם. Kimchi thinks that Immanuel may be some other son of Ahaz. But why was Hezekiah to be superseded?

To pass over the improbability of Isaiah's alluding to the queen as *the almah*¹, it is to be noted that the prophecy is expressed in terms which exclude a reference to the past. The birth of Immanuel was still in the future. Whether in the immediate, or in the far distant (though prophetically present) future, is a point on which interpreters might differ; but the terms of the prophecy exclude the past; and exclude therefore the identification of Immanuel with Hezekiah, who was already born. For 'that these words were spoken whilst Ahaz was king, is evident from the text, and owned by the Jews. Now Ahaz reigned but sixteen years; and Hezekias, his son and successor, was twenty-and-five years old when he began to reign; and therefore must be born several years before Ahaz was king, and consequently before these words were spoken'. We must therefore reject the application to Hezekiah, which is the best supported of all the non-Messianic applications.

VI. The state of the argument is then as follows.

1. In favour of the exclusively Messianic interpretation, we have the titles and general terms by which Immanuel is described; for these are such as would be extravagant and non-natural, if applied to any other than the Messiah. This view is confirmed, directly, by a strong current of tradition; and still more by the admissions of those who, while contending for other interpretations, are constrained to find room for a further Messianic reference. Some hold that no Messiah is still to be expected, because *Israel has already enjoyed Him in the days of Hezekiah*. 'He himself, it was said,' believed the prophecy to refer to him, and 'with the expectation of immortality thus engendered, took no care to marry or secure the succession till startled by his alarming illness'. Such a belief involves two distinct propositions; as a learned writer

¹ The propriety of the LXX rendering ἡ παρθένος will be discussed in the Appendix.

² Kidder's *Demonstration of the Messias*, II. 313.

³ Stanley, *Lectures on the Jewish Church*, II. 462.

has well remarked. For the first ; viz. that Isaiah's prophecy was delivered *with a distinct Messianic reference* ; we might claim the authority of Hillel, and if it should so chance, of Hezekiah himself : but whether the prophecy was fulfilled in Hezekiah is a point which would still remain to be decided. 'It is a known saying of Hillel, recorded in *Sanhedrin* c. Chelek, that *There is no Messiah to the Israelites, because they have already enjoyed Him in the days of Hezekiah*. Divers of the later Rabbins endeavour to mollify these words of Hillel by their several expositions, but in vain. And R. Joseph understood him better, who thought he took away all expectations of a Messiah, and therefore fairly prayed for him, *Condonet Dominus hoc R. Hillel*. Howsoever, it appears that from two principles, whereof one was false, he gathered that false conclusion. For first, he thought those words in Isaiah were spoken of the Messiah : which proposition was true. Secondly, he conceived that those words were spoken of Hezekiah, and fulfilled in him, which proposition was false. From hence he inferred that the Israelites were not to expect a Messiah after Hezekiah : which conclusion was also false¹.'

2. Against the Messianic interpretation, there is one argument that has been urged with much plausibility. There is indeed no *specific* solution in contemporary history on which non-Messianic interpreters are agreed ; but it is argued that Isaiah's words point to a fulfilment in the immediate future, and could not therefore have been spoken of the Messiah. Isaiah does indeed declare that in the early years of Immanuel, a great, and that an immediate inroad of the Assyrian power should desolate the land. The invasion was to take place before the child should 'know to refuse the evil and choose the good.' Does it follow that Immanuel is not the Christ ?

VII. If it be part of the scheme of Divine Providence—and here history speaks plainly—that Christian people should have looked prematurely for the accomplishment of their

¹ Pearson *On the Creed*. Art. III. Note 17.

Lord's prophecies about "the end of all things;" there is little difficulty in conjecturing that a like uncertainty may have been permitted to prevail in the minds of Jews to whom Isaiah spoke. The hope of a deliverer would be none the less comforting, though his Epiphany might seem nearer than it was. As with the people, so with the prophet. It is needless to assume that every prophet of the former dispensation must have been gifted with a degree of pre-science for which apostles longed in vain. The question: 'When shall these things be?' (Matt. xxiv. 3), does but elicit the assurance, that 'of that day and hour knoweth no man, no not the angels of heaven, but my Father only' (ver. 36). And even after the Resurrection it was not for men "to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in His own power" (Acts i. 7.) Their part was to 'Watch,' and to 'be ready.' 'In an hour when ye think not, the Son of man cometh.' They were to maintain an uncalculating expectancy; and their consequent frame of mind was not unfavourable to those premature anticipations, into which, as some think, they were actually led. If this be the case, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that a like uncertainty in the matter of times and seasons may have found place with the chief of Messianic prophets: and thus the way is prepared for such an application of the prophecy in question, as at once satisfies the strict requirements of grammatical sequence, and gives their full natural force to those remarkable descriptive epithets, which it has been found by those who have attempted it, no easy task to explain away.

Isaiah, it might be conjectured, now contemplates as imminent the fulfilment of the ancient prophecy of Shiloh (Gen. xlix. 10). The time was at hand when the sceptre should depart from Judah; ere long to be recovered by the great Restorer, who should unite the scattered "peoples" beneath His sway. With no thought of comforting the impious Ahaz (who is regarded in prophetic vision as superseded), Isaiah dwells, in his hearing, on the prelusive calamities; and assures him that the inroad of Rezin and

Pekah is but a beginning of sorrows. Soon will that land be wholly desolate¹, of whose two kings he is afraid.

For himself, the prophet hopes to see that *Salvation of the Lord*, which his own name symbolized. Nor is he the only prophet that was disappointed in that his hope.

'Verily I say unto you,' are the words of Christ Himself to His disciples, "that many prophets and righteous men have desired to see those things which ye see, and have not seen them; and to hear those things which ye hear, and have not heard them.' Matt. xiii. 17.

In words spoken afterwards, not addressed to Ahaz, the prophet describes the ultimate deliverance of the people of God, which evangelists have claimed as fulfilled in Jesus.

We conclude that Isaiah prophesied of Christ, as 'God with us;' and that the New Testament writers apply his prophecy as directly Messianic. It may suffice to notice some of their most conspicuous citations.

St Matthew, having described the Annunciation, thus continues: 'Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, the virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us.' Matt. i. 22, 23; Is. vii. 14; viii. 8. The words *ὁ θεὸς μετ' αὐτῶν* (Rev. xxi. 3), refer, it may be, to the same passages. The child to be born 'shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever: and of his kingdom there shall be no end,' Luke i. 32, 33; Is. ix. 7. The Baptist, by preparing the way of his coming Lord, was 'to give light to them that sit in darkness and in the shadow of death' (Luke i. 79; Is. ix. 2). A citation by St Matthew (iv. 15, 16) of the same verse, in connexion with the preceding, will be noticed in the following chapter. The proverbial

¹ For this absolute use of עֶזֶב, compare אֶרֶץ תְּעֹזֵב Job xviii. 4. For its meaning see also Is. vi. 12; xvii. 2.

question; 'Why seek ye the living among the dead?' (Luke xxiv. 5), corresponds to the words of Isaiah, which the Authorized Version thus renders: 'Should not a people seek unto their God? for the living to the dead?' Is. viii. 19. The *stone of stumbling* (Is. viii. 14, 15) is referred to by our Lord: and again by SS. Paul and Peter. 'Whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder.' Matt. xxi. 44. Luke xx. 18. 'For they stumbled at that stone; as it is written, Behold I lay in Sion a stumbling-stone and rock of offence.' Rom. ix. 32, 33. Cp. Is. xxviii. 16. 'And a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence, even to them which stumble at the Word.' 1 Pet. ii. 8.

VIII. The prophecy above considered has been a central point and nucleus of controversy from the commencement of the Christian era.

Dr Nicoll has observed, in a sermon on Is. ix. 6, that, 'These words contain a most remarkable prophecy relating to the nativity, divine nature, and general description of Christ; as must appear incontrovertibly certain to every unprejudiced mind. But there are few passages of the Old Testament, which have been more (either designedly or otherwise) perverted, and more differently interpreted in ancient and modern times. Indeed, the manner in which we find it explained may invariably be regarded as a criterion, by which we may know whether the expositor was, or was not, a Christian; or at least what sentiments he entertained concerning the nature of Christ.'

There is much truth in this statement. But, on the other hand, when every allowance has been made for the controversial element of the investigation, it must be confessed that there have remained two real difficulties, already alluded to; one on each side of the question. It is easy to see that the non-Messianic interpreter has been forced into non-natural explanations, in his attempt to explain away the exalted description of the nature and functions of Immanuel. It is

no less easy to detect the inherent weakness of attempts that have been made to sever the prediction of His birth from the immediate context. The real closeness of its connexion with that context best appears from some of the expedients which have been devised to meet the difficulty.

One solution, adopted by Vitringa and many others, is that the prophet does but measure the time present¹ by the anticipated stages of Christ's life on earth. On this it may justly be remarked, that an opponent might declare the view to be non-natural and *ab extra*, without thereby standing convicted of any unfairness arising from polemical bias.

A second explanation, set forth below, I venture to characterize as artificial.

"On Isaiah vii. 14, we are told that in the primary but lower sense, the sign was given to assure Ahaz...The *sign* given had, secondarily and mystically, a respect to the miraculous birth of Christ. I answer: In the first place, there appears to have been no sign given, if we except the prediction itself; and if the prediction alone was the sign or wonder (which I contend is the case), then the birth of the Messiah was its one and sole object; and on the faith of this the safety of Israel entirely depended...The fifteenth verse, I suppose, must refer to the child to be named Immanuel. 'Butter and honey,' it is said, 'he shall eat,' *on account of his knowing*; not, *that he may know*, &c. The Hebrew is לִדְעָתוֹ מָאוֹם, *for, or because of (!)*, his knowing the refusal. That is: His character shall be such, that even when a child, He shall have knowledge sufficient to choose what is good for Himself, contrary to the character of all others, who are perfectly passive at this age..."

"Let us now come to ver. 16. Here we are told that, 'before the child shall know to refuse the evil, and to choose the good, the land shall be forsaken of both her kings.' I think it must be evident that the child Immanuel cannot be meant here; because we are assured (!), in the preceding

¹ *Ita mysterium tangit ut statim ad sua tempora redeat. Poli Synopsis, III. 80 h.*

verse, that he shall, even as a child, know to refuse the evil, and to choose the good: besides the fulfilment of the prediction respecting Him was too remote to admit of comparison with the fate of these kings. This last consideration has been felt and acknowledged by every writer, I believe, who has touched upon the subject. At the third verse preceding, we are informed, that Isaiah was to take his own son Shearjashub, and to go and meet Ahaz on this occasion. If, then, the child just alluded to was not Immanuel; why may it not have been this son of the prophet? This view of the subject seems to be fully confirmed by similar phraseology used with respect to another son of Isaiah in viii. 4. Such language could not, after what has been said, properly apply to Immanuel, but will be suitable enough to Isaiah's son; and this will perhaps be sufficient to account for the circumstance of his having been taken to meet Ahaz. Besides, the events predicted respecting these kings must have taken place within the time thus limited."

IX. What was the characteristic feature of the 'sign' given to Ahaz? And what the significance of the article in the expression 'the virgin'?

These questions have been answered variously, yet without consequent disturbance of the general conclusions reached above. It may suffice therefore to dismiss them briefly.

1. Four kinds of *signs* are catalogued by Hengstenberg¹: Sometimes the sign is 'a mere naked word' (Ex. xiii. 12). Sometimes the sign is an embodiment of a prediction, 'so that the word assumes, as it were, flesh and blood' (Is. viii. 18). Sometimes the sign is a fulfilment in the immediate future of some natural event, which could not, except supernaturally, be foreseen: and this furnishes the proof that in the distant future, that will be fulfilled which was foretold as impending. The fourth kind of sign consists in 'the immediate performance of a miraculous work going beyond the

¹ *Christology*, II. 39.

ordinary laws of nature' (Is. xxxviii. 7). 'In the passage before us,' adds Hengstenberg, 'no other sign can possibly be spoken of than one of the two last classes.' Rosenmüller, having propounded the same two alternatives, declares, with a '*dubium non potest esse*,' for the last.

Delitzsch draws his answer to the same question, 'What constituted the extraordinary character of the fact announced?' from the descriptive titles of ix. 6. 'Immanuel Himself was to be a *wonder*, or *wonderful*. HE would be God in corporeal self-manifestation, and therefore a *wonder*, as being a super-human person. We should not venture to assert this if it went beyond the line of Old Testament revelation; but the prophet himself asserts it in ix. 6 (cf. x. 21): His words are as clear as possible; and we must not make them obscure to favour any preconceived notions as to the development of history. The incarnation of Deity was unquestionably a secret that was not clearly unveiled in the Old Testament; but the veil was not so thick but that some rays could pass through.' The '*virgin*,' observes the same writer, continued throughout 'an enigma, stimulating inquiry (1 Pet. i. 10—12), and waiting for a historical solution.'

2. 'The' virgin,' might grammatically refer to one present in person, and pointed out; or to one present only in prophetic vision. Or again, the expression might denote, 'the virgin' that had already formed the subject of prophetic announcements. Nor is this view refuted by the apparent uniqueness¹ of the prophecy in question; unless it be assumed that the sum total of Old Testament prophecy (unlike, e.g. some Epistles² of St Paul) has been handed down to us.

¹ Virgo illa: nam ἡ Ἀρτικὴ virginem certam, ὡρισμένην, audientibus notam indicat. The indefinite rendering is defended by a vague allusion to the 'generic use' of the article. ἡ might be translated 'a,' in the sense of *any*; not in the sense, *some one*. In Ps. lix. 6, 'grin like a dog,' means the same as

the plural, 'like dogs;' and implies that what one would do, *any other* of the species would do.

² Compare the *now obscure* allusion: 'And now ye know what withholdeth, that he might be revealed in his time.'—2 Thess. ii. 6.

³ Compare Col. iv. 16.

NOTES ON CHAPTER III.

A. Dr Henderson thus defends the rendering, *shall be forsaken of*. "It (מפני) is also used after the verb עזב, Is. xvii. 9, and appears, in such connexion, to have no more force than מן (Lev. xxvi. 43)." This view is not borne out by the same commentator's note on the passage of Isaiah to which he refers: "עזבו מפני" forms a constructio prægna, *which they left* (when they fled) *before the children of Israel.*" This implies the *presence* or approach of the children of Israel. *To be forsaken of* such and such persons, implies the *absence* or departure of such persons.

Grievous complications have resulted from the attempt to join עזב and מפני in Is. xvii. 9. It seems best to make the latter word refer back to ידיו, thus:

'In that day shall his strong cities be—

like the leavings of a thicket or a *tree top*, that men have left—
before the children of Israel.'

This rendering stands self-commended by its symmetry, and preserves the accentuation of the original. The same image is presented in the sixth verse: 'Yet gleaning grapes shall be left in it, as the shaking of an olive-tree, two or three berries in the top of the *uppermost bough*.'

B. Cappellus wishes to read 6 + 5, for 60 + 5. Buxtorf declares it unprecedented in Holy Scripture thus to express a number greater than ten; "duobus minoribus, addendis sc." (*Anticritica*, p. 946.) Perhaps the strangest emendation proposed is Vitranga's, שש' וחמש, *six + 10 + five*. 'Denn wer in aller Welt schrieb wohl...eine Zahl halb mit Buchstaben, halb mit Ziffern; z. B. 6 zehn, vi decim?' (Gesenius.) Rosenmüller concludes: 'Habes conjecturas varias, quibus perlectis multo eris incertior quam fueras ante...Minime igitur mihi dubium, genuinum esse id in quo libri omnes consentiunt...'

Buxtorf gives authorities for two of the principal methods by which the full complement of 65 years may be obtained, viz. (i) by going back for a starting point, ליום שנגזר בימי עמוס, *to the day*

that was decreed in the days of Amos (Jarchi); and (ii) by reckoning onward to the deportation by Esarhaddon. For a defence of the second method see Delitzsch, I. 211.

C. The hiphil of **אמן** means 1. *to stand fast* (Job xxxix. 24); 2. *to believe*. The niph'al has, corresponding to (1), the meaning *to be established*; and by a proportionate variation from (2), would come to mean, *to be confirmed in belief*, as in the text.

Perhaps it is best to arrange the clauses as follows: 'If ye will not believe, except ye be confirmed (by a sign), then spake the Lord again to Ahaz, saying, Ask thee a sign...' Compare Mark ii. 10, 11, 'But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, he saith to the sick of the palsy, I say unto thee, Arise.' See *Poli Synopsis*, III. 74 n.

D. For cases in which **ל** approximates to **עד**, see the Lexicons. With **לדעתו**, '*that he may know*,' compare Lev. xxiv. 12, 'And they put him in ward, *that* the mind of the Lord might be shewed them.' The **ל** in **לפרש** expresses the connection between the act described in the first clause, and the discovery of the mind of the Lord: but the essential connection is, that the one gave time for the other: hence the **ל** must express, more or less exactly, the duration of that time, '*till* the mind of the Lord should be shewed.' In **לדעתו**, the **ל**, in like manner, expresses duration, '*till* his knowing.' The eating of butter and honey does not directly contribute to the knowledge of good and evil; but the early years, during which the feeding on such fare continues, give time wherein that knowledge may spring up. Some such explanation of the **ל** is necessitated, independently, by the context, 'For before the child shall know...'

The most natural rendering of **לדעתו**, taken alone, is, *to the end that he may know*. If the words were separated from those which follow, they would *seem* to mean that the eating of butter (or curdled milk) and honey was to contribute in some direct way to the power of discernment between good and evil; and this suggests a figurative interpretation, in accordance with many comparisons, as Ps. xix. 10; Prov. xxiv. 13, 14; 1 Pet. ii. 2. Compare the Rabbinic usages of such texts as, 'Honey and milk are under thy tongue.' Cant. iv. 11. See Bernard's *Yad Hachazakah*, p. 93. Regard being had to the professedly enigmatic nature (viii. 16) of his prophecy, it seems far

from improbable that Isaiah may have intended to hint at such a secondary application; and this would account for the occurrence of an expression which, apart from the context, is so misleading as לדעתו.

E. הרבית הגוי לא הגדלת השמחה. From this reading of the text (ix. 3) the Authorized Version has been led to the contradictory rendering, 'Thou hast multiplied the nation, and not increased the joy: they joy before thee according to the joy in harvest, and as men rejoice when they divide the spoil.' A superficial simplification is introduced by the reading of the קרי; 'its (לו) joy Thou hast increased;' but this gives an unnatural position to the לו.

The כתיב may be rendered literally, 'Thou hast multiplied the nation: Thou hadst not increased the joy:' and this would mean, in accordance with one of the very commonest of Hebrew idioms (the omission of the relative), 'Thou hast now multiplied the nation, whose joy Thou hadst formerly not-increased:' where לא not, attaches itself to the following word as an *inseparable* prefix. [For a striking example, compare x. 15, לא עץ, and see Lowth's note. The idiom has found its way into the Greek Testament, οὕτως οὐκ ισχύσατε, Matt. xxvi. 40, Were ye so unable to watch with me one hour?]

In Is. ix. 3, the LXX, though on the whole obscure, testifies to the accuracy of the reading לא הגדלת by its rendering ὁ κατήγγαγες, where the ὁ is explanatory, and the κατήγγαγες arises from a combination of the *negative* with the following *exaltedst*. The ellipsis thus supplied is not peculiar to the Hebrew language. In English we might write idiomatically, 'the nation Thou minishedst.'

A rendering which conveys an explicit *contrast* (ἐπλήθυνας τὸ ἔθνος ὃ οὐκ ἐμεγάλυνας, Symmachus) has strong claims to a place in the series of antitheses:

Humiliation; glory	ix. 1.
Darkness; light.....	2.
Independence; oppression ...	4.
War; peace	5.

We conclude that the passage has no need of emendation. See, on the other side, Smith's *Dict. of Bible*, Art. *Septuagint*.

CHAPTER IV.

Local Coincidences.

Matth. ii. 6, 15, 18, 23; iv. 15.

ST Matthew records as correspondent to prophetic announcements five circumstances in the history of the Saviour's life. 1. The birth in Bethlehem. 2. The murder of the Innocents. 3. The settlement in Capernaum. 4. The sojourn in Egypt. 5. The return to Nazareth. The nature of the correspondence has to be sought in detail; each case presenting its peculiar difficulties: and the above arrangement has been chosen to facilitate the inquiry; the third case leading naturally to the more complex fourth and fifth. The last in order involve a two-fold difficulty in prophetic reference and in fulfilment. In what sense does Hos. xi. 1 apply to Christ; and how does the sojourn in Egypt bring about an accomplishment of the prophecy? Whence is it gathered that Christ was to be a 'Nazarene'; and how are the prophecies on that point fulfilled by His residence in Nazareth? The third case presents as the sole subject for inquiry, the nature of the correspondence between Christ's dwelling 'in Capernaum, which is upon the sea-coast, in the borders of Zabulon and Nephthalim:' and the prophecy, supposed Messianic, of Is. ix. 1, 2.

I. *Bethlehem Ephratah.* Mic. v. 2; Matt. ii. 6.

The connection between the prophecy of Immanuel and those in Mic. v. is so plain and so generally admitted that a detailed examination of the latter may be dispensed with.

If the former be Messianic, as has been concluded, so too are the latter. Isaiah speaks of 'the virgin' of the house of Judah as the mother of the Messiah: Micah localizes the conception, and assigns to Bethlehem Ephratah¹ the distinction which contrasts so strongly with its own intrinsic power and dignity: 'But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, little one to be among the thousands of Judah, from thee shall come forth for me, to be ruler in Israel, one whose procession is from of old, from everlasting.'

Micah, like Isaiah, had denounced the iniquities of the people, and proclaimed the judgments that awaited them. The words of the two prophets have points of coincidence, and it has been supposed that the phraseology of a passage wherein Micah deals so roughly with the false confidence and security that had arisen, was formed upon Isaiah's prophecy of *God with us*. 'The heads thereof judge for reward, and the priests thereof teach for hire, and the prophets thereof divine for money: yet will they lean upon the Lord and say, *Is not the Lord among us?* none evil can come upon us.' Mic. iii. 11.

However this may be, Isaiah prophesies of the great Deliverer, and as it were in the same breath, of the Assyrian flood that should desolate the land. The same invasion is present to Micah's gaze, while he looks forward to the coming 'Ruler, whose goings forth are from of old, from everlasting.' From the lowly Ephratah must He come. That village, too insignificant to be represented among the magnates of its tribe, should give birth to no merely local ruler, but One who should bear sway in the collective Israel. 'This man,' adds the prophet, 'shall be *Peace*, when the Assyrian shall come into our land: and when he shall tread in our palaces.' (Mic. v. 5.) This same, an apostle declares to be 'our *Peace*,' (Eph. ii. 14.) who fulfils the prophetic utterance, and works out the predicted deliverance, abstracted from the local imagery by which it had been veiled.

¹ 'And Rachel died, and was buried in the way to Ephrath, which is Bethlehem.' Gen. xxxv. 19.

The promise made to Bethlehem Ephratah is the same, now set forth with greater concentration and definiteness, as that by which the preeminence was first assigned to Judah among the tribes.

Few passages have been more disputed than the prophecy of Shiloh (Gen. xlix. 10); and it is now, as of old, extremely difficult to assign with accuracy the true etymological meaning of its leading word. But all difficulties notwithstanding, one thing is clear, viz. that to Judah the sceptre is assigned¹. To him a marked preeminence is given, which is not to cease till a certain *coming*; and 'to him shall the submission of peoples be.' The dominion of Judah is spoken of as even then commencing; and this remark is of the last importance in its bearing upon King David's words:

'Howbeit the Lord God of Israel chose me before all the house of my father to be king over Israel for ever; for He hath chosen Judah to be the ruler, and of the house of Judah the house of my father; and among the sons of my father He liked me to make me king over all Israel.' (1 Chron. xxviii. 4.)

This selection of Judah does not date from the actual appointment of David, but seems clearly to refer to a former time; and to what time, it may be asked, but to that of the expiring patriarch?

All doubt on the point is apparently removed by 1 Chron. v. 2, where this preeminence is distinctly referred back to the paternal blessing; and it is moreover pointed out as something in itself remarkable that while Joseph succeeded to the forfeited primogeniture of Reuben, it was for Judah that the principedom was reserved. This point is well brought out by the Authorized Version.

'For Judah prevailed above his brethren, and of him came the chief ruler; *but*² the birthright was Joseph's.'

¹ On the ambiguous word מחקק in the same verse see note A p. 72.

² Micah's צעיר להיות may signify: 'Thou little one, *minor natu*, (that

These quotations alone bridge over the ages which had elapsed since the days of Jacob; and thenceforward the Messianic prerogative of the tribe of Judah is dwelt upon with more and more distinctness. The name of David is used to designate the coming ruler long after David's self had ceased to rule; and when prophets speak of restoration and return to power, it is the throne of *David* which is to be set up; it is the 'sure mercies of *David*' that can never fail. The Apocalypse conjoins the prophecies and aspirations of centuries when it speaks in one verse (v. 5) of 'the root of David,' and of the 'Lion of the tribe of Judah.' (Gen. xlix. 9.)

We conclude then that the Jews of old looked to the tribe of Judah, and afterwards more specifically to the house of David, for the Messiah. The prophet Micah apostrophises Bethlehem as His birthplace; and there is evidence in the Gospels that the prophecy was thus interpreted.

In answer to Herod, the theologians refer to Mic. v. 2, as an *a priori* ground for believing Bethlehem to be the destined birthplace of the Christ:

'Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea in the days of Herod the King, behold, there came wise men from the east to Jerusalem, saying, Where is he that is born King of the Jews? for we have seen his star in the east, and are come to worship him. When Herod the King had heard these things, he was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him. And when he had gathered all the chief priests and scribes of the people together, he demanded of them where Christ should be born. And they said to him, In Bethlehem of Judea; for thus it is written by the prophet, And thou, Bethlehem, in the land of Juda, art not the least among the princes of Juda; for out of thee shall come a Governor, that shall rule my people Israel,' (ii. 1—6).

Here is no question of accommodation: no room for

art) to be....' For this common use of *youngest* according to his youth.' Compare Ps. lxviii. 27, 'Little Benjamin elder shall serve the *younger*.' 'The their ruler.'

doubt in explaining the connection between the Scripture, and that which is put forward as its accomplishment. Nor is there anything recondite in the prophecy or its application. It is the popular acceptance¹ (ver. 4) of a plain prophecy which Matthew records. The original declares that Bethlehem, despite its *littleness*, shall give birth to the ruler, not of a tribe, but of all Israel. The citation proclaims Bethlehem 'not the least,' for the reason that 'out of thee shall come'² that Ruler; and it thereby implies that but for this it would be indeed 'the least.' The LXX. agreeing with our Hebrew text, reads: 'among the *thousands*'³. The citation has 'among the *princes* (*ἡγεμόσων*).' The one depicts Bethlehem as too small for a place among the principalities of the land: the other, as unworthy to send forth a ruler who should stand in the congregation of its princes. The discrepancy may be accounted for by the change of a single vowel point⁴; or again the word *ἡγεμόσων* may have arisen from an instinctive assimilation to the Greek word for a *Governor* which follows. The latter explanation resembles that given by Dr Hengstenberg, who sees an argument for the non-Aramaic origin of St Matthew's Gospel, in this correspondence of *ἡγεμόσων* with *ἡγούμενος*. The former method of reconciliation is more commonly thought satisfactory.

II. *Rachel weeping for her children.*

Jer. xxxi. 15; Matt. iv. 18.

The prophet Jeremiah, in describing 'the time of Jacob's trouble' (xxx. 7), and his subsequent restoration, makes use, once and again, of a poetical *prosopopæia*. 'This is a figure

¹ 'Hath not the scripture said, That Christ cometh of the seed of David, and out of the town of Bethlehem, where David was?' Joh. vii. 42.

² Some have thought that the '*Judea profecti*' of Suetonius and Tacitus is to be referred to the LXX. *ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ ἐξελεύσεται*.

³ *הָלָל* is translated *family*, in Judg. vi. 15. Compare 1 Sam. x. 19, 'By your tribes, and by your *thousands*.'

⁴ *הָלָל* for *הָלָל*. Is. lx. 22 might be referred to in support of the Hebrew text: 'A little one shall become a thousand, and a *small one* a strong nation.'

very common to all authors, to bring in a person speaking; and there is no man in his wits quarrels with them for it.' St Matthew selects one instance out of the many, and represents Rachel, who was buried in the vicinity, as bewailing the victims of Herod's massacre, in words first applied by the prophet to the Babylonish captivity. 'Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying, In Rama was there a voice heard, lamentation and weeping, and great mourning, Rachel weeping for her children, and would not be comforted, because they are not.' Matt. ii. 17, 18.

This might be thought a sufficient account of the matter; but objections have been raised, partaking in some cases of the nature of refinements, which it may be well to notice. It is urged that Rachel, as not being the mother of Judah (Gen. xxix. 35), could not rightly be said to weep for Bethlehemites as her children: Leah ought to have been introduced, not Rachel. The appropriateness of the allusion may be vindicated on general grounds; but the mode of *citation* has first to be considered. Can the evangelist be said, in this particular, to have distorted or misapplied the words of Jeremiah? The prophet, it has been remarked above, has been speaking in general terms of the captivity, and has already made use, on more than one occasion, of *prosopopœia*. Jacob is personified in xxx. 10, 11; Zion in xxx. 12—17. So too are Israel, the virgin of Israel, and Ephraim, in the following chapter, that viz. from which the citation is drawn.

It would scarcely occur to the reader of Jer. xxxi. to restrict Rachel's solicitude (ver. 15) to those who were actual descendants of her own sons, as opposed to Leah's; or in fact to make her mourning and her comfort (ver. 17) one whit less general than such as is described both before and after. The place Ramah is mentioned subsequently¹ in connection with a general gathering of prisoners from the surrounding

¹ 'The word that came to Jeremiah from the Lord, after that Nebuzar-adan the captain of the guard had let him go from Ramah, when he had taken him being bound in chains among all that were carried away captive of Jerusalem and Judah, which were carried away captive unto Babylon.' Jer. xl. 1.

districts. This (to say nothing of the prophet's personal share therein) gives a clue by which we might account for the mention of the great mourning in Jer. xxxi. 15; and at the same time excludes any such artificial hypothesis as that Rachel was but weeping for her own personal descendants. The allusion is mainly local; and in such a passage, to descend to further particulars would be repugnant to the spirit of the Hebrew style. More than this, it would seem that in the immediate context of the citation the family of Jacob is thought of as at one, and that Rachel weeps for all¹ as for her children. It may be assumed at any rate, until the contrary is proved, that the promise of restoration includes the tribe of *Judah*: 'there is hope in thine end, saith the Lord, that *thy children* shall come again to their own border' (xxx. 17): and if Jeremiah includes Judah in his expression, '*thy children*,' his words suffer no distortion by being applied, as in the Gospel, to the infants of Bethlehem.

On the general propriety of the allusion little needs be said. Rachel is a fit type of maternal fondness: 'Give me children, or else I die' (Gen. xxx. 1). Her burial place was in the neighbourhood² of Bethlehem, the central point of Herod's outrage. The hearing of the voice in Ramah, supposed beyond the immediate precincts of the massacre, would import the loudness of the lamentation, as in Is. x. 30: 'Lift up thy voice, O daughter of Gallim: cause it to be heard unto³ Laish, O poor Anathoth.' But Ramah may have fallen within the limits of Herod's edict, which was not confined to Bethlehem itself: for 'Herod, when he saw that he was mocked of the wise men, was exceeding wroth, and sent forth,

¹ Jacob's words to Joseph, 'Shall I and *thy mother* and thy brethren indeed come to bow down ourselves to thee to the earth?' (Gen. xxxvii. 10) were spoken when Joseph's own mother was dead.

² 'Rachel died...when there was yet but a little way (כְּבֵרֶת אֶרֶץ) to come to Ephrath: and I buried her there in the way of Ephrath; the same is Bethle-

hem.' Gen. xlviii. 7; xxxv. 19. Rachel's sepulchre is mentioned in 1 Sam. x. 2, and it is inferred that it was near to Ramah, since, on the way thence to Gibeah, 'primum occurrit sepulchrum Rachelæ, deinde terebinthus Thabor, tum Gibeah.' *Rosenmüller. Poole.*

³ Or 'Hearken, O Laish' (*Deitzsch*): which implies a hearing 'unto Laish.'

and slew all the children that were in Bethlehem, and *in all the coasts thereof*, from two years old and under, according to the time which he had diligently inquired of the wise men' (Matt. ii. 16). 'The slaughter of the Innocents,' concludes Bishop Kidder¹, 'was not restrained to the town of Bethlehem, but extended to all the coasts and confines thereof: and then the voice might well be heard in Ramah; and Rachel (from whom the tribe of Benjamin sprang) might be truly said to weep for her own children in the closest and strictest sense.'

III. *The land of Zabulon and the land of Nephthalim.*

Is. ix. 1; Matt. iv. 15.

Our Lord's settlement in Capernaum is thus described: 'Now when Jesus had heard that John was cast into prison, He departed into Galilee: and leaving Nazareth, He came and dwelt in Capernaum, which is upon the sea-coast, in the borders of Zabulon and Nephthalim: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, The land of Zabulon, and the land of Nephthalim, by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles; the people that sat in darkness saw a great light; and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death light is sprung up.' Matt. iv. 12—16.

1. The fifteenth verse presents a grammatical difficulty, which does not however affect the application and general understanding of the prophecy. How is the accusative, *way² of the sea* (breaking in as it does upon a series of nominatives or vocatives), to be explained or accounted for? 'It is difficult to maintain, with Meyer, that εἶδε in ver. 16 is the governing verb:' and to render accordingly, 'The land of Zebulun and the land of Naphthali (saw) the way of the sea³

¹ *Demonstr. of the Messiah*, II. 211.

² The words, 'by the way of the sea,' as above quoted, correspond to the simple accusative ὁδὸν θαλάσσης.

³ The tract in question being made visible by the light of Christ shining across from Capernaum (Alf. *in loc.*).

on the other side of the Jordan. Galilee of the Gentiles, the people that sat in darkness, saw a great light¹. It is difficult, argues the same grammarian, to render ὁδὸν in an absolute adverbial sense, as equivalent to *by the way*: 'for passages such as 1 Sam. vi. 9², Numb. xxi. 33, Ex. xiii. 17, are no authority for an accusative without government by a verb, in an address containing vocatives.' Whether or no this be thought conclusive against an interpretation which makes ὁδὸν obliquely indicative of the prophet's point of view, as he looks 'seaward beyond Jordan,' it may be worth while to suggest that the citation *may* be, of set purpose, fragmentary, and incapable of exact rendering as a whole, without reference to the original context from which it is taken. The former verse might then be regarded as a catalogue of names to which the Evangelist designs to call attention: in the latter, with retrospective reference to the districts mentioned, he declares that they, 'the people that sat in darkness, saw great light.' The citation, we might conjecture, is discontinuous, while the ring of the *familiar version* is retained. The verses in question are, for all the purposes of citation, an exact counterpart of the original. They express plainly, whatever be their grammatical arrangement, that a region once lying in darkness had been illumined by the light of Christ; and the region that lay in darkness is that described in ver. 15.

2. The chief point to be considered is the nature of the correspondence between the prophecy and that which is here set forth as its fulfilment. The answer to this question might throw some additional light upon the formula of citation, *that it might be fulfilled*³; and thus prepare the way for the better understanding of those more difficult citations to which it is

¹ Winer, *Grammar of New Test. Diction*, xxxii. § 6.

² ὁδὸν ὁρίων αὐτῆς πορεύσεται. Corresponding to ὁδὸν θαλάσσης (Is. ix. 1), the LXX. read καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ οἱ τὴν παραλίαν. They may, possibly, have anticipated a governing verb from the following πορεύμενος (seeing that ὁδὸν

πορεύσθαι is an ordinary expression and παραλίαν corresponds to יַרְדֵּן, or ὁδὸν). St Matthew however changes πορεύμενος into καθημένος, and thus renders such an explanation inapplicable. See also Note B. p. 72.

³ See Note C. p. 72.

prefixed: 'Out of Egypt have I called my son;' 'He' shall be called a Nazarene.' Matt. ii. 15, 23.

It has been assumed that the passage cited had an original Messianic reference, and must consequently have received a definite fulfilment when Christ took up his abode in Capernaum. But was that fulfilment a final and exhaustive one?

This question has been answered in the affirmative by many commentators, who explain *ἵνα πληρωθῇ* as here signifying: 'That the prophecy which, as far as the mournful part of it is concerned, was in some degree verified in the abduction by Tiglath Pileser (2 Kings xv. 29), and by the religious debasement of those cities, might now have its *full* and *final* accomplishment in the light of the Gospel of Redemption, diffused by the preaching of Christ and His Apostles who were Galileans, in that land *first*, which was *first* overshadowed by the darkness of captivity.'

But Isaiah seems to contemplate Immanuel as making His power felt far and wide from *Zion*, rather than as resident in the district named. More than this, he depicts His light as truly *seen*, rather than as shining forth unheeded upon the spiritually blind: nor can he be thought to have contemplated a merely passing illumination, which should fade, and leave the darkness thicker than before. 'Woe unto thee, Chorazin! woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works which were done in you had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. But I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgment, than for you. And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell: for if the mighty works which have been done in thee had been done in Sodom, it would have remained until this day. But I say unto you, That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment than for thee.' (Matt. xi. 21—24.)

More might be added to the same effect: but the above will suffice to indicate that Christ's residence in Capernaum *may* have been adduced, not as the full and final accomplish-

ment¹ of the prophetic announcement, but as a partial though distinct realization, which *symbolized the fulfilment of the whole prophecy in HIM.*

IV. *The flight into Egypt.* Matt. ii. 15; Hos. xi. 1.

St Matthew thus describes the flight from Herod's massacre: 'And when they were departed, behold, the angel of the Lord appeareth to Joseph in a dream, saying, Arise, and take the young child and his mother, and flee into Egypt, and be thou there until I bring thee word: for Herod will seek the young child to destroy him. When he arose, he took the young child and his mother by night, and departed into Egypt: and was there until the death of Herod: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Out of Egypt have I called my son.'

This citation suggests two subjects for discussion: viz. (i) the applicability of the prophecy to Christ; and (ii) its fulfilment in Him. The first involves no difficulty which is peculiar to the case before us; and may therefore be dismissed for the present, with few words. The Messianic ideal of the prophets borrowed its expression from the vicissitudes of the national life. The attributes of Jehovah were displayed by His dealings toward the chosen people: but His gracious purposes were, so to say, frustrated by their unfaithfulness. Those purposes could not ultimately fail, but must of necessity be realized; and He in whom they would be realized was the Messiah. To Him one side of the nation's history was applicable; not the nation's own shortcomings, but whatever was expressive of Jehovah's unchanging purpose toward them. Their sacrificing to Baalim, and their burning incense to graven images (Hos. xi. 2), might be things of the past; but every expression of God's love must find a realiza-

¹ This suggestion may be expressed interrogatively: would the prophecy have remained *ipso facto* unfulfilled, if Christ had not thus resided in the district named?

tion, and that in God's true Son (Hos. xi. 1). Hence arose such comparisons between the externals of Christ's life and the history of the nation as that which has now to be inquired into. But we could not, it may be premised, have arrived by *a priori* reasoning at the nature of the correspondence, in such a way as to anticipate the circumstances of Christ's life by way of necessary inference from the life of the nation. This is well expressed by Dr Wordsworth, in his note on Matt. ii. 15.

'This was spoken, in the first instance, of the ancient Church of God delivered by Him from Egypt in its infancy. The Holy Spirit applies it to Christ; and He thus teaches us:—

'To regard Christ as One with His Church in all ages of her history. In the persecution of the literal Egypt, He teaches us to see a persecution of Christ. In all their affliction He was afflicted, and the Angel of His presence saved them (Is. lxiii. 9). He was with them in the Exodus, and led them through the Red Sea: they drank of that Spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ (1 Cor. x. 4—9). They were in Him, and He in them.

'To regard what is said by the Holy Spirit concerning the literal Israel as God's Son, as having a prelusive reference to what is declared in the Gospel concerning the only begotten Son of God; and to see under the guidance of the Holy Spirit speaking in the Gospel, its *πλήρωσις*, or *accomplishment*, in Christ.

'Thus, in His dealings with His own prophecies, the Holy Spirit opens to us new lights as to their meaning, lights which we could never have hoped to receive.'

There are two classes of interpretation here to be considered:

1. The words of St Matthew, above quoted, are commonly supposed to indicate that Christ went down into Egypt, in order that by a subsequent exodus He might give occasion for the fulfilment of the prophetic utterance, 'Out of Egypt have I called my Son.' The analogy of the two

calls, as thus limited to the times of exodus, is seemingly a slight one. The bringing up of Israel out of Egypt was a signal deliverance from oppression there endured ; Christ, on the contrary, escaped Herod's massacre by this descent into Egypt and sojourn there. Egypt was to Him a refuge ; to them a house of bondage (Ex. xx. 1). The journey of Moses (Ex. iv. 20) bears a certain resemblance to that of Joseph, 'and the young child and his mother.' but the latter was undertaken in fear of Herod, and the former when all danger had passed away. The command to leave Egypt, in the one case, has an obvious verbal correspondence with the command to return into Egypt in the other. To Moses it was said, 'Go, return into Egypt ; *for all the men are dead which sought thy life*' (Ex. iv. 19). The command to Joseph was, 'Go into the land of Israel : *for they are dead which sought the young child's life.*' In all this there is more almost of contrast than of agreement ; the solitary coincidence being, that as Israel was brought up out of Egypt, so the infant Jesus, though under very different circumstances, was brought up out of Egypt. These contrarieties would, however, testify to the historic truth of the account ; for it is incredible that an analogy so precarious should have formed the basis of the narrative.

2. Dr Lee, who rejects the above rendering, writes¹ as follows :

"It is said that the child was in Egypt until the death of Herod. It is added, 'that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Out of Egypt have I called my son.' Thus the passage stands in our version ; but I ask, How can this apply to the context ? It is only said here that Christ remained so long in Egypt that it might be fulfilled, &c. ; and then the prophecy is cited. It is not said that He left Egypt, and so the prediction was fulfilled : the account of His leaving Egypt is not entered upon till we come to the twentieth verse ; and then we hear

¹ *Serm. and Diss.* p. 178.

nothing of this prophecy. I prefer taking it therefore in the sense in which I have translated the passage from Hosea: *Since or from (the times of) Egypt, I have named (Israel) my son.*"

To this second method of interpretation Bengel *e.g.* has not hesitated to give in his adherence. It is required, argues this commentator, by the parallelism; and the expression 'call' is inapplicable to what is invariably described as a *leading*, or *bringing* out from Egypt. Several points in the original context have to be considered.

The first clause of Hos. xi. 1, describes God's love of the infant nation Israel; the second clause speaks of that 'call from Egypt,' the meaning of which remains to be determined. The above argument from the parallelism assumes that as the first clause speaks of Israel as *a child*, so the second, by its expression, 'from Egypt,' must denote a reckoning onward from the nation's infancy. The parallelism may be illustrated from the writings of the same prophet:

'And I will give her her vineyard from thence, and the valley of Achor for a door of hope: and she shall sing there as in the days of her youth, and as in the day when she came up out of the land of Egypt.' (Hos. ii. 15.)

Whatever may be the precise value of this argument from the parallelism, it may be noted that, *from the Egypt-time*, is an admissible interpretation of the words, '*from Egypt*,' as is shewn by Hos. xii. 9; xiii. 4: 'And I that am the Lord thy God *from the land of Egypt* will yet make thee to dwell in tabernacles, as in the days of the solemn feast.' 'Yet I am the Lord thy God *from the land of Egypt*, and thou shalt know no God but me: for there is no Saviour beside me.' Where 'the expression, *from the land of Egypt*, may not be restrained only to the act of bringing them out¹ of Egypt, but comprehend both his preservation of them there and his bringing them out thence, and all other great benefits by which, from that time of declaring them to be his people,

¹ See Pococke on the passages cited; where the LXX., agreeing with the Targum, insert *ἀπὸ τῆς Αἰγύπτου*.

he approved himself to be *their God*, a God to them in a more peculiar manner than to other nations... 'The Lord and God of them and of all was he from the beginning, but *their Lord* by more particular interest, *from the land of Egypt, in framing them wherein into a people to himself*, and bringing them out thence with mighty signs and wonders, and protecting them thenceforward, he shewed such evident tokens of his power and favour, as neither before nor to any other people.'

Several authorities agree in the rendering, 'I named.' Thus, 'the author of the MS. Arab. translation, *from Egypt have I named him my son* ; according to which way Kimchi also gives this meaning: *Out of Egypt I began to call him my son*. They seem to follow the Chaldee, which hath *out of Egypt I called them sons*.' Israel there began to exist as the chosen *nation*, and was there first named 'my son': 'Thus saith the Lord, Israel is my son, even my first-born' (Ex. iv. 22). In all this, however, the rendering of the phrase, *from Egypt*, is most important. The clause might be rendered, without great variation in the sense: *from the Egypt-time I called to* (*i.e.* summoned or invited) *my son*. This gives perhaps the simplest construction, and agrees best with the apparent meaning of the context, which will next be briefly noticed.

In the second verse of Hos. xi. the word *call* recurs, and there in the sense, *invite*: 'As they called them, so they went from them:' which many interpret of an unheeded call by God's prophets to His worship. Others interpret it of invitations to idolatry, as seems most in accordance with the marked contrast in the next verse: *Whereas I¹, even I, had taught Israel to go*. The preceding verses may be rendered:

'When Israel was a child, then I loved him ; and from the Egypt-time I called my son.

'They called them, so they went from before them: to² sacrifice to Baalim, to burn incense to graven images.'

¹ ואנכי תרגלתי Le Clerc's rendering shews the emphasis: 'Sed vocarunt Israelitas alii, et propter hos sic abierunt...Ego docui Ephraimum ire, cepit eum Moses in brachia sua.'

² Fut. *lit.* 'that they might.'

God's lifelong care is contrasted with their unfaithfulness, and His love with their ingratitude; till it is declared at length (ver. 5) that they 'shall not return to the land of Egypt (*i.e.* to the good times of old¹), but the Assyrian shall be his king, because they refused to return.' The name Egypt was associated with the spring-time of national existence, with Jacob's blessing of the nascent tribes, with their election to divine sonship *in* that land, before the exodus.

This interpretation, which makes the *call* precede the exodus, seems to simplify St Matthew's application of the prophecy:

'When he arose, he took the young child and his mother by night, and departed into Egypt. And was there until the death of Herod: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, From the Egypt-time² called I my son' (ii. 14, 15).

Subjoined are extracts from the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy, to which Dr Lee thus refers. 'In the apocryphal gospel of our Saviour's infancy, I find this text cited, not with reference to Christ's egress from Egypt, but to his being preserved there from the cruelty of Herod. It will not be too much, therefore, to suppose that, in the early times of the church, this view of the text may have generally prevailed.'

This Gospel sets forth Christ as miraculously designated God's Son, and there, *in Egypt*, so acknowledged. It then adds, 'Here was fulfilled the prophecy which saith, From Egypt have I called my son.' Israel was called 'My son, my first-born,' (Ex. iv. 22) in Egypt and thenceforward. Christ was acknowledged as God's son *in* and *from* that land. The extracts are taken from Mr Cowper's translation of the *Apocryphal Gospels*, pp. 178—180.

¹ Compare Hos. ii. 15, already cited.

² To illustrate this rendering of the Greek, compare *ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός*, Matt. xix. 12; *ἐκ νεότητος*, Acts xxvi. 43; and the corresponding classical usages.

'Here the Greek says *out of*, viewing the time specified not as a *point* from which something is reckoned, but, by a more vivid conception, as an expanse *out of* which something is diffused,' Winer.

On the arrival of 'Joseph and lady Mary,' the people inquire of a certain idol, 'What is this agitation and commotion which hath arisen in our land?' The idol replies: 'There cometh hither a God in secret, who truly is a God, neither is any God beside Him worthy of worship, because He is truly the Son of God. And the same hour that idol fell, and at its fall all the inhabitants of Egypt and others ran together.' In the next chapter (the eleventh) a demoniac child of the ministering priest describes his cure by contact with the swaddling clothes of the Lord Christ. 'Having taken one of them I placed it on my head, and the demons left me and fled away.' And his father, greatly rejoicing because of him, said, 'My son, it may be that this child is the Son of the living God who created heaven and earth; for when he came to us, the idol was broken, and all the gods fell, and perished through the might of his magnificence.'

The twelfth chapter opens with the statement that the prophecy in question was *then and there* fulfilled: it then describes the consternation of Joseph and Mary, and their preparation for departure.

'Here was fulfilled the prophecy which saith, Out of Egypt have I called my son. But Joseph and Mary, when they heard that the idol had fallen and perished, feared and trembled. Then they said, When we were in the land of Israel Herod thought to slay Jesus, and therefore he slew all the children of Bethlehem and its borders; and there is no doubt but the Egyptians, as soon as they hear that this idol is broken, will burn us with fire.'

The most noteworthy point in connection with the sojourn in Egypt is here taken to be the acknowledgment of Christ's divinity consequent upon the fall of the Egyptian idols in His presence. The same view, it may be added, is set forth in the gospel of pseudo-Matthew, where the prophecy of Hosea is not quoted. 'If this were not the God of our gods, our gods would by no means have fallen on their faces before him, neither would they lie prostrate in his sight; wherefore they silently avow him to be their Lord... Then

all the people of that city believed in the Lord God through Jesus Christ.' The departure from Egypt is very cursorily alluded to: 'Not much time after, an angel said to Joseph, Return to the land of Judah, for they are dead who sought the child's life. And it came to pass that after the return, &c.'

Whichever of the renderings considered in this section be adopted; whether, *from Egypt I named my Son*, or (as seems more consonant with the Hebrew) *from Egypt I called to (i.e. invited) my Son*, the reference would be, not to a single act in history, like the bringing up of Israel out of Egypt, but to the continued display of that divine favour which was first shewn to Israel as a nation in the land of Egypt¹. The prophet describes God's lifelong care for the chosen nation, and in so doing he employs expressions which are in themselves symbolical, and which therefore, in their literal sense, have no necessary application to the Messiah. In this case too, as above, it may be questioned whether the prophetic utterance would have failed of its realization in Christ, if He had escaped Herod's massacre by a flight to any other than the literal² Egypt. It would seem rather that the realization would have been as complete, even though its literal expression may have been different; and that St Matthew does but adduce the external coincidence as *symbolizing the fulfilment in Christ of what Hosea had expressed symbolically*.

V. *He shall be called a Nazarene.* Matt. ii. 23; Is. xi. 1.

Of the various explanations that have been given of this citation, the form *Nazoræus* seems to exclude that which assumes a derivation from *Nazir* (or Nazarite), for this would necessitate the vocalization *Naziræus*. Of other interpretations there are two, running up into one, which seem to satisfy the requirements of the case. The one is that Christ should be despised, or obscure, as an inhabitant of Nazareth: 'Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth?' (Joh. i. 47). The other that the reference is to Isaiah's prophecy of

¹ See Note D, p. 73.

² Rev. xi. 8.

the *Netser*, or *Branch* (xi. 1); or rather to the whole class of prophecies which represent the Messiah, not indeed by the word *Netser* (which is used of Him once only), but by some synonymous expression. There is one antecedent objection to this solution, on which Bengel *e.g.* has very reasonably laid great stress, viz. that a Z in the Greek points *invariably* to such a spelling in the Hebrew as would exclude the derivation from *Netser*. There are exceptions, far from numerous, to the rule here laid down: but one exception will suffice to remove the objection, and, not indeed to afford any presumption that the proposed derivation is the true one, but to prepare the way for other considerations which would seem to point to that conclusion. An example is presented by the LXX. form of *Uz*¹ (Gen. x. 23); and to this may be added, from extraneous sources, *Zωφασημύλν*².

In favour of the derivation *Netser* are the spellings of the Arabic and Syriac versions, and still more, the names by which Christ and His followers were designated in later Jewish writings. There is apparently no sufficient reason for doubting that the contemptuous expression, 'the sect of the Nazarenes' (Acts xxiv. 5), corresponds to those later contumelious expressions derived from *Netser*; a word used indeed of the Messiah in Is. xi. 1, but occurring too in Is. xiv. 19, in a sense well suited to its application as a title of contempt: 'But thou art cast out of thy grave like an abominable *branch*.' In the name of the city Nazareth, it would seem that the termination *eth* is non-essential. In the oft-quoted passage of David de Pomis, we find *Netser* given as the name of the town: 'A Nazarene is one born in the town Netser, of Galilee, distant three days' journey from Jerusalem.' And 'even at the time of Eusebius (*Hist.* i. 7) and of Jerome, the place was called *Nazara*.' The latter identifies Nazareth with the still existing Nazara, a village of Galilee, near Mount Tabor, and fifteen miles to the east of Legio. In *Epist.* xvii.

¹ Οὐζ, for עֵז. Fürst. *sub lit.* ע. μν, צוֹפֵי שְׁמִים. Sanchun, p. 10, Orell.'

² 'Perraro Z adhibent, ut Ζωφασημύλν. (Gesen. *Thesaur.* 1143 b).

ad Marcellum, he alludes expressly to the derivation from *Netser*: 'Let us go to Nazareth, and according to a right interpretation of that name we shall see there the *flower* of Galilee¹.' This view of the primitive form of the word explains, as Dr Hengstenberg further remarks, the non-occurrence of the letter *T* in the adjectival forms *Nazoræus*, *Nazarenus*; where *Nazaretæus* might have been expected if the form Nazareth involved the *th* as other than an ex-crescence.

Buxtorf in his Talmudic Lexicon, mentions first of all, under the title *Ben-netser*, a notorious freebooter called the 'chief of robbers'.² The name recurs, as descriptive of the 'regnum impium,' in a comment upon Dan. vii. 8: 'I considered the horns, and, behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots; and behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things.' And Isaac Abarbanel further declares this same Ben-netser to be Jesus the Nazarene (Notsri). To this Buxtorf adds the saying from *Aruch*, 'Netser is the accursed Nazarene.' Jerome writes of the Jews that, 'three times a day they anathematized Christians in their synagogues under this name of Nazarenes;' and it may be added that even a verb to Nazarize³ (*Christianus fieri*) was in vogue amongst them. Having then a strong external presumption that St Matthew's *Nazaræus* includes a reference to the *Netser* of Is. xi. 1, we proceed in the next place to consider what, with the Evangelist, was the probable significance of the allusion.

'Out of the stumps of Jesse,' writes Dr. Delitzsch on the passage alluded to, 'i. e. out of the remnant of the chosen royal family, which has sunk down to the insignificance of the house from which it sprang, there comes forth a twig which promises to supply the place of the trunk and crown; and down below, in the roots covered with earth, and only

¹ See Hengstenberg, *Christol.* 11. 108.
The neighbourhood is said to have been
virgultis consita, which favours the

above derivation.

² ראש לסטים, lit. *caput latronum*.

³ נתנצר or התנצר.

rising a little above it, there shows itself a *netser*, i. e. a fresh, green shoot.' The prophecy is thus pregnant with a meaning which is altogether missed in some allusions to the passage, which seem to indicate that the name *Branch* is a sort of casual appellation of the Messiah, e. g. 'There may be an allusion to *Netser* (a branch), by which name our Lord is called in Is. xi. 1, and from which word it appears that the name Nazareth is probably derived.' The true significance is brought out still more emphatically in Is. liii. 1, 2: 'What manner of man¹ is this on whom the arm of the Lord hath been revealed? For he grew up like a sucker or small side-shoot from a root or stump, left for dead in barren ground: he had no form nor comeliness; and when we saw him, there was no beauty that we should desire him.' By the word *Netser* are symbolized those characteristics of the Messiah which are here prophetically set forth. He was to be 'despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief.' Christ answered to this description in all those circumstances of his life which contrasted with the popular anticipations of 'King Messiah.' The obscurity of Nazareth forced itself on so ready an adherent as Nathanael (John i. 47); from it the title on the cross borrowed an epigrammatic significance (John xix. 19); it entered into an opprobrious designation of Christ's followers, adopted by Tertullus (Acts xxiv. 5); and was applied by Jews in aftertime, in a way that has already been dwelt upon at sufficient length.

Our Lord, it may be concluded, is set forth by St. Matthew in the passage before us, as realizing a conspicuous series of prophetic announcements, not by dwelling in a city connected etymologically² with a word once met with in those prophecies, but by all those circumstances in his earthly life that were naturally attendant upon, and suggested by, His residence in Nazareth. His dwelling in Nazareth, and being

¹ See next Chapter.

² Compare e. g. 'נֹר' est *regii capitis insigne*: et נֹרֶת, Hillero interprete, est oppidum quo vertex montis *corona-*

tur. Itaque *Nazareni* cognomen Germanice exprimi posset: *Zu Cronberg hat der Gekrönte gewohnet*. Vid. Psalm cxxxii. 18.'

named therefrom is adduced as *symbolizing the fulfilment of that whole class of prophecies in HIM*.

The formula of citation¹ which introduces the prophetic reference considered above, has been more or less refined upon as a means of solving the difficulties which the passage presents. Lost and *unwritten*² prophecies have been referred to. Others have inferred from the use of the plural 'by the prophets,' that there is a merely general reference to the import of those prophetic descriptions wherein Christ is set forth as lowly and despised, and that no more definite solution is to be sought. This laxer view is not, indeed, excluded by the formula of citation, but all things considered, is untenable as it stands: it requires, in fact, to be modified as above, by supposing a reference to a particular expression (Is. xi. 1), itself symbolical, and set forth, not as an actual name by which the Messiah was to be called, but as representing his circumstances and condition. The fulfilment does not consist in merely 'being called,' but in *being* all that the name implied: such in fact is the common Biblical usage of the word 'to call.' It has been urged against the interpretation above adopted, that in the far more precise prophecies of the branch, in Zech. iii. 8; vi. 12; Jer. xxiii. 5; xxxiii. 15; Is. iv. 2, the word *Tsemach* is used. The objection thus stated involves a misconception of the prophecy of the *Netser*, that frail, feeble shoot, whose increase was to transcend anticipation; and confounds it with other prophecies which describe the after-growth without explicit reference to its small beginning. The objection however may be re-stated, and in its revised form requires an answer. The word *Netser*, it might be urged, is not used in Is. liii. 2, where the Messiah's lowliness is brought out by a like similitude. This is doubtless an argument against the notion that the 'prophets' cited told of Christ as one who should be a Nazarene *by name*; but it is of no force as against the view explained above, viz. that the prophecies

¹ τὸ ρηθὲν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν. See Matt. i. 23; ii. 15, 18; iv. 15.

² 'Non ait Matthæus scriptum est, sed dictum est.'

in question described him, without reference to name or place¹, as he should truly be. St Matthew singles out *retrospectively*, one typical example which contains a reference to the name, itself typical of Nazarene; and this actual correspondence is adduced as itself typifying the fulfilment of a whole class of Messianic predictions in JESUS of Nazareth. If Christ had not resided in Nazareth, or been *called* a Nazarene, it could scarcely have been affirmed that the collection of prophecies of which Isaiah's prophecy of the Netser is viewed as a nucleus, had lacked their accomplishment; no more, in fact, than such failure could now be argued from the non-appearance of any title of our Lord derived from the word *choter*, which stands in parallelism with *netser*.

The Evangelist's reference, above considered, was doubtless plain to his contemporaries, however difficult it may be for a later generation to fix its meaning. The prophecy of the *netser* was familiar to the populace, as descriptive of the Messiah, but it does not follow that its significance was generally accepted; for it is notorious that some passages wherein the unostentatious demeanour of the coming King is most clearly portrayed, were glossed over and explained away in the received Chaldee versions of Holy Writ. The Jews would at once grant the true Messiah to be the antitype of the *Netser*, but might yet regard the title as inapplicable in its Messianic significance to the lowly *Nazarene*. There is however an example of our Lord's recognition as at once the *Nazarene* and the Messiah, which seems to favor the hypothesis of an allusion to Isaiah's prophecy, 'There shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch (*Netser*) shall grow out of his roots:' the same collocation of ideas is perhaps discernible in the following passage: 'And they came to Jericho: and as he went out of Jericho with his disciples and a great number of people, blind Bartimeus, the son of

¹ One writer, anxious to discover a local reference, observes that Zebulon (Is. ix. 1), which contains Nazareth, is derived from **נָחֻל**, κατ' ὅλην. 'Ibi

ergo habes, sed occulte et prophetice, **ὅτι Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται**, *h. e.* Hebræorum more erit.'

Timeus, sat by the highway begging. And when he heard that it was Jesus of Nazareth, he began to cry out, and say, Jesus, *thou son of David*, have mercy on me. And many charged him that he should hold his peace: but he cried the more a great deal, Thou son of David, have mercy on me.' (Mark x. 46—48; Luke xviii. 35—39).

NOTES ON CHAPTER IV.

A. מַקְדָּוֹן (Gen. xlix. 10) has been variously rendered, *lawgiver* and *ruler's staff*. The latter rendering is illustrated by Ps. lx. 7, 8; cviii. 9: Ephraim is my helmet; Judah my *sceptre*; Moab is my washpot; over Edom will I cast out my shoe. The former by Is. xxxiii. 22: 'For the Lord is our judge, the Lord is our *lawgiver*, the Lord is our king; he will save us.' But it matters little whether Judah, conceived of as living in the person of a descendant, be described as in possession of the ruler's staff; or whether it be declared explicitly that his descendant shall bear rule, until a certain *terminus ad quem*.

B. It has been suggested that the accusative ὁδόν (Matt. iv. 15) might be governed by a verb (which would be either *humbled*, or *glorified*) understood from the original Hebrew. But why is not 'land' also in the accusative, as in the original? There are traces indeed of a reading γῆν, but it ill agrees with the general run of the LXX. rendering. Others seem to have supplied κατοικοῦντες. See *Holmes and Parsons*.

C. It may be here noted that we are not confined, even by classical usage, to what may be called the strict interpretation of τότε ἐπληρώθη, ἵνα πληρωθῇ, and the like. This is well illustrated by the subjoined passages quoted by Le Clerc, in his note on Matt. ii. 14:

(i). Διογενὴς ὁ Σινωπεὺς συνεχῶς ἐπέλεγεν ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ, ὅτι τὰς ἐκ τῆς τραγωδίας ἀρὰς αὐτὸς ἐκπληροῖ καὶ ὑπομένει, εἶναι γὰρ πλανῆς, ἄδικος, κ.τ.λ. *Ælianus*, Lib. III. c. 29.

Diogenes Sinopensis perpetuo dicebat de se, exsecrationes tragœdiæ *se explere* et ferre, esse enim erronem, sine domo, &c.

(ii). Simili ratione Olympiodorus, in vita Platonis, ei aptat versum Homeri :

κειμένον αὐτοῦ, μέλιτται προσελθοῦσαι πεπληρώκασιν αὐτοῦ τὸ στόμα κηρίων μέλιτος, ἵνα ἀληθὲς περὶ αὐτοῦ γένηται·

τοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ γλώσσης μέλιτος γλυκίων ῥέεν αὐδῇ.

Cum jaceret, apes accedentes impleverunt os ejus favis mellis,⁷ *ut verum de eo fieret* illud Homeri : ‘Cujus a lingua vox dulcior melle fluebat.’

D. In Ezek. xxiii. 8, this phrase ἐξ Αἰγύπτου refers to what had been begun ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ (ver. 3), and continued thenceforward : καὶ τὴν πορνείαν αὐτῆς ἐξ Αἰγύπτου οὐκ ἐγκατέλιπεν. In Hos. xi. 1, the LXX. read ἐξ Αἰγύπτου μετεκάλεσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ. ‘But this seems so inconvenient, that a noted learned man (Vossius) as great a defender of the LXX. as any, not flying to a various reading, as if they read *לכניי*, as Cappell supposeth, saith, sane LXX. interpretes sic vertisse stultum est existimare, *that it is a foolish thing to think that the seventy Interpreters did so render*... Yet a long while hath this gone for the real version of the LXX. in this place. So Eusebius took it to be, and saith that Aquila reading it in the singular, τὸν υἱόν μου, did it δουλεύσας τῷ Ἑβραϊκῷ, addicting *himself to the Hebrew*. St Jerome also looked on it as so, while he hence takes an argument to shew that St Matthew cited this place, juxta Hebraicam veritatem, *according to the Hebrew truth*, and not according to the LXX.’ There is an opinion, mentioned by Eusebius, and held chiefly by defenders of the LXX. reading, that St Matthew’s reference is to Num. xxiv. 8, or elsewhere, instead of to Hosea. This opinion has been taken up by Vossius, who gives a caution, ne quis somniet ex Os. xi. 1 verba esse deprompta.

The Arabic follows the LXX. The Syriac has, *from Egypt I called him my son*. Symmachus, ὅτι παῖς Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἡγαπημένος, ἐξ Αἰγύπτου κέκληται υἱός μου. In Matt. ii. 15, Wiclif has, *fro egipt I haue clepid my sone*. Other old English translations agree, word for word, with the Authorized Version. Compare, further : ἐκ κοιτίας μητρός μου ἐκάλεσε τὸ ὄνομά μου (Is. xlix. 1). St Paul may allude to Hos. xi. 1, 3, in Acts xiii. 17, 18 : He *reared* them (Is. i. 2) in Egypt ; He *nursed* them in the wilderness.