

SWEETGOSPELHARMONY.COM

The Gospel in the Law

PART II

CHAPTER V.

The suffering Messiah.

Is. lii. 13—15 ; liii.

GREAT as is the contention about the meaning and application of this prophecy, it may be laid down as generally admitted that a doctrine of vicarious satisfaction is contained therein, and that it must have formed the groundwork of apostolic teaching on the sacrificial death of Christ. Allusions to the passage and appropriations of its phraseology are frequent, while from the majority of its verses direct citations have been borrowed. There are more or less direct citations from lii. 15 ; liii. 1, 4, 5, 7—9, 11, 12, some needing only to be pointed out, while others, as presenting peculiar difficulties, invite a more detailed inquiry. But before proceeding to consider the citations, it may be well to attempt by a retranslation of the passage to elucidate some points which in the Authorized Version are obscure ; and in this retranslation it seems best to retain for the most part the familiar phraseology, even though it should appear that in some few cases another phrase might have been chosen with advantage, or another word have recommended itself as a more striking and exact representation of the original. It may be premised that some details which have no very obvious bearing on the question of citation have been passed by without discussion.

lii. 13. Lo, my servant shall deal prudently,
He shall rise, and be extolled, and be very high.

14. Even as many were astonished at thee ;
So marred was his¹ visage more than any man,
And his form more than the sons of men.
 15. So shall he agast² many nations ;
Kings shall shut their mouth at him :
When they see the like whereto had not been told them ;
And ponder the like whereto they had not heard³.
- liii. 1. Who had⁴ believed the tidings told us,
And for what manner of man⁵ hath the arm of the
LORD been displayed.
2. For he sent up as it were a shoot before him,
As a stock⁶ sendeth from parched ground,
With no form thereto nor any beauty.
And when we saw him, there was no sightliness that
we should desire him.
 3. He was despised and forsaken of men ;
A man of sorrows and acquainted with ills :
And we hid as it were our faces from him ;
He was despised, and we esteemed him not.

¹ 'They marvelled, saying, How marred was his visage...' Thus the change to the third person is accounted for. The prophet *takes up* the direct form of address in ver. 15. [p. 122.]

² Or thus: 'So shall he make...to stand agaz'd.' The active verb *agast* (= *set a gaze*) is used by Chaucer, Spenser, &c. The Hebrew is *הָיָה*, which is here taken as fut. hiphil from *הָיָה* (Is. lvi. 10); *yahzeh* becoming *yasseh*, just as *mah-zeh* becomes *maszeh* (Ex. iv. 2). See Note A, p. 124.

³ Some see an allusion to this verse in 1 Cor. ii. 9 (but see Is. lxiv. 3). This view is in a manner confirmed by St Paul's words in ver. 8: 'Which none of the princes of this world knew...'

⁴ This chapter (ver. 1—10) has been supposed to express the thoughts of the

kings and nations as they stand 'aghast in speechless trance.' The past, '*had believed*,' may be conditional, as in Lam. iv. 12, 'The kings of the earth, and all the inhabitants of the world, *would not have believed* that the adversary and the enemy should have entered into the gates of Jerusalem.' Compare Hab. i. 5; Acts xiii. 41, 'which ye will not believe, though it be told you.'

⁵ *עַל מִי*, 'who would have thought that for such an one...?' What was he that for him...? So in Amos vii. 2, 5: *מִי יָקוֹם יַעֲקֹב*, 'What is Jacob that he should arise?'

⁶ The *root* or stump did not spring up *en masse* from the ground, but sent out a small sucker or side shoot, *before* or in front. A *neser* grew 'out of his roots.' Is. xi. 1. See Rev. v. 5.

4. Surely himself took up our ills,
And bare the burden of our sorrows :
And we did esteem him
Plagued, smitten of God, and afflicted.
5. Yet was he pierced for our transgressions,
He was bruised for our iniquities :
The chastisement of our peace was upon him ;
And with his stripes we are healed.
6. All we like sheep had gone astray ;
We had turned every one to his own way ;
And the LORD made to meet on him
The iniquity of us all.
7. It¹ was exacted, and he was evil entreated,
Yet he opened not² his mouth :
As a lamb is led to the slaughter,
And as a ewe before her shearers is dumb,
So he opened not his mouth.
8. He was taken from prison and from judgment :
(And of his generation who could tell ?
For it was cut off from the land of the living)
For the transgression of my people that were plagued³:
9. And they appointed him a grave with wrongdoers ;
But with a rich man was his tomb⁴ :
Because he had done no violence,
Neither was guile found in his mouth.
10. For the LORD purposed when he sorely bruised him :
That if his soul would make an offering for sin,

¹ Viz. our *iniquity*, or its penalty. The Heb. *nagas* is applied to the exaction of debts. Lowth's rendering is : 'It was exacted, and he was made answerable.'

² Or : 'yet *would he not open*.'

³ The plague spot of divine displeasure was on them, whereas we had thought *Him* plagued (ver. 4). For the construction, cp. Job iii. 15 : 'Or with princes *that had gold*,' lit. *gold to them*.

The LXX. add a Π , thus Π $\nu\epsilon\epsilon$ $\lambda\epsilon\mu\tau$, $\eta\chi\theta\eta$ $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$.

⁴ 'It (viz. his honourable burial) was the beginning of the glorification which commenced with His death.' This first note of just requital leads up to the declaration in ver. 10, that suffering had been set before Him as the gate of glory. The LORD's purpose, from first to last, was the conditional glorification of his Servant. See note B, p. 126.

- He should see a seed prolong its days.
 And the purpose of the LORD shall prosper in his hand.
 11. Of the travail of his soul he foreseeeth that he shall be
 satisfied¹,
 By his knowledge that ² he my servant, being righteous,
 shall make many righteous³;
 And their burden of iniquities himself will bear.
 12. Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great⁴,
 And he shall divide the spoil with the strong;
 Because that he poured out his soul unto death,
 And was numbered with transgressors.
 Yet himself took up the sin of many,
 And He shall make intercession⁵ for the transgressors.

The passage opens with the Divine sentence that the servant of the Lord shall deal prudently or prosperously and shall attain to the highest degree of exaltation that can be expressed or conceived. He shall be exalted (to borrow an expression from the old Messianic interpreters) 'above Abraham, and above Moses, and above the ministering angels.' The horror with which multitudes regarded, or rather shrunk from the sight of a form and visage so marred as scarcely to seem human, shall be surpassed only by the blank astonishment of kings and peoples at the glorious end of His self-sacrifice. They shall stand agazed, and dumbly ponder on the like whereunto had not before been seen or heard. Who *could* have believed such tidings? Who would have

¹ Since from the travail of his soul he is enabled to foresee a satisfaction, (by the consciousness that his undeserved sufferings shall redound to the justification of the many) he takes up the burden, and the purpose prospers. Heb. xii. 2.

² 'By his knowledge that'—There is a stop on this word in the Hebrew; the 'knowledge' referring equally to the *remainder of the clause*, and not specially to any portion of it. So the stop at

'him' (ver. 4) marks the *mutual coherence* of the following clause.

³ Rom. iii. 26 : *δικαιον καὶ δικαιοῦν-τα*. Rom. v. 18, 19.

⁴ Or : 'I will apportion him the many' (LXX. *κληρονομήσει πολλούς*). See Ps. ii. 8. '*Therefore*' means : *and so, for the following reason*, viz. 'because'.

⁵ *Fut.* Having taken their sin upon him, he has obtained the right to intercede on their behalf. Heb. vii. 25. Cp. Heb. iv. 25.

thought that on the behalf of such an one the arm of JEHOVAH would have been displayed? seeing that in His first estate He was frail, and unsightly, and unpromising, like a side-shoot from a stump that had been left for dead in a thirsty soil. He was a man of pains and ills; we shrunk from the very sight of Him; He was despised and we esteemed Him not. But while we thought Him divinely plagued, His ills and pains were in truth what He had *taken up* from us, and was bearing as His own burden. We were *scattered* every one to his own way, and the Lord caused our multiplex iniquities to *clash together* upon Him. Satisfaction for others' sins was required of Him, yet He murmured not. He was dragged from confinement and the judgement-seat, for the transgression of 'my people,' on whom in truth lay the curse, and whose was of right the punishment. No trace of His generation remained upon the earth: none knew whence He came, or whither He went. He is like one that has been immured in a dungeon for long years till his antecedents are clean forgotten, and the circumstances that bring him then at length before the notice of the world, and draw the eyes, and soon the hearts, of all men unto Him, are His hasty condemnation and violent death. Not till after they had appointed Him a common grave with a heap of malefactors do they discover something of His true worth; and then they relent, and consign Him at last to a rich man's private burial mound. Here begins the glorification which the LORD had purposed from the beginning; and which *He* had as constantly foreseen from amid His sufferings. Because He suffered wrongfully, and poured forth His life in behalf of many, I will grant Him 'the many' for His inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for His possession. He died once for their sins, and so shall ever live to make intercession for them.

I. *On the Messianic interpretation.* The application of the prophecy to the Messiah seems to have been accepted by the Jews of old without hesitation, and to have been abandoned subsequently with controversial aim.

The threefold exaltation : ' He shall rise, and be extolled, and be very high : ' was applied, as we have seen, in its several gradations, to King Messiah. It describes, according to Kimchi, who avoids the Messianic interpretation, the greatest exaltation that can be expressed or conceived. The bearing of others' sins and diseases was also attributed to the Messiah ; the only restriction being that He was viewed, at least by some, as solely or especially the deliverer of *Israel*. It has been well remarked by Gesenius, that to the Jew, with his notions of sacrifice and substitution, there was but one obvious and natural interpretation of those portions of the prophecy which told of one bearing the sins of others, and making expiation by His death. The Messianic interpretation was and in fact *must* have been, the oldest and the plainest to Jewish minds ; and such considerations are of weight, as is elsewhere remarked, independently of the results to which any of the more modern methods of interpretation might seem to lead.

The frequent direct and indirect citations of the prophecy by Apostles and Evangelists, which will be considered in the sequel, show clearly the importance which they attached to it as a portraiture of the suffering Messiah. There is a distinct reference to Is. liii. 12, in the words of our Lord Himself : ' For I say unto you, that this that is written must yet be accomplished in me, And He was reckoned among the transgressors ' (Luke xxii. 37) ; and it is not improbable that the intimation, ' how it is written of the Son of Man, that He must suffer many things, and *be set at nought*¹ (Mark ix. 12), had a principal reference to the prophecy in question. The allusion may have been thus definite, or it may, on the contrary, have been entirely general ; but it assumes in any case, by its very brevity and indirectness, that the ancient Scriptures spoke more or less plainly and intelligibly of a suffering Messiah ; for it is no merely didactic and explanatory statement, but appeals unmistakeably to an existing belief, and

¹ ἐξουδερωθῇ. Hengstenberg notices Theodotion render נבזה by ἐξουδερωμέ-
that in Is. liii. 3, Symmachus and *ros.*

would seem to imply that the prophecies alluded to were explained in accordance with Christ's words by 'the scribes' that had been mentioned in ver. 11. The correspondence between the historical Christ and his prophetic portraiture is so exact that it leaves nothing to be desired. A writer after the event could have produced no more graphic delineation of his life and person. 'Indeed the prophetic picture of the sufferings of Jesus of Nazareth is so lifelike, that when it has been for the first time brought before Jews ignorant of the passage, they have affirmed that the chapter has been inserted in the Christian editions of the Hebrew Bible¹.' On the other hand, such alternative applications as have been proposed cannot but be allowed to have fallen short of the description, which is thus made extravagant and untrue: there is, in fact, no attempt to appropriate the prophecy to any definite individual other than Jesus of Nazareth, which is sufficiently successful to call for notice. The theory that the description is borrowed from an older account of some individual martyr, besides standing solely on its merits, does not go to the root of the matter, or determine in what sense the prophet used the words and phrases which, according to this hypothesis, he had borrowed, as apt embodiments of his ideas, from some ancient source². Nor again is there good reason for the assertion that the Messianic interpretation was an afterthought, and that it was natural for a later age, but not so for the prophet and his contemporaries, to discern in his description the lineaments of Christ³.

There is another interpretation which explains the expression, '*my servant*,' as designating the prophetic order taken collectively; an interpretation which has little to recommend it, and which Rosenmüller, *e. g.* one of its former advocates, has rejected, for a more plausible but still incomplete inter-

¹ Aids to Faith, *Essay* III.

² Da er seine Gedanken nicht besser als durch solche *älterer* Worte ausgedrücken wusste... (*Ewald*). It may be added that Ewald regards Is. xl.—lxvi. as for the most part the composi-

tion of a later hand than Isaiah's.

³ Der Glaube der Spätern hier den geschichtlichen Messias zu finden lag gewiss sehr nahe,... (*Ewald*).

⁴ The Messiah is called '*my servant* the branch,' in Zech. iii. 8 (Fürst).

pretation. This last demands consideration: the whole people are thought to be referred to under the collective title *servant*, and the prophet is supposed to describe their sufferings (in terms unprecedented) as an expiation for the sins of others. It needs scarcely be pointed out that on this supposition a far from literal interpretation must be adopted. The description must in fact be taken as ideal even to Jewish minds, and *a fortiori* to the kings of the nations who are depicted as astounded at their discovery then made, that the humiliation of the Jews had an expiatory virtue for their oppressors. But the difficulty of supposing the whole Jewish people to be alluded to has been felt by many interpreters, and accordingly a modification of this last view has been proposed. Since the reference cannot be to all, some would have it that the more pious Jews alone are designated¹. This last eclectic theory may be dismissed with the remark, that it serves as a protest against the preceding application to the collective people. The requisite discrimination it would be especially unnatural to ascribe to the kings that wonder as they behold; nor is the criticism of Rosenmüller to be overlooked, that it is difficult to conceive of a part of the nation as suffering vicariously for the rest when one and all were involved in a common calamity.

The application to the collective people has some arguments in its favour which, though inconclusive, deserve consideration, and may contribute in a measure to the required solution. It is not remarkable that the modern Jews, attracted on the one hand by the national instinct, and repelled on the other by the polemical bias against Christianity, should have acquiesced in the conclusion that the expiatory value of Israel's sufferings and the future glorification of the race are here described. It must not however be denied that, prejudice apart, the arguments for this application are of some force, though not convincing.

The passage in question follows closely upon the summons: 'Loose thyself from the bands of thy neck, O captive daugh-

¹ So Paulus: 'non totum populum Hebræum sed meliorem duntaxat ejus partem intelligi existimat.'

ter of Zion. Break forth into joy, sing together, ye waste places of Jerusalem : for the Lord hath comforted his people, he hath redeemed Jerusalem. The Lord hath made bare his holy arm in the eyes of all the nations, and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God. Depart : touch no unclean thing. The Lord will go before you ; and the God of Israel will be your rereward.' (Is. lii. 2—12).

The prophecy in question intervenes, and in immediate sequence the enlarged hopes and functions of the Jewish Church are set forth. It is henceforth to be a Church of the Gentiles. 'Enlarge the place of thy tent...For thy Maker is thine husband ; and thy Redeemer the Holy One of Israel. The God of *the whole earth* shall he be called.' (liv. 2, 5).

From the form as well as from the general tenour of the context it might seem at first sight that the intervening passage now under consideration is descriptive of the collective chosen people ; for not only are their sufferings and their restoration described before and after, but they are spoken of in the collective singular as the 'captive daughter of Zion,' and again, as 'a woman forsaken and grieved in spirit, and a wife of youth' for a moment forsaken, but now comforted with the assurance : 'with great increase will I gather thee.' All this however is very unlike the definite and sustained personality of the *servant of the LORD*, which is brought out the more clearly by comparison and contrast, and by the recurrent interchange of singular and plural, in relation to other personages there dramatically represented. He, the despised and forsaken one, becomes the marvel of great kings and nations, He alone bears the sins of multitudes that had wandered, each upon his several way. His generation was cut off and he suffered, one for all. He was numbered with criminals, but buried at length in a rich man's private tomb. He was upborne in suffering by the consciousness that his individual self-renunciation would issue in the restoration of the many. Throughout the passage, it may be asserted, there are as clear marks of sustained individualism as there could be if one only person were certainly described ; whereas

of the context, both before and after, nothing that at all approaches to this can be affirmed; but, on the contrary, the 'woman forsaken,' and 'the captive daughter,' are professedly representative of God's people and the holy city. The abrupt change to a pure singular in the intermediate passage is in itself striking, and needs to be accounted for: the more so that not only is a change of form adopted, but the individual, or what is presented individually, is very different in essential character from the city or collective people addressed before and after. It is nowhere intimated that the sufferings of the captive daughter of Zion were voluntarily undergone, or that they were endued with any power of expiation for the sin of others. At first Zion is afflicted: then restored. They had sold themselves for nought; they were redeemed without money (lii. 3), not by their own act or instrumentality, nor yet for any merit of their own. Zion restored is the purely passive recipient of the Redeemer's gift. Such contrasts must not lightly be passed over. Such distinctions remain to be accounted for, and they seem assuredly to militate against the more modern applications of the intermediate verses, or at any rate against the finality of such applications.

Like phraseology to that of Is. liii. 2 is indeed used elsewhere of the Jewish people, as *e. g.*, in a previous chapter of Isaiah: 'The vineyard of the Lord of Hosts is the house of Israel and the men of Judah his *pleasant plant*' (v. 7): and the immediate context is in a measure favourable to this acceptation. But the main conception of the passage has assuredly not been realized historically by any event in the national life; nor can it be said that any actually existent disposition of heathens towards Judaism is described in those verses, which some of the greatest commentators have referred not to the prophet, speaking in his own person, but to the Gentile kings, 'the princes of the world.' The description then must either depict something to be accomplished in the future (*i. e.* it must be *prophetic*), or it must embody an ideal which corresponds to no reality past, present, or to come. On the latter supposition it would be erroneous not in degree

only but in kind. It would err, that is to say, not merely by predicting for Zion a more glorious future than was to be her heritage, but by attributing to her sufferings a propitiatory value, and to herself a perfect sinlessness at variance with fact and with the apparent tendency of other declarations of this same prophet.

As it is much disputed whether the fifty-third chapter contains the reflections of the heathen potentates or of the prophet himself, it may be well to notice some particulars tending to obviate objections to the former view, which has up to this point been presupposed. One of the chief objections arises from the expression '*my people*' in verse 8, which it is assumed must designate 'the covenant people, for whose benefit the atonement and substitution of the servant of God were, in the first instance, intended (Matt. i. 21); yea, were to a certain degree, exclusively intended, inasmuch as the believing Gentiles were received into it as adopted children¹.' But, in the first place, this same word *people* is in itself as applicable to heathens as to Jews; thus, 'Thou hast made us as the offscouring and refuse in the midst of the *peoples*' (Lam. iii. 45); and, secondly, the expression '*my people*' would come quite naturally from the mouths of the several Gentile kings. Nor is the term so obviously inappropriate even from Dr Hengstenberg's point of view, as above set forth. Whether indirectly or directly, the affliction of the servant of God was to bring peace, as Rashi remarks upon the passage, *to all the world*; and the Gentiles who are supposed to be expressing their astonishment, and acknowledging their criminality, may very naturally be regarded as converted and received within the pale of the 'covenant people.' They that were *lo-ammi*, not my people, had now become my people, *ammi*². There are besides some considerations which directly favour the appropriation of Is. liii. 1—10 to the Gen-

¹ Hengstenberg, *Christology*, II. 292. The text referred to, 'He shall save *his people* from their sins,' seems scarcely to favour the narrower application of '*my people*.' Also, God is *not* speaking.

² The *former* view, viz. that one of the Gentile kings uses the expression '*my people*' in its ordinary sense, is the view adopted in the text. Gen. xli. 40; Ex. ix. 27; 1 Kings xxii. 4.

tile kings. The most obvious interpretation of those passages which describe the servant of God as bearing the sins of others, seems to point to the conclusion that the whole punishment fell upon Him, while the guilty escaped the merited infliction. If this be so, then by an extension of Rosenmüller's argument against Paulus, we are led to reject the view that the suffering was endured vicariously for the redemption of *Israel*; for it cannot be denied that the chosen people suffered in their own persons, and are described by the prophets as reduced to the last extremity. 'We have transgressed and have rebelled: thou hast not pardoned. Thou hast covered with anger, and persecuted us: thou hast slain, thou hast not pitied. Fear and a snare is come upon us, desolation and destruction. Mine eye runneth down with rivers of water for the destruction of the daughter of my people.' (Lam. iii. 42—48.) 'Awake, awake, stand up, O Jerusalem, which hast drunk at the hand of the Lord the cup of his fury: thou hast drunken the dregs of the cup of trembling, and wrung them out. There is none to guide her among all the sons whom she hath brought forth; neither is there any that taketh her by the hand of all the sons that she hath brought up.' (Is. li. 17, 18.) Zion cannot then be said to have escaped punishment; nor were her sufferings other than the fit penalty of her own proper sins. What then is the relation of the servant of the Lord to the covenant people?

The Messiah, it would seem, is represented as the last relic of the chosen people; the one sprout that springs from the worn-out stem. His generation is cut off from the land of the living (Is. liii. 8); just as, in a verse above quoted, it is said of Zion that 'there is none to guide her among all the sons whom she hath brought forth.' As in a former chapter the individual Shear-jashub symbolises the *remnant* that *shall return*, so in the passage before us the remnant that returns from the captivity forms conversely the starting-point for the ideal conception of that solitary and mysterious Personage who makes atonement by his death for the whole world's transgressions. The world sins; he only suffers. He is slain

by lawless hands ; and the nations are drawn unto Him by the attraction of His death. Two representations above alluded to are thus avoided : viz. (i) that the chosen people escaped all sufferings ; and (ii) that their actual sufferings were voluntary and undeserved. It remains only to consider whether there is anything unnatural in the supposition that the Gentile kings are here dramatically represented as contemplating and reflecting upon the sufferings and glorification of the servant of God. It may suffice to remark, in answer to any objection hence arising, that such dramatic representations are to be found in the Lamentations of Jeremiah. The desolated Zion is there depicted as crying to the outer world : ' Is it nothing to you, all ye that pass by ? behold, and see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow, which is done unto me, wherewith the Lord hath afflicted me in the day of his fierce anger ' (i. 12). The world treats her with derision : ' All that pass by clap their hands at thee ; they hiss and wag their head at the daughter of Jerusalem, saying, Is this the city that men call The perfection of beauty, The joy of the whole earth ? All thine enemies have opened their mouth against thee : they hiss and gnash the teeth : they say, We have swallowed her up : certainly this is the day that we looked for ; we have found, we have seen it.' (ii. 15, 16). And again, in a verse already quoted, the astonishment of the whole world at her humiliation is described. (iii. 12).

II. *On the popular conception of the Messiah.*

There is an appearance of vacillation in the Chaldee paraphrase of this prophecy ; some portions of it being referred to the Messiah, and others *to the nation*. This peculiarity of the version affords a ready answer to one objection against the Messianic interpretation. It is urged that the Christ is invariably depicted as a king or warrior¹; and it is further assumed

¹ On the later fiction of 'a double Messiah,' of a *son of Joseph* to suffer, and a *son of David* to reign, see Pearson *on the Creed*, Arts. II, IV, VII ; Buxtorf. *Lex. Chald.*, root מִשַּׁח, and s. v. אֲרַמִּילֹם, root אָרַם.

that if predictions of a suffering Messiah really existed, the popular expectations at the time of Christ's appearance must have been very different from what they are admitted to have been. But the national bias would suffice to explain the prevalence of the actually existent notion, more especially if chief prominence was given even in Holy Scripture to the view which would in any case have commended itself most strongly to the populace. In the Targum above alluded to the sufferings of the Messiah are glossed over or more directly perverted. The descriptions of His sufferings are accommodated to their antecedent conceptions of Him as a subjugator of the heathen world ; and that, 'haud raro contra planum et apertum verborum sensum.' If in their Authorized Version the notion of a suffering Messiah was thus suppressed, it was surely no more than natural that it should have gained but slight hold on the popular imagination. Nor is it difficult to account for the prevalence of such anticipations as in those times were uppermost in the Jewish mind. The triumph of Messiah was, so to say, an *elementary* conception. His sufferings were the teaching of a more advanced age. The result, His glory, was first proclaimed ; and afterwards His career of suffering, the means whereby His glorification was to be achieved.

Nor again is it unnatural that even in later times the glories of Messiah should take precedence of His sufferings ; that the former should be dwelt on oftentimes alone ; the latter rarely, and then only in connexion with the former¹. The apparent confusion in the Chaldee paraphrase is, as it would seem, in approximation to the clear and consistent rendering which assumes that the conception is ideal, but that the basis of the conception is the *national development*. This ideal, like others, was to be realized in the Messiah, to whom the prophet points. The humiliation complements but does not contradict the exaltation ; and CHRIST is then more minutely

¹ This does not necessarily involve the assumption that the particular stage of such development is conceived of by the prophet as past or present : it may still be future.

portrayed when the temporary rejection of His people is in view.

III. *Recognized citations.*

The distinct references to this prophecy are numerous and range over the greater portion of the fifty-third chapter, besides including a citation from the last verse of the fifty-second. If the Messianic purport of the whole be first established, these direct citations occasion for the most part but slight difficulty: but besides the distinct and readily discoverable allusions, it is no more than a natural assumption that there must exist many latent and informal coincidences, which would yield at length to a careful scrutiny, and might when discovered give a clew to the argument and train of thought in some obscure and doubtful passages. Such a clew seems to be given in the vexed passage Phil. ii. 5—11, which will be considered in the sequel; but it is proposed first to discuss the chief recognized citations. In the subjoined list the numbers prefixed mark the verses of the original to which allusion is made, beginning from the last verse of the fifty-second chapter.

15. As it is written, To whom he was not spoken of, they shall see; and they that have not heard shall understand. (Rom. xv. 21).

1. That the saying of Esaias the prophet might be fulfilled, which he spake, Lord, who hath believed our report? and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed? (Joh. xii. 38).

1. But they have not all obeyed the gospel. For Esaias saith, Lord, who hath believed our report? (Rom. x. 16).

4. That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses. (Matt. viii. 17).

5, 6. By whose stripes ye were healed. For ye were as sheep going astray. (1 Pet. ii. 24, 25).

7, 8. The place of the scripture which he read was this, He was led as a sheep to the slaughter; and like a lamb

dumb before his shearer, so opened he not his mouth : In his humiliation his judgment was taken away : and who shall declare his generation ? for his life is taken from the earth. (Acts viii. 32, 33).

9. Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth. (1 Pet. ii. 22. Cp. Rev. xiv. 5).

11. Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness. (1 Pet. ii. 24).

12. And the scripture was fulfilled, which saith, And he was numbered with the transgressors. (Mark xv. 28).

12. For I say unto you, that this that is written must yet be accomplished in me, And he was reckoned among the transgressors. (Luke xxii. 37).

12. So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many. (Heb. ix. 28. Cp. Joh. i. 29 ; 1 Pet. ii. 24 ; 1 Joh. iii. 5).

12. Who was delivered for our offences. (Rom. iv. 25. Cp. Matt. xvii. 22.)

Remarks on the foregoing citations.

15. St Paul here follows the LXX. : 'They to whom it was not announced concerning him shall see.' where the words, 'concerning him' (i. e. *my servant*, Is. lii. 13), are explanatory, and do not occur in the Hebrew. The original describes prospectively the astonishment of Gentile kings and nations, when they shall have seen what (*or*, such a thing as) had not been told them...; the unheard-of marvel being the exaltation of the servant of the LORD, whose first estate gave no promise of so glorious an end. But the original certainly admits of the turn which has been given to it by the LXX. ; 'when they to whom it had not been announced shall have seen.' These two renderings are ultimately coincident in meaning, and either might, without material change, be substituted for the other. St Paul has been asserting the independence of his Gospel labours : 'Yea, so have I strived to preach the gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build

upon another man's foundation: but as it is written, 'To whom he was not spoken of, they shall see: and they that have not heard shall understand.' He had made it his endeavour so to distribute his labours that he might tell of Christ to such as had never heard of Him; and this is precisely the same as saying that he had striven to make his announcement come freshly to his hearers, *sc.* by preaching to nations that had not named the name of Christ before.

1. The Evangelist and the Apostle agree in following the LXX., who prefix *Kύπτε*, and this seems to confirm the *prima facie* impression that the question cited is put into the mouth of Esaias, and not merely referred to as occurring in the writings of that prophet. In the foregoing translation from the original it has been assumed, on the contrary, that converted heathens are represented as the speakers. This however involves no *essential* contrariety; for in the one case the prophet would be the actual speaker, and in the other would be representing mediately his own views and impressions. There are two points remaining to be considered, *viz.* the meaning of *ἀκοή*, for which the Authorized Version has *report*; and the propriety of the conditional rendering from the Hebrew, 'Who would, or could, have given credence?'

The word *ἀκοή* occurs in St Paul's citation, and is repeated in his inference from the citation; although its recurrence is not apparent to the English reader. The Authorized Version is as follows: 'But they have not all obeyed the gospel. For Esaias saith, Lord, who hath believed our *report*? So then faith cometh by *hearing*, and hearing by the word of God.' The corresponding word in the Hebrew may be roughly rendered *hearsay*: it means, not *report* or *preaching*, but something *heard*. In the last verse of Is. lii. the nations are represented as considering such a thing as they had never before been told of, and as reflecting thereupon: 'Who could have believed our *herynge*'¹ (lii. 1). The Greek *ἀκοή* represents, both in etymology and usage, the Hebrew word which it

¹ For Isaye seith, lord who bileued to our herynge. *Wiclif.*

replaces, and in its most natural acceptation is equivalent to the 'word of hearing,' or *word heard*¹. Is this meaning necessary or admissible in St Paul's citation? 'The sense in the inference from the citation,' argues Tholuck, 'must be the same as in the citation itself'; and the ordinary meaning seems most appropriate in the inference, for faith comes not immediately from *preaching*, but from the *hearing* and appropriation of the preaching. To adopt the rendering *preaching* or *report*, throughout the passage, gives rise, moreover, to the singular inconsequence: 'But they have not all obeyed the gospel. For Esaias saith, Lord, who hath believed our *report*? So then faith cometh by *report*.' A conclusion which would have followed more naturally upon the affirmation that *all had obeyed*. If however ἀκοή in the citation denotes what the Prophet, and those to whom it had been revealed, had 'heard of the Lord of hosts' (Is. xxi. 10), and in consequence believed, while others had not believed, because they had not heard; a logical connexion between the two verses, Rom. x. 16, 17, becomes at once apparent. 'Who believed the hearing that we heard?' Only we who heard. 'So then faith cometh not but by hearing.' *They* did not and in truth *could* not believe; 'for how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard?' (ver. 14). This agrees, in all that concerns the Apostle's purpose in adducing it, with the original Hebrew as it has been rendered on p. 75. Whether Isaiah or the Gentiles speak the words, St Paul's argument for the necessity of preachers is the same. The Gentiles, we have assumed, are represented in the original as exclaiming; 'Who could have believed' (*sc.* had it not been revealed to him from without) the great mystery which we, having heard and seen,

¹ λόγος ἀκοῆς (Heb. iv. 12; 1 Thess. ii. 13). So Hengstenberg.

² Tholuck is here arguing *against* the meaning adopted in the text. See Alford, *in loc.*

³ They say, 'who could have believed the report that we have heard?' as St Paul's quotation of the passage

(Rom. x. 16) requires the sense to be, when he says, 'But they have not all believed the Gospel, for Esaias saith, who could have believed what we have heard?' (Mason and Bernard, *Heb. Gram.* II. 314). But their incapacity to believe is rather implied than expressed by τὸς ἐπιστῶσαν; 1 Cor. i. 21.

at length believe? St Paul represents them as not having believed, or been in a position to believe, antecedently to that *hearing* which cometh 'by the word of God.' But had they not heard at all? In a certain sense they had, though not effectually. 'Yes verily, their¹ sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the end of the world' (ver. 18).

St John cites Is. liii. 1, as fulfilled in the Jews, who, 'though he had done so many miracles before them, yet believed not on him: That the saying of Esaias the prophet might be fulfilled which he spake, Lord, who hath believed our *herynge*? and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed?...These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory, and spake of him.' (Joh. xii, 38, 41). The writer had truly *heard*, and to him the Lord's mighty working had been revealed. Not so with all to whom the arm of the Lord had been displayed externally. Their disbelief is taken as implying their *inability* to believe, which is accounted for in the words of the same prophet². For this reason could they not believe, 'because that Esaias said again, he hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart; that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them.' (Is. xi. 10). The Evangelist and the Prophet alike lay stress upon a revealing of the mystery as a pre-requisite for faith in what the world could not imagine for itself. Before believing they must hear, and the arm of the Lord must be revealed to them, even as to Esaias and his fellows. Not at the outward ears must the message stop; but it must penetrate, and be appropriated, and impress itself by a Divine power upon the inner sense.

4. The Evangelist renders and applies the Hebrew literally. The two Hebrew words rendered *took*, and *bare*, import respectively his *taking up* (*sc.* from others to himself) and his *bearing as a burden* the pains³ and ills thus taken up. The

¹ This citation of Ps. xix. 4 describes the testimony of the material universe to the glory of God.

² 'Sequitur amplius, non poterant

credere.' *Bengel.*

³ The word *pain* is perhaps the best rendering of מכאוב, although the familiar 'sorrows' has been retained in the

Hebrew implies the continued burdensomeness of these 'infirmities;' the servant of the Lord was bowed down beneath the weight, from which others had been relieved by the transference of their sicknesses to Him. In the Gospel the chief stress is laid upon the removal of literal diseases by Christ, and except so far as *sympathy* with the afflicted is implied, there is no reference to the oppressiveness of His burden; no intimation that it fell with its full force upon Him. He is represented rather as one able to bear, without sensible depression, the infirmities which were found too heavy for the powers of frail humanity. He was preeminently the strong One who 'pleased not himself,' but vouchsafed 'to bear the infirmities' of the weak.' (Rom. xv. 1—3). The original more plainly implies, and the LXX. expresses², that he was *afflicted* on behalf of others.

5, 6. The words, 'by whose stripes *we* were healed,' stand, in the Hebrew, in parallelism with the statement: 'the chastisement of our *peace* was upon him.' The word 'peace' might also be rendered *soundness*³; and the meaning would thus correspond more exactly with the succeeding clause, viz. that cited by St Peter. As 'the blueness of a wound cleanseth away evil' (Prov. xx. 30); so 'the stripes and weals that were inflicted upon Him have made us sound and well.' In a word which follows the citation: 'ye were as sheep going astray; but are now returned unto the Shepherd and *Bishop*⁴ of your souls;' there may be, as it has been suggested, a passing reference to Ezek. xxxiv. 11, 'Behold I, even I, will both search my sheep, and *seek*⁵ them out.'

7, 8. This citation has given rise to great diversity of interpretation, and none of the current renderings can be said to recommend itself as convincing, or to have been accepted by general agreement as other than provisional. The Greek

translation on p. 76. The words ἀσθενείας and νόσους aptly correspond to the original expressions.

¹ τὰ ἀσθενήματα βαστάζειν.

² περὶ ἡμῶν ὀδυνᾶται.

³ 'Venustissimum ὀξύμωρον,' exclaims Vitranga here. He means the same as Jerome when he says: *suo vulnere vulnera nostra curantur* (Delitzsch).

⁴ ἐπισκοπῶν.

⁵ ἐπισκέψομαι.

words are in themselves difficult, and perhaps, it may be found, misleading; for they suggest, as most obvious, what are far from satisfactory renderings of at least one clause. The rendering of the Hebrew is no less disputed; and both the original and the citation being thus unsettled, various attempts have been made to force each into accordance with some more or less arbitrary interpretation of the other. An independent investigation will suggest as admissible and appropriate, a rendering which had been presented *in paraphrase*, by some of our own older translators, but has been, as it would seem, owing to the form in which it was presented, now for a long time set aside, neglected and forgotten. In this rendering, it should be premised, there is no attempt to make it appear that the special verses cited are, throughout, exactly correspondent to the particular words or verses in the Hebrew for which they stand; but while no approach is made towards harmonizing in the literal and grammatical sense, it will be found in the end that we have set before us in the passage considered, what is in all other than merely critical respects a most apt citation, and an appropriate *text* for a discourse upon the passage from which it is taken. But before entering upon this direct examination, it may be well to state some of the principal explanations as now accepted of the clauses wherein lie the chief difficulties and stumbling-blocks: 'In his humiliation his judgement was taken away: and who shall declare his generation? for his life is taken from the earth¹.'

(i) Bengel and others understand this *taking away of judgement* as equivalent to *justification*. This view is drawn out by Dr. Wordsworth as follows: *In his humiliation, &c.*, represents the Hebrew, 'He was taken from oppression and judgement;,' and it seems the LXX. means to say that *by his humiliation his condemnation was taken away*, i.e. *He was justified*: and thus the words are a paraphrase of the original, and mean that, 'He was made perfect, through (as well as from) sufferings,'

¹ ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει αὐτοῦ ἡ κλῆσις διηγέσεται; ὅτι αἴρεται ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ ἡρᾶται, τὴν δὲ γενεάν αὐτοῦ τίς αὐτοῦ.

and was exalted not only *from* His humiliation, but *because* 'He humbled Himself and became obedient unto death.' (Phil. ii. 8 ; Heb. ii. 10).

Who shall declare His duration? i.e. although He is cut off as man, yet He is the eternal God. He is ἀγενεαλόγητος ὡς Θεός.

Because His life is cut off from earth (Dan. ix. 26), He endures for ever in heaven; that is, He as God-man is exalted for ever by His temporary humiliation on earth.

(ii) Another explanation corresponding to Lowth's rendering of Is. liii. 8:—'By an oppressive judgement (*lit.* oppression and judgement) He was taken off:'—is thus alluded to by Mr Humphry in his note on Acts viii. 23 :

The following explanation of this difficult verse is, with some shades of difference, generally adopted by commentators; 'In His humiliation, when He was arraigned by the Jews, He was unjustly dealt with; the true judgement of Him was taken away. And who shall describe the wickedness of the generation which treated Him thus? For His life is taken away by them from the face of the earth.'

In each of the above interpretations there is an assimilation of the Greek to what are in fact unsatisfactory renderings of the original Hebrew. But it is perhaps needless to seek for an exact agreement between the particular verses cited from the Greek and the corresponding verses in the Hebrew. Such assimilation would seem almost to be declared unnecessary by the terms in which the citation is introduced. What we have presented is professedly an extract or summary, and it would suffice to show that it well represents the general tenour of the passage from which it has been taken. Philip is commanded by the angel of the Lord to 'go toward the south unto the way that goeth down from Jerusalem unto Gaza, which is desert. And he arose and went: and, behold, a man of Ethiopia, an eunuch of great authority under Candace queen of the Ethiopians, who had the charge of all her treasure, and had come to Jerusalem for to worship, was returning, and, sitting in his chariot, read Esaias the prophet.

Then the Spirit said unto Philip, Go near, and join thyself to this chariot. And Philip ran thither to him, and heard him read the prophet Esaias, and said, Understandest thou what thou redest?...The *place*¹ of the Scripture which he read was this, He was led as a sheep to the slaughter², &c.' (Acts viii. 26—33). This word 'place' may be equivalent to our *paragraph* or *section*; or it may denote only the *general contents*³ of the passage read. 'And the eunuch answered Philip and said, I pray thee, of whom speaketh the prophet this? of himself, or of some other man? Then Philip opened his mouth, and began at the same Scripture⁴, and preached unto him Jesus.' No comment on the passage is subjoined, and nothing more specific is implied about it, than that it was applicable to JESUS, and formed a suitable text for a discourse upon His life and death. The literal rendering, 'In His humiliation His *judgement* was taken away,' represents effectually the ambiguity of the Greek. The word *judgement* suggests naturally, but not necessarily, a *judicial* sentence; and so too does its Greek equivalent. But either word might be applied to a mere estimate or opinion, that is passed unauthoritatively upon any person or thing. There is a passage in the LXX. version of the second book of Kings which affords a peculiarly apt illustration of the meaning that seems most appropriate in the passage before us. 'What *manner of man* was he which came up to meet you, and told you these words?' where the literal rendering would be: 'What is the judgement⁵ (i.e. the true *estimate*, *character*, and *status*) of the man?' This meaning of 'judgement' leads to a clear and appropriate rendering of the clause in question: viz. 'in (or by) humiliation, the true estimate⁶ of Him was taken away:'

¹ *περιχώ.*

² "May not this be a kind of summary or heading of the passage meant? Such a manner of introducing a passage is found in Classical Greek." In Rabbinic Hebrew, it is *usual* to quote fragmentarily, and to presuppose in the reader a familiarity with the passage

alluded to.

³ The *tenoure*. Tyndale, Cranmer.

⁴ 'Commoda ratio doctrinæ, ordiri a textu oblato, et reliqua quæ dicenda sunt, subnectere.' *Bengel*.

⁵ *τίς ἡ κρισις τοῦ ἀνδρός*; 2 Kings ii. 7.

⁶ *κρισις* is here abstract. In 1 Kings i. 7, it may be said to be taken con-

and this is found upon examination to be coincident with the rendering of Tyndale and Cranmer¹: 'Because of His humbleness He was not esteemed.' The clause would thus depart very widely from the particular words of which the Greek is professedly a rendering, but would aptly correspond to a main feature in the prophetic picture of the Messiah, who was despised and rejected, 'and we esteemed Him not,' but judged Him according to appearance, not with rightful judgment (Joh. vii. 24).

The remaining clauses may be rendered, in accordance with patristic exegesis: 'And who shall declare His generation?' seeing that His life is upraised from earth;' where the present *αἰψεται* denotes not the single act of removal from the earth, but (solely or supplementarily) a chronic state of exaltation above it, which contrasts with the 'humiliation' of the former clause. The whole verse would thus describe the mystery and greatness of His being, which were wrongly deemed of through His humiliation. The clause: 'who shall declare His generation?' may have given rise to the prevalent opinion, expressed in Joh. vii. 27, that 'when Christ cometh, no man knoweth whence He is.' The Hebrew, as we have rendered it, represents His generation as cut off from the earth, so that no trace could be found of the stock from which He sprung. The Greek amounts to a sublimation of the original, and expresses, what the prophet may have intended to shadow forth in such guise as his general treatment of the subject admitted. The representation in this particular would be necessarily imperfect and inadequate, in its

cretely of the man's true worth, which is the *thing estimated*. It may be remarked that the word *character* has this same double use.

¹ Wiclif's rendering is: 'in mekenesse his dome was *taken up*,' or *accepted* by him.

² Delitzsch observes that the LXX. *την γενεαν κ.τ.λ.* 'can only mean, so far as the usage of the language is concerned: *Who can declare the number of*

his generation?' i.e. of his spiritual *posterity*. But this is not required by the usage of *γενεα*. See Ps. xlviii. 20, *γενεας πατερων αυτου*. The word may mean *stock*, or, abstractly, *lineage*. Perhaps it here signifies, more diffusively, the whole nature of his life and being. It would thus very properly stand in parallelism with '*life*,' as does the same Hebrew word *לך* in Is. xxxvii. 12: 'Mine *age* is departed, &c.'

literal acceptance; in like manner with the succeeding declaration: 'He shall see a seed prolong its days.' The latter must be spiritualized, and so the former; and this former when spiritualized takes not unnaturally such a turn as the patristic commentators, above alluded to, have given it. The admissibility of this interpretation may be regarded from another point of view. In Heb. vii. 3, the mysteriousness of Christ's origin is regarded as symbolized by the absence of any recorded genealogy of Melchisedec. The *same* writer might be conceived of as drawing a like inference from Isaiah's words: 'who could declare His generation, for it was cut off from the land of the living?' And if so, there is little difficulty in conceiving that such a view may have been present to the *Prophet's* mind, and may be developed legitimately from his words.

*Other explanations of דור.*¹

(a) In the original Hebrew, the word 'generation' stands in parallelism with the common word for 'life,' just as in the hymn of Hezekiah, referred to in the notes; where the meaning *contemporaries* is not obviously appropriate, for it seems harsh, in that context, to speak of the king's 'generation' as removed from him, rather than of the king himself as taken from their midst. More than this, it is probable, as lexicographers remark, that this word for *generation* means, firstly, *a period*², and only secondarily, the generation of men living at that period; but, whatever may be the *order* of significations, the word is clearly used in numerous passages for a period, and measure of time. (b) Or it might signify (as some think) in the first instance, not *age* but *dwelling-place*: thus Ps. xlix. 20 has been interpreted: 'he shall go to his fathers' *dwelling-place*, the grave. The meaning, *fleshly 'tabernacle'*, is appropriate in the hymn of Hezekiah, and would lead, if adopted in Is. liii. 8, to the same meaning, *manner of life*³, which commentators, in this or that way, have arrived at, as

¹ But see, especially, § (i), p. 123.

βλωσις. The classical *βλος* includes both.

² דור might mean *ætas*, and hence,

³ See note D, p. 127.

best suited to the passage. This meaning is applied by Bishop Lowth, *in loc.*:—It is said that, before any one was punished for a capital crime, proclamation was made before the prisoner by the public cryer in these words: quicunque noverit aliquid de ejus innocentia, veniat et doceat de eo. And our Saviour seems to refer to such a custom, and to claim the benefit of it, by His answer to the High Priest, when he asked Him of His disciples and of His doctrine: 'I spake openly to the world; I ever taught in the synagogue and in the temple, whither the Jews always resort; and in secret have I said nothing. Why askest thou me? ask them which heard me, what I have said unto them: behold, they know what I have said' (Joh. xviii. 20, 21). St Paul likewise, in similar circumstances, standing before the judgment seat of Festus, seems to complain of the same unjust treatment; that no one was called, or would appear to vindicate his character. 'My *manner of life* from my youth, which was at the first among my own nation at Jerusalem, know all the Jews: which knew me from the beginning, if they would testify; that after the straitest sect of our religion I lived a Pharisee.' (Acts xxvi. 4, 5).—Such a meaning of 'generation' may be adopted, perhaps even more appropriately, if this commentator's rendering be not accepted as a whole, but modified in one particular. 'His manner of life who *would* declare?' is Lowth's rendering: *i.e.* who would come forward *i.e.* to declare His innocence, to which it was actually in his power to testify? But the *potential* rendering, 'who *could* declare?' is at least equally admissible, and, brings out moreover the same meaning from the original that has been assigned, independently, to the corresponding clauses in Acts viii. 33:—He was dragged from confinement and the bar; and who could describe or imagine the whole tenour of His being: *cut off* as he was, in the dungeon, from communion with the living world? 'They have cut off my life in the dungeon, and cast a stone upon me. Waters flowed over my head; then I said, *I am cut off.*' (Lam. iii. 53, 54).

9. This word 'sin' corresponds to *violence* in the original,

and to *lawlessness* in the LXX. In the second clause the LXX. read *guile*, in the accusative, thus making it depend on the verb *did*. The true construction seems to be: 'neither guile in his mouth;' where the copula has to be supplied. St Peter supplies it in the form *εὑρέθη*, *was found*, which has been adopted in the translation on p. 76.

11. Besides the verbal coincidence, 'bare our sins,' there is apparently a paraphrastic agreement between the conclusion of the verse from St Peter, and a clause of Is. liii. 11. 'My righteous servant shall *make many righteous*, for he shall bear their iniquities.' 'He bare our sins, that we should live unto righteousness.'

12. Our Lord's citation in Luke xxii. 37 gives an example of *a priori* application, and thus approves most emphatically the Messianic interpretation of the prophecy. In Heb. ix. 28, the statement that 'Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many,' is supplemented by the declaration that 'unto them that look for Him shall He appear the second time without sin unto salvation,' which agrees with the true rendering of the last clause in the Hebrew: 'and He *shall* make intercession for the transgressors.' The LXX. conclude less accurately with: 'He *was* delivered for their offences.' This form of words has been adopted by St Paul, who does not however stop short at their conclusion, but adds that He 'was raised again for our justification.'

IV. There is a difficult passage in the Epistle to the Philippians, which seems to have been formed upon the concluding verse of the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. The Authorized Version, which is considered open to objection, runs as follows: 'Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: Who, being in the form of God, *thought it not robbery to be equal with God: But made Himself of no reputation*¹, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: And being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, and became obedient unto death, even the

¹ οὐχ ἀπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ, ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν, κ.τ.λ.

death of the cross.' (Phil. ii. 5—8). The meaning of the English, which perhaps the majority of commentators now reject as inappropriate, is that, though conscious of His divine dignity, and feeling equality with God to be His of right, He yet 'made Himself of no reputation,' and condescended to assume the servile form of man. The explanation by which the above is commonly replaced, is, that He did not treat His equality with God as a piece of plunder, or a thing to be clutched greedily and guarded jealously, but divested Himself of the glories and prerogatives of Deity by taking to Himself the form of man. The main obstacle¹ to the acceptance of some such rendering as this latter is the palpable impropriety of likening Christ's equality with God, *more or less directly*, to a spoil or thing external. Attempts have indeed been made to prove that this Greek word *plunder* frequently signifies nothing further than a thing to *set store by*, the idea of plunder and robbery having passed out of sight; but it would seem that the examples adduced to prove this are not quite convincing, and fail at their best to do more than remove the idea of acquisition one step into the background. If a *spoil* does come to mean a thing to be held to pertinaciously, it is only because it is still regarded as a thing external, not inherent, and which *because of its externality* may escape one's grasp, if it be not guarded jealously. A way of meeting this difficulty will be suggested in the sequel: meanwhile, the verses following will be considered.

'*He made Himself of no reputation*,' is a paraphrase of the Greek words, *He emptied Himself*, which is explained as meaning that, *He divested Himself* of the external attributes of Deity, and 'stripped Himself of the insignia of majesty.' 'The emphatic position of *ἐαυτόν*' continues Dr Lightfoot, 'points to the humiliation of our Lord as *voluntary*², *self-*

¹ The concrete use of ἀρπαγμός 'presents greater difficulty' from a scholar's point of view: but, all things considered, the most telling objection seems to be the theological one. Mr Wratislaw observes (*in loc.*) 'so too

δόσις has constantly the meaning of δόμα,' and compares ἀρπαγμός to which (conversely) δόσσαμα is frequently equivalent.

² This (without αὐτός) seems destructive of the emphasis on ἐκένωσεν.

imposed.' There is however another explanation of the words : 'Himself He *emptied*:' admissible alike in English, Greek, and Hebrew, viz. ; *He poured out*¹ *His soul or self*²: and that, as it is added in ver. 8, *unto death*. Here then it would seem that we have a reference to Is. liii. 12, where it is written that, 'He hath poured out His soul unto death.' The citation is presented in two parts, and the Apostle, in a running comment, fills in the several steps whereby the lowest depth of degradation has been reached. He poured out His divine Self, by taking the servile form of man, and keeping His divinity in abeyance. He further humbled His human self by obedience, to the extent of death, and that death the death of the cross. In the expression 'servant' there is a phraseological coincidence with Is. lii. 12, *My servant* shall deal prudently. Christ, from his pre-existence as coequal God, assumes the servant-form of man. He becomes, *i. e.*, *God's* servant, by becoming man ; and then, as above described, He further bowed Himself to the most degrading of deaths. 'Therefore,' declares JEHOVAH by the prophet, 'will I divide Him a portion ; because He hath poured out His soul unto death.' (Is. liii. 12). 'Wherefore,' adds the Apostle, 'God also hath highly exalted him, and given Him a name which is above every name.'

It remains to ask by what train of thought the Apostle may be supposed to have arrived at the comparison or contrast in ver. 6 ; 'He deemed it not ravin³ to be as God.' With these concluding words has been well compared the '*Ye shall be as*⁴ *God(s)*' of Gen. iii. 5. St Paul once and again contrasts the characteristics of the first and the second Adam, 'As in

Besides, mere spontaneity is expressed sufficiently in the preceding clause.

¹ אל תער נפשי (Ps. cxli. 8) ; where Aquila has, μη ἐκκενώσης. Symmachus and Theodotion, μη ἀποκενώσης. Compare the classical, ἐκκενοῦν θυμὸν εἰς σχεδὸν γέροντος, and εἰς με κένωσον πᾶν βέλος (Lidd. and Scott).

² In Ps. cv. 18, the Hebrew words : 'his soul (*i. e.* *person* or *self*) entered

into iron : ' are rendered in the Bible version : '*He* was laid in irons.' The Prayer Book inverts the construction and renders : 'The iron entered into his soul.'

³ He demed not raueyn, that him silf were euene to god. *Wiclif*.

⁴ The particle of comparison, ὡς, is here rendered ὥς (LXX), but in many other places *tra*.

Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.' 'The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit.' 'The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven.' (1 Cor. xv. 22, 45, 47). In the passage before us, as some think, there may be an explicit contrast between the mind of Adam and the mind which was in Christ Jesus, who stands out in marked contrast with the natural man, and reverses alike his actions and their consequences. If the negative particle be taken as not merely excluding a supposition, but as *reversing*¹ it, and implying its direct opposite; so that the 'thought *not ...but made,*' of ver. 6, 7, would mean: 'so far was he from thinking...that he made;' there results an explanation which accounts for the origin of the comparison with 'ravin,' and at the same time obviates the difficulty which would arise from comparing, more or less remotely, to a thing external, what in the immediate context has been declared to be inherent in Christ. At the same time, to recognize this word *ravin* as describing a thing external, brings out very effectually what seems the true significance of the emphatic *ἐαυτόν*, His very Self: so far was He from clutching at equality with God as a thing external, that He renounced His inmost SELF, and kept in abeyance his inherent equality with God. He did not as did Adam, who deemed it ravin to be equal with God; but emptied out His divine Self, and took the servant-form of man. And so He shall rise and be extolled and be very high. He shall be seated far above all principality, and power, and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come. Every knee shall bow to do Him homage; every tongue shall confess that He is LORD. Angels and men are

¹ Is. x. 15 may be again referred to for a typical example of this *reversing* power of the negative. 'Shall the axe boast itself against him that heweth therewith? shall the saw magnify itself against him that brandisheth it? as if

the rod brandished them that wield it; as if the staff wielded the *no-wood*?' i.e. *man*, who, so far from being dead matter like itself, is 'of a quite different and superior nature.'

given over to His dominion, and become His portion. 'He inherits multitudes, and divides *the mighty for*¹ *a spoil*.'

This the LXX. may intend to express. But independently of the Greek, many think that the balance of argument is for a like rendering of the Hebrew: 'I will give Him a portion in² the many; and He shall apportion for Himself the³ mighty (*or* the numerous).' The word here rendered *many* is so rendered by the Authorized Version in lii. 14, 15; liii. 11, 12; and has been replaced by *great* in the first clause of the twelfth verse, merely to avoid a rendering which would be palpably inappropriate; for to share the spoil along with many others, argues the comparative smallness of the individual share. It is more in accordance with the general tenour of the passage to represent Him as at length exalted far above all rivalry, and moreover there is a marked retributive propriety in His *possessing* the multitudes for whom He suffered. Such, we conclude, *must* be the meaning of the Hebrew, if *rabbim* in the first clause of ver. 12 means the same as both before and after. The righteous One, foreseeing that He should justify the *many* (ver. 11), resolves to take upon Himself the burden of their sins: He bears the sin of *many* (ver. 12): and JEHOVAH bestows upon Him the *many* for His portion.

If this be the true interpretation of liii. 12, the representations of our Lord as, strictly speaking, a *Redeemer*, are traced at once to their source. A further examination of the LXX. rendering shews that they probably intended to express this more explicitly than had been supposed above. Their words should perhaps be rendered: 'Therefore shall He⁴ (that

¹ τῶν ἰσχυρῶν...σκύλα, *a spoil consisting of the mighty* (Is. liii. 12). So Jud. v. 30, σκύλα βαμμάτων.

² As in a territory.

³ The parallelism favours this rendering; the *article* before 'many' corresponding to ΠΝ, taken as the mark of the objective case.

⁴ διὰ τοῦτο αὐτὸς κληρονομήσει πολλοὺς, καὶ τῶν ἰσχυρῶν μεριεῖ σκύλα, ἀνθ' ὧν παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον ἢ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ, κ.τ.λ. Comp. ἀντὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ (ver. 9). αὐτὸς refers back to αὐτὸς ἀπολεί, and strongly marks the consequential connection of the two verses.

bare the sins of many) inherit *many*, and divide the spoil of the mighty, *for whom His life was given up to death...*' Our Lord declares that 'the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister¹, and *to give His life a ransom for many*' (Matt. xx. 28; Mark x. 45); where the last clause expresses the same idea as the LXX., and exhibits, too, the same form of words, with the addition of the epexegetical λύτρον, or *price of redemption*. St Peter appeals to the elect as knowing that they 'were not *redeemed* with corruptible things, as silver and gold², But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a *lamb*³ without blemish, and without spot' (1 Pet. ii. 18, 19). And St John expresses the same more at length, in other words: 'And when he had taken the book, the four beasts and four and twenty elders fell down before the *Lamb*, And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed⁴ us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and nation' (Rev. v. 8, 9).

V. The Lamb of God. Joh. i. 29, 36.

I. The form of the above expression, and the manner in which it is introduced by the Baptist, combine to prove that the appeal is to some pre-existent and definite conception, the origin of which would naturally be sought for in Holy Writ. The title must refer—as Dean Alford justly remarks—to some known and particular lamb. It is inconceivable that the expression should, in a testimony so precise and formal as that of the Baptist, be nothing but an hyperbole, and that, *one wholly unprecedented*, and to his hearers *unintelligible*. Christ is designated as at once the Lamb of God, and the taker away of the sin of the world⁵; and this double title⁷

¹ εὖ δουλεύοντα πολλοῖς (Is. liii. 11).

² δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν. See 1 Tim. ii. 6.

³ οὐ μετὰ λύτρων οὐδὲ μετὰ δώρων (Is. xlv. 14).

⁴ Is. liii. 7.

⁵ ἐξηγόρασας.

⁶ 'Agnus Dei primum a mundo in

se recepit, deinde a seipso devolvit peccati sarcinam.' Bengel.

⁷ Bengel's view of the construction is the following: 'Chrysost. *Dicit Johannes, ἀμὸν καὶ ὅτι αἰρεῖ κ.τ.λ.*' Vulg. 'Ecce agnus Dei, ecce qui tollit etc. Uterque illud ὁ ἀμὸς, ὁ αἰρεῖ, non per con-

points to Isaiah's prophecy of One who Himself bears the sins of others, and is likened in ver. 7 to a lamb led to the slaughter. Some see a mere reference to the paschal lamb, to which St Paul compares our Lord in 1 Cor. v. 7: 'Christ our passover is sacrificed for us.' Such a reference is by no means to be excluded, but rather to be held in conjunction with the former¹: indeed it is by the whole scheme of sacrificial typology that the special reference would itself be instinctively interpreted by the Baptist's hearers. That system would naturally present itself to the Jewish reader of Is. liii., and at once open to him a meaning which a mind untrained by the sacrificial system would have passed over. The prophecy is a gem set in the sacrificial framework; the main pinnacle to which the whole structure converges. The system was contrived with such regard to minute details, and those details were adhered to with so religious a scrupulosity, that it is at least more natural to regard them as having, than as not having, some designed meaning and significance. It is unnecessary to suppose that those details, standing alone, would have been understood as clearly prophetic types of the Messiah; but it may be affirmed that they entered largely into the prophetic ideal of Is. liii., and that this ideal with its after realization in Christ, threw a flood of light on what before had been perceived but dimly, and deepened by its intense illumination the shadows of the past. There are clear indications in the Old Testament that such external acts as the offering of slaughtered animals, were without efficacy in themselves; their typical import was apprehended; their true spiritual significance had been gathered up and set forth, in this fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, many ages before the coming of the just ONE, whom Evangelists announce as the final Antitype.

2. St John, in his Apocalyptic vision, 'beheld, and lo, in the midst of the throne and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, *stood a Lamb² as it had been slain.*' And

structionem substantivi et adjectivi, sed erat' (Joh. ii. 13). *Bengel.*
per appositionem accepit.

¹ 'Atque ipsum pascha tum prope v. 6). The LXX has, *ὡς πρόβατον ἐπὶ*

² *ἀρνίον ἐστηγός ὡς ἐσφαγμένον* (Rev.

in his account of the crucifixion he quotes, as fulfilled in Christ, what was ordained in the law of Moses about the paschal lamb: 'When they came to Jesus, and saw that he was dead already, they brake not his legs. These things were done that the scripture might be fulfilled, A bone of Him shall not be broken.' (Joh. xix. 33, 36.) It is doubted whether the Evangelist refers to Ex. xii. 46: *Ye shall not break a bone thereof*: or to Ps. xxxiv. 20: Many are the afflictions of the righteous: but the Lord delivereth him out of them all. He keepeth all his bones: *not one of them is broken*. There is too 'another place which speaks of the same point, viz. Numb. ix. 12: *and a bone they shall not break in it*.' But the language of the Psalm would itself, no doubt, have been formed upon the familiar phraseology of the Law; and, accordingly, we may adopt the view expressed by Bengel, 'Psalmus Mosen, Johannes Psalmum, nec non Mosen respicit.' A passing allusion, from whatever chapter and verse taken, would at once bring before a Jewish reader the details of the familiar paschal solemnities: one word, with its sudden flash, would light up all around.

VI. The good Shepherd. Joh. x. 11—19.

The appropriation by our Lord of this title shepherd might be regarded as a gathering up of many prophetic utterances, with a particular¹ reference to Is. liii. The strength of the evidence for this connection lies in the uniqueness of the reiterated expression, '*lay down*² my life.' 'I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd *giveth his life*³ for the sheep. But he that is an hireling, and not the shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and fleeth: and the wolf catcheth them and scattereth the sheep. The hireling fleeth, because he is an hireling, and

σφαγήν ἤχθη (Is. liii. 7), and in the following clause has ἀμνός for 'ewe.'

¹ 'Pastor bonus) ille de quo prædictum est per prophetas...*Ponit*) Hoc quinquies dicitur, summa vi. Hoc summo omnia reliqua beneficia pasto-

ralia præsupponuntur, includuntur, inferuntur [*Esai*. liii. 10, 6].'

² τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τίθῃσιν. Comp. παρατίθεμαι (Luke xxiii. 46): and ἔθηκες, used of temporary deposition, Luke xix. 21.

careth not for the sheep. I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep, *and* am known of mine; as the Father knoweth me, *and*¹ I know the Father: and *I lay down my life* for the sheep. And *other sheep I have, which are not of this fold*: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd. Therefore doth my Father love me, because *I lay down my life*, that *I might take it again*. No man taketh it from me, but *I lay it down* myself. I have power *to lay it down*, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father.' 'The expression, *to put one's soul for some one*,' writes Dr Hengstenberg, 'does not, independently and by itself, occur any where else in the New Testament; in John xiii. 37, 38, Peter takes the word out of the mouth of the Saviour, and in 1 Joh. iii. 16, it is used in reference to these declarations of our Lord. The expression is nowhere met with in profane writers, nor in the Hellenistic *usus loquendi*. In the discourses of our Lord, no less than in Is. liii. 10, the expression is used of His sacrificial death.' These considerations might be thought sufficient to establish the allusion to the prophecy; but it may be added that the sheep are there represented as actually scattered (Is. liii. 6; Joh. x. 8, 12); and that the laying down of his life by the servant of the Lord, is one act only in a *set purpose*², which lacks completion till the life is taken up again. (Is. liii. 10; Joh. x. 17.) 'This commandment have I received from my Father.' This, 'the LORD purposed when He sorely bruised him.'

Mr Robertson thus depicts the risks incidental to the shepherd-life: 'Beneath the burning skies and the clear starry nights of Palestine there grows up between the shepherd and his flock an union of attachment and tenderness. It is the country where at any moment sheep are liable to be swept away by some mountain-torrent, or carried off by hill robbers,

¹ 'There is a reciprocal affection between the Shepherd and the sheep. There is a reciprocal affection between the Father and the Son; and the one is the parallel of the other.' (Robert-

son, *Sermon on Joh. x. 14, 15.*)

² With βουλή (Acts ii. 23; iv. 27) compare ὕψι, βούλεται (Is. liii. 10). For ἄγιον παῖδα (iv. 27), see the following ver. of Isaiah.

or torn by wolves. At any moment their protector may have to save them by personal hazard. The shepherd-king tells us how, in defence of his father's flock, he slew a lion and a bear: and Jacob reminds Laban how, when he watched Laban's sheep in the day, the drought consumed. Every hour of the shepherd's life is risk. Sometimes for the sake of an armful of grass in the parched summer days, he must climb precipices almost perpendicular, and stand on a narrow ledge of rock, where the wild goat will scarcely venture. Pitiless showers, driving snows, long hours of thirst—all this he must endure, if the flock is to be kept at all.' This shews something of the significance of our Lord's *ψυχὴν τίθημι*. He risks or stakes His life for the sheep, not without a clear prescience of the issue; and thus, in other words, he casts away or deposits that life to save the sheep. If the passage of St John above cited be taken as explanatory of the passage in Isaiah, we may trace the prophet's form of expression (ver. 6, 8) to its source. We were like lost sheep: He, the shepherd, was made responsible for our wanton strayings: He took to Himself the consequences of our iniquities, that He might be able to say, 'Of them which Thou gavest me have I lost none.'

The cardinal passage to which the New Testament constantly refers in connection with redemption by Christ's death, is on all sides allowed to be this fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. If then in references to the subject generally (and still more, where a reference to the actual passage is discernible) we note a reiterated expression of any doctrine about the extent of the efficacy of that death: it is only natural to ask whether that doctrine reflects any new light upon the prophecy itself, or favours this or that of the conflicting views upheld by commentators. Now our Lord refers in His discourse upon the good shepherd, to His *other sheep*, 'which are not of this fold.' The Baptist again, referring to the same cardinal passage of Isaiah, speaks of JESUS as taking away the sins of the *world*. The Evangelist marks with strong emphasis this universality of the redemption. 'And one of them, named Caiaphas, being the high priest that same year, said unto them, Ye know nothing

at all, nor consider that it is expedient for us that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not. And this spake he not of himself: but being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation; and not for that nation only, but that also He should gather together in one *the children of God that were scattered abroad.*' (Joh. xi. 49—52.) Such passages fall in with the view adopted in the text, that Is. liii. 1—10 contains the reflections of the Gentile world.

VII. *The twenty-second Psalm.*

This Psalm has been compared with the passage from Isaiah above discussed, and is regarded, from various points of view, as distinctly applicable to the Messiah. Some have supposed a primary reference to David (to whom it is inscribed), with a mystical appropriation to Christ; others have held that it is simply and solely Messianic. On the other hand non-Messianic interpretations have been built upon the hypothesis of a personal reference, (*e. g.* to David or to Hezekiah), and again of a reference by personification to the exiled Jewish nation. 'I may however mention,' writes Dr Phillips, 'that there is this one great objection to either David or Hezekiah being made the subject, viz. the utter impossibility to find events in the life of one or the other to correspond with the statements which are here recorded. There is not indeed one expression throughout the Psalm which would lead the student to the history of David or Hezekiah, for the purpose of searching out the agreement of statement with event.' Against the application to the collective Israel, the clearly marked individuality of the Psalm is very reasonably adduced: 'The mother' of the sufferer is mentioned; a tongue, jaws, hands and feet, bones, and garments, are ascribed to him; nay, in ver. 7, he is distinguished from the ungodly, and in ver. 23, from his brethren.' And further, 'it must be noticed that there is nothing from which we can conclude that the sufferings of the individual were a punishment for his sin;

¹ Ps. xxii. 11 illustrates Hos. xi. 1, 3.

his innocence, although not expressly asserted, may yet be inferred. Whereas the sufferings of the Jewish people were always regarded as merited; they have been usually considered as the consequences of their abandoning God, and adopting a heathenish idolatry.' This however does not necessarily exclude a reference *of some kind* to the captivity and its circumstances, the existence of which is rendered probable both from a direct view of the Psalm taken separately, and from its phraseological and other coincidences with Psalms wherein the circumstances of the captivity are commonly supposed to be alluded to. The hundred and second Psalm is very generally referred to that occasion, and to this the twenty-second is in many respects similar, as also to the disputed sixty-ninth, on which more hereafter. The following is a transcript of Dr Phillips' preface to Ps. cii. 'The title of this Psalm is either, a prayer *of*, or a prayer *for*, the afflicted. In the latter case, this portion of Scripture may be regarded as a form of prayer adapted for the use of a Church or an individual when oppressed by heavy affliction. From several passages, it appears that the Psalmist prays either for himself, or *as representing in his own person the people of Israel* who were at that time in captivity, but who were by certain circumstances induced to expect a speedy return to their country, and the restoration of the temple in Zion.' To the same effect, Mr Perowne: 'This Psalm must have been written by one of the exiles in Babylon, probably towards the close of the captivity, when the hope of a return seemed no longer doubtful. In mournful strains he describes his bitter lot. His very heart was smitten within him, as the grass is withered in the hot eye of the sun. His enemies turned his misery into a proverb; his life was drawing to a close under the heavy wrath of God.' Then comes the prospect of deliverance; of the rebuilding of Zion; and the conversion of the kingdoms to serve the Lord.

This much being premised with regard to the reference of Ps. cii., we proceed to indicate its general and particular agreement with Ps. xxii. and lxix.

In each case an individual, reduced to the last extremity, cries to God for aid. He is parched and blasted by his fiery trial: 'my strength is dried up like a potsherd' (xxii. 15); 'my throat is dried' (lxix. 3); 'my bones are burned as an hearth. My heart is smitten and withered like grass' (cii. 3, 4). He is a *reproach* of men (xxii. 6; lxix. 20; cii. 8) and is grieved especially by the taunt that JEHOVAH is not indeed the Salvation of His people (xxii. 8; lxix. 6). The LORD at length is glorified in heaven and earth, when it is seen that 'He hath *not despised* nor abhorred the affliction of the afflicted' (xxii. 24); 'for the Lord heareth the poor, and *despiset* *not* his prisoners' (lxix. 33). 'He will regard the prayer of the destitute, and *not despise* their prayer' (cii. 17). The allusion to the captivity¹ seems clearly marked in Ps. lxix and cii., while the general result is described by similar expressions in all three of the psalms considered. 'All the ends of world shall remember and turn unto the Lord: and all the kindreds* of the nations shall worship before Thee. A *seed* shall serve Him; it shall be accounted to the Lord for a generation' (xxii. 27, 30). 'Let heaven and earth praise Him, the seas and every thing that moveth therein. For God will save Zion, and build the cities of Judah: that they may dwell there, and have it in possession. The *seed* also of his servants shall inherit it: and they that love His name shall dwell therein' (lxix. 36). 'So the heathen shall fear the name of the Lord, and all the kings of the earth his glory. When the Lord shall build up Zion...The children of thy servants shall continue, and their *seed* shall be established before thee' (cii. 28). This conclusion*, common to the three Psalms, seems to point to the speaker as no merely ordinary individual — 'an exile in the hands of the heathen, in extreme peril, and

¹ It is not argued that the three Psalms refer to the same time, but only that there is a general similarity in their structure. The indefinite term 'afflicted' (xxii. 24) is quite appropriate to 'prisoners.' It stands in the heading of

Ps. cii., which refers to 'the groaning of the *prisoner*,' in ver. 20.

^{*} Add to this the form of address in ver. 4: '*our* fathers trusted, &c.', which falls in with the suggestion in the text. See Ps. xxxix. 12.

condemned to death,' who shews 'how a worshipper of Jehovah could at such a time win his way to hope from the depths of despair'—but as a *typical* Sufferer, whose deliverance is the turning point in the world's destiny and the sign for the converting of the nations from scorers (ver. 8) to worshippers. The allusions to different stages of captivity in the general Psalms by no means proves that those Psalms were actually written contemporaneously with the circumstances described, and with a merely historical reference to them; but only that the circumstances of those times lent an imagery for the expression of certain feelings and conditions, which *we still retain* as suited for the representation of spiritual ideas. There is something more than a conventional propriety in such an expression as being *tied and bound by the chain of our sins*; nor is there any very obvious reason for the assertion, that the like expressions when they occur in a Psalm are necessarily literal, and that it was left for a later age to discover their true spiritual application. If such applications now present themselves as natural to the devotional reader, it is allowable to conjecture that the like may have been the case with the older Jews (who used the same Psalms devotionally¹); and it is very far from incredible that they may have been *actually composed* with a meaning which some interpreters would now call non-natural. If the speaker in the Psalm be a typical sufferer, the Psalm might naturally be appropriated by individual worshippers—as Psalms still are—and yet point, *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, to an individual MESSIAH as its perfect antitype. The probability of a Psalm's having been so used, and of its having conveyed a Messianic reference to the ancient Jews, must be tested, obviously, by such indications as may be gathered (from whatever source) of their scriptural exegesis and modes of thought. Such indications are afforded by the New Testament applications, which, to take the lowest ground, express the thoughts of the individual writers, and more than this, *were intended to be* (and doubtless were)

¹ The heading of Ps. cii. may be roughly rendered, *Penitential Psalm*.

understood by their contemporaries, to whom they were addressed by way of illustration or of argument.

VIII. *Ps. xxii. compared with Is. liii.*

Assuming that the Psalm is, in some one of the senses proposed by commentators, to be applied to the Messiah, we remark that it portrays him less minutely than does the Prophet, or rather that it is an essentially partial representation, which shews forth one side only of the sufferer's condition. It tells simply of *suffering* and *restoration*, without implying that the suffering was voluntarily undergone, or that it contributed by way of merit to the wellbeing of the nations. In Isaiah, on the contrary, the Servant of the LORD deliberately takes up the sin of others, and by so doing frees them from their burden. Here, the Gentiles are convinced of Jehovah's power and faithfulness by the delivery of His worshippers, and so they turn and serve Him. Here again the restored sufferer praises the LORD in the great congregation; while there all conduces, as the LORD had purposed, to the glory and exaltation of His servant. The Psalmist tells of hope to God's chosen One from the abyss of despair, and of a world's conversion at the sight of His deliverance: the Prophet describes Him as the world's Redeemer, and tells of a glory and dominion that He purchases by the outpouring of His Soul.

IX. *Narrative of the Crucifixion.*

In Ps. xxii, as in the sixty-ninth, we have presented to us the picture of a typical sufferer, and in the circumstances of Christ's crucifixion the Gospel history shews a literal correspondence of *word* and *deed* with the description in the Psalms. 'And when they were come unto a place called Golgotha, that is to say, a place of a skull, *They gave him vinegar to drink mingled with gall* (Ps. lxix. 21): and when he had tasted thereof, he would not drink. And they crucified him, and parted his garments, casting lots: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, *They parted my*

garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots (Ps. xxii. 18). And sitting down they watched him there; and set up over his head his accusation written, THIS IS JESUS THE KING OF THE JEWS¹. Then were two thieves crucified with him, one on the right hand, and another on the left. And they that passed by² reviled³ him, wagging their heads (Ps. xxii. 7), and saying, Thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, save⁴ thyself. If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross. Likewise also the chief priests mocking him, with the scribes and elders said, He saved others; himself he cannot save. If he be the King of Israel, let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe him. *He trusted in God; let him deliver now, if he will have him* (Ps. xxii. 8): for he said, I am the Son of God. The thieves also, which were crucified with him, cast the same in his teeth. Now from the sixth hour there was darkness over all the land unto the ninth hour. And about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, '*Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani*'⁵ (Ps. xxii. 1), that is to say, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?* 'Some of them that stood there, when they heard that, said, This man calleth for Elias. And straightway one of them ran, and took a sponge, and filled it with vinegar, and put it on a reed, and gave him to drink. The rest said, Let be, let us see whether Elias will come to save him' (Matt. xxvii. 33—49). 'And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father, *into thy hands I commend my spirit* (Ps. xxxi. 5): and having said thus he gave up the ghost' (Luke xxiii. 46).

St John also describes the offering of this same potion, but with the variation of a word; and describes it moreover as necessary for the complete fulfilment of the scripture. 'After this, Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished⁶,

¹ Jesus is thus marked out by heathens as a representative personage. So in the Psalm, as had been concluded independently, the sufferer is to the heathen view a representative of Israel.

² 'And the people stood beholding'

(Luke xxiii. 35, and LXX).

³ μυκτηρίζω (Mark and LXX).

⁴ σωσάτω (Luke and LXX).

⁵ אֱלִי אֱלִי מָה שָׁבַחְתָּנִי, is the Targumic version of the clause.

⁶ τετέλεσται.

"that the scripture might be fulfilled¹," saith, I thirst. Now there was set a vessel full of vinegar; and they filled a sponge with vinegar, and put it upon *hyssop*, and put it to his mouth. When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar, he said, It is finished: and he bowed his head, and gave up the ghost' (Joh. xix. 30). The allusion is, apparently to Ps. lxix. 21; 'They gave me also gall for my meat; and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink:' and the formula of citation would seem to testify emphatically to a Messianic reference in the Psalm. The precise nature of that reference is left undetermined by the citation, and is to be gathered, as is elsewhere remarked, from a study of those ancient Jewish modes of thought, to which the words and imagery of the Jewish Scriptures appealed. The hypothesis of a *typical* representation which would adapt a Psalm for individual² devotions, and at the same time convey to those who used it the notion of a perfect individual Antitype, fulfilling literally what was expressed symbolically, is not *prima facie* at variance with the affirmation that though 'all things (in themselves necessary) were *completed*,' it was further requisite to *complete* the series of external agreements between the words of Scripture and the circumstances of Christ.

X. *The 'vinegar mingled with gall.'*

It is remarkable that, while the second potion mentioned by SS. Matthew and Mark corresponds to the *one* mentioned by St John, yet the first, as described by St Matthew, presents the closest verbal resemblance to what is spoken of in Ps. lxix. 21. St Matthew's description *suggests* the propriety of a modified rendering in the Psalm; and St Mark's variation has given rise to a subjoined conjecture of Dr Nicoll which well deserves attention.

1. St Matthew speaks of 'vinegar *mingled with* gall;' the

¹ τελειωθῇ.

² The form of some Psalms which treat of national events, while the speaker is clearly an individual, may be

accounted for by supposing them to have been written expressly for congregational use.

Psalm, in separate hemistichs, of 'gall for meat,' and 'vinegar to drink.' The question which presents itself is whether the hemistichs should not rather be taken as referring alike to the potion, and as thus connecting the ὄξος and the χολή—in like manner with the Evangelist's account. The Hebrew 'gall' presents no objection, but on the contrary, the evidence is rather in favour of its use as a decoction: 'The Lord our God hath put us to silence, and given us *water of gall* to drink' (Jer. viii. 14). The word with which it is joined in the Psalm, is of greater difficulty. It does not occur again¹, but its meaning has been conjectured from a few passages to be *solid food*. It is allowable however to conjecture that it means generally a *ration*², without exclusive reference to solids or to liquids; or even that it may have referred *originally* to liquids, and may have come at length to be applied generally, like the common expression for a banquet, *mishteh* (Gen. xix. 3). The verse in question might then be explained to mean (with strict adherence to the tenses of the original), that they put 'gall' into my allowance, when they were on the point of giving me my ration of 'vinegar' to quench my thirst. The anesthetic potion customarily administered to the condemned is treated of in the standard commentaries. It was supplied, as Lightfoot notes³, by the 'daughters of Jerusalem,' and was refused by the Saviour because (in the words of Bengel) *sensus plane imperturbatos volebat retinere ad mortem usque*. Some arguments will be adduced in a later section, for the stupefying qualities of the 'gall,' as mentioned in the *Psalm*. With regard to the second potion, it may be observed that there are two ways of reconciling the three accounts. It is usual to conform St John's account to that of SS. Matthew and Mark, by taking *hyssop* to mean a *rod* which chanced to be of hyssop. If however it be thought more natural to

¹ But see Lam. iv. 10 (LXX).

² בְּרוֹת, a portion, might be referred to בָּרָה, to select. In 2 Sam. iii. 35, the rendering, 'All the people came to cause David to partake of bread,' is, seemingly,

as appropriate as 'eat.' See 2 Sam. xiii. 6, 10, &c. Symmachus has, τροφήν.

³ So Poole: 'Sanctæ mulieres vinum myrrhatum Christo pararunt more gentis.'

explain St John's account as meaning that some hyssop was placed *in* or *round*¹ the sponge, we might then bring St Matthew's account into conformity with it by the simple expedient of rendering *κάλαμος*, *reed-plant*², and understanding it, not of an instrument wherewith the saturated sponge was presented³, but of some drug or aromatic substance, which was sprinkled or infused before the 'vinegar' was offered.

2. The late Professor Nicoll has proposed⁴ to reconcile the two descriptions of the first potion, by referring both accounts to an Aramaic original, wherein the variation *myrrh* for *gall*, might have arisen from the corruption of a single letter⁵. The same writer makes suggestions for harmonising other varying accounts; beginning with the accounts of our Lord's baptism, which it is proposed to reconcile as follows. "St Matthew thus describes the baptism of Christ: 'And Jesus, when He was baptized, *went up* straightway out of the water: and lo, the heavens were opened upon him' (iii. 16). St Mark has nearly the same words: 'And straightway *coming up* out of the water, He saw the heavens opened' (i. 10); where both of them make use of the same words, *to go or come up*. But St Luke, in relating the same circumstance, expresses himself somewhat differently: 'Jesus also being baptized, and *praying*, the heaven was opened' (iii. 21). Instead of saying that Jesus *went up* out of the water, he says that He was *praying*. This little difference may be accounted for, by supposing that St Luke read in the document the word denoting *prayer*, which differs from that denoting *to go up* by a single letter, which is very similar to its corresponding one, and might easily be taken for it⁶. In the same passages SS. Matthew and Mark represent the Spirit of God descending upon Him 'as a dove,' where St Luke has 'in a bodily shape like a

¹ ὁσσωπότης οἶνος, *wine prepared with hyssop* (Lidd. and Scott, *Lex.*). Περιθεῖς, like περιβάλλω, *circumdare*, &c., admits either construction.

² ἄρδος καὶ κρόκος, *κάλαμος καὶ κινάμωμον*. Cant. iv. 14.

³ Luke xxiii. 36.

⁴ *Sermons*, p. 124.

⁵ מורא for מורא (usually written מורא). The word for *hyssop* is מורא.

⁶ One reading may have been, *on his praying* (עלה); the other, *on his going up* (עלה).

dove.' The reason of this difference might be easily explained by supposing that SS. Matthew and Mark used the word denoting similitude in a pleonastic sense¹, (like a particle of similitude) while St Luke gave to it its strongest signification."

XI. *The Serpent of brass.* Numb. xxi. 9; Joh. iii. 14.

There are two matters in relation to the brazen serpent, which it will be best to consider separately. First, what was its probable significance, to those who looked to it for healing, and before any typical reference to Christ had been pointed out? And, secondly, in what way was His crucifixion antitypical to the elevation of the serpent?

1. To a people saturated with the principle of religious symbolism the lifting up of the serpent could scarcely fail to suggest the *existence of* some esoteric meaning, which may or may not have been grasped more definitely than such general conviction would of necessity imply. The following is the account of the transaction: 'And the people spake against God, and against Moses....And the LORD sent fiery serpents among the people, and they bit the people; and much people of Israel died. Therefore the people came to Moses and said, We have sinned, for we have spoken against the LORD, and against thee; pray unto the LORD, that He take away the serpents from us. And Moses prayed for the people. And the LORD said unto Moses, Make thee a fiery serpent, and set it on a pole: and it shall come to pass, that every one that is bitten, when he looketh upon it *shall live*. And Moses made a serpent of brass, and put it upon a pole. and it came to pass, that if a serpent had bitten any man, when he beheld the serpent of brass, he lived' (Numb. xxi. 5—9). There are some reflections upon the narrative in the *Wisdom of Solomon* (xvi. 5—7): 'For when the horrible fierceness of

¹ Compare: 'דמות, a likeness, a thing like; Is. xl. 18, what likeness will ye compare with him? Usually concrete, an image, &c. An adverb: like as, instar. Is. xiii. 4.' (Fürst, *Lex.*) So כנון, sicut similitudo, quasi (Buxtorf, *Lex. Chal.*).

beasts came upon these, and they perished with the stings of crooked serpents, thy wrath endured not for ever : but they were troubled for a small season, that they might be admonished, having a sign of salvation, to put them in remembrance of the commandment of the law. For he that turned himself toward it was not saved by the thing that he saw, but by thee that art the Saviour of all.' 'Certain it is that the Jews do allow that this brazen serpent was a figure of something else, and that it had a spiritual sense and meaning. And when Justin Martyr, in his dialogue with Trypho the Jew, insisted upon this as a type of the death of Christ, and appealed to the company what reason (excluding that) could be given of this matter ; one of them confessed that he was in the right, and that himself had enquired for a reason from the Jewish Masters, but could meet with none'.¹ That it had a meaning, all allow : what the meaning was some do their best to explain, others deprecate the attempt as impious : '*challâ! challâ!* the thing was done by God's command, and it is not for us to inquire into the why and wherefore of the serpent form.' So writes R. Aben Ezra ; and lest his warning should be disregarded, he puzzles the too curious inquirer with some further questions :—"Where is the wood that will sweeten bad water when honey cannot ? What is the meaning of *laying a lump of figs upon the boil*, when it is not in the nature of them to remove it ? But the truth is : 'Such knowledge is too wonderful and excellent for me : I cannot attain unto it.' Another commentator (Rashi) writes : 'And our authorities have said, *Can a serpent kill or make alive?* Nay, but when Israel looked upward, and humbled their heart to their Father which is in heaven, they were healed, and if they refused, they perished.' All this is testimony to the *existence* of a meaning which has still to be sought. Here a noted allegorist comes to the inquirer's aid, and *leads up to* a plausible interpretation. 'Philo the Jew does in several places mention the difference between the *serpent of Eve*, and the *serpent of Moses*, or this brazen serpent of which I am now

¹ Kidder, *Demonstr. Messias*, I. 211.

speaking¹. He makes one directly opposite to the other ; and that which deceived Eve to be a symbol of voluptuousness, and in token thereof doomed to *goe upon his belly* (Gen. iii. 14) : but this of Moses to be a symbol of fortitude and temperance. That was the destroyer of mankind, this the saviour of the Israelites : *every one that sees it* (the brazen serpent) *shall live. Very true: For if the mind bitten with Eve's Serpent, which is voluptuousness, can spiritually discern the beauty of temperance: i.e. The Serpent of Moses, and through it, God himself, he shall live. Onely let him see and consider.* That the serpent should carry back the thoughts of a Jew to the serpent of Eve, seems natural, not to say unavoidable ; but that the serpent of Moses should have been thought to represent directly something *good* would be least of all likely when the plague was a plague of serpents. The way to salvation was by a bruising of the serpent's head (Gen. iii. 15) ; and Moses, by affixing the serpent to the flagstaff, seems to have symbolised *the impalement and extermination of the BODY OF SIN.*

2. Our Lord's *lifting up* is thus compared by Him to the lifting up of the serpent : 'As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up : that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have eternal *life*' (Joh. iii. 14, 15). Where it is not affirmed that the serpent was a direct representation of Christ, but in reverse order, the lifting up of Christ is assimilated to the elevation of the serpent. The type is not formed upon the model of Christ, but Christ is assimilated thereunto. 'Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a *curse* for us : for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree²' (Gal. iii. 13). 'He hath made Him to be *sin* for us, who knew no sin ; that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him' (2 Cor. v. 21). In the familiar sacrificial system the victim 'is regarded as bearing the sins of those for whom atonement is made. The curse is transferred

¹ Kidder, *Demonstr. Messias*, 1. 211. metu sic loqui, nisi apostolus præiret ?

² 'Quis auderet sine blasphemia Bengel.

from them to it. It becomes in a certain sense, the IMPERSONATION of the sin and of the curse¹.

Additional remarks.

1. The transition to the third person, in lii. 14, has been explained briefly as arising from a sudden (*idiomatic*) change in the speaker's point of view. We are expecting: 'so marred was *thy* visage:' but the prophet throws himself into the beholder's point of view, and writes: *so marred was 'his' visage*. This commingling of direct and indirect narrations is quite in accordance with Hebrew usage. A striking example occurs in Ps. xi. 1: 'How say ye to my soul, Flee as a bird to your mountain?' Where the Psalmist, in the middle of a quotation, comes back suddenly to his own point of view, and instead of sustaining the *quotation*, 'Flee as a bird to our mountain,' he writes, 'Flee as a bird to' your 'mountain.' In Is. lii. 14, 15, the prophet thus passes from the second person to the third (which he then retains):

Even as many marvelled because of thee,
That so marred was 'his' visage more than any man:
So shall he agast, &c.

2. *His rest shall be glorious* (Is. xi. 10). 'Abravenel brings these words as a proof that what is said (Is. liii. 9), *He made His grave with the wicked*, cannot belong to the Messiah, because it is said that His rest shall be glorious². The vulgar Latin renders these words, *erit sepulchrum ejus gloriosum*. And we find the Greek interpreters elsewhere render the word *rest* in this sense. Thus, *he shall enter into peace, they shall rest in their beds...* is by the Greek rendered, *his burial shall be in peace*.' The objector here takes for granted that the earlier chapter of Isaiah is Messianic. If this be so, it is difficult, as Stier well observes, to avoid the conclusion, that Is. liii. (which so strikingly reproduces the prophecy of the *Netser*) must itself be Messianic.

¹ See Lightfoot on Gal. iii. 13. In Hebrew, *sin-offering* actually means *sin*.

² Kidder, *Demonstr. Messias*, i.

3. *Who shall declare His generation?*

(i) One of the meanings above suggested is, Who could describe Him, *sc.* by defining the stock from which He sprang? There is a common usage of *generation*, which entirely justifies some such explanation. 'It is also taken' for men of like quality and disposition, though neither of one place nor age. Ps. xiv. 5. God is in the *generation* of the righteous' (Prov. xxx. 11—14; Matt. iii. 7; Acts ii. 40; 1 Pet. ii. 9). In Ps. xxiv. 3, the question is asked, 'Who shall ascend into the hill of the LORD? or who shall stand in His holy place?' Then follows a *description* of one duly qualified, and, in immediate sequence; 'This (*talis*) is the generation of them that seek thee.' To know the stock whence such and such a man has sprung, is thus used, by an easy transition, of knowing *the class to which he belongs*. To know his *yeved*, is to know his CHARACTERISTICS. Hence, for the meaning of Acts viii.: 'In His humiliation He was lightly esteemed, but who could adequately describe Him?'

(ii) Another explanation (*yeved*=βίωσις²) has been proposed, which leads to a like general result. If *yeved* can mean, the *class* to which so and so belongs, it may be naturally transferred to his general surroundings, or to the *affairs* with which he is conversant. In Luke xvi. 8, the meaning is that the children of this world are wiser *in respect of their own* (worldly) *matters*³ than are the children of light in theirs. It is perhaps best to render: 'in dealings with their own *class*,' and to explain *yeved* as in the foregoing paragraph: but very slight variation would result from rendering *yeved* by *affairs*. Such a meaning is appropriate (if not required)

¹ Cruden, *Concordance*. This meaning is applied by Mr Perowne to Matt. xxiv. 34; 'where ἡ *yeved* αὐτῆς means, *this race, with all its moral characteristics; not the people now alive.*'

² In Chaldee ܝܝܕ means *habitare*: also, *disponere*, which bears out Lowth's rendering, *manner of life*.

³ εἰς τῇ *yeved* τῇ αὐτῶν, which

Theophylact explains, ἐν τῷ βίῳ τούτῳ, Weisse (correctly), '*Im Verkehr mit ihrem Gleichen*;' Neander (too vaguely), '*Von ihrem Standpunkte.*' (Trench, *Parables*.)

⁴ 'An allusion, strangely often missed, to the debtors in the parable.' (Trench.)

in Gen. vi. 9, where it is said that Noah was 'perfect in his generations;' a phrase which from the parallelism (Noah *walked* with God) and from the contrast in ver. 8, must be ultimately equivalent to the more usual, 'perfect in his ways.'

4. *Further references to Psalms xxii.; xxxiv.; cii.*

'For which cause He is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee' (Heb. ii. 11, 12; Ps. xxii. 22). 'For thine is the kingdom' (Matt. vi. 13; Ps. xxii. 28). 'My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour' (Luke i. 46, 47; Ps. xxxiv. 3; Is. lxi. 10). 'If so be ye have tasted that the LORD is gracious' (1 Pet. ii. 3; Ps. xxxiv. 8). 'Follow peace with all men.' 'For he that will love life, and see good days, let him refrain his tongue from evil, and his lips that they speak no guile: let him eschew evil, and do good; let him seek peace and ensue it. For the eyes of the LORD are over the righteous, and His ears are open unto their prayers; but the face of the LORD is against them that do evil' (Heb. xii. 14; 1 Pet. iii. 10—12; Ps. xxxiv. 12—16). 'And thou, LORD, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the works of thine hands: they shall perish, but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed; but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail' (Heb. i. 10—12; Ps. cii. 25—27; Heb. xiii. 8). Ps. lxix. will be considered in another section.

NOTES ON CHAPTER V.

A. In Richardson's *Engl. Dict.* the following lines are quoted from Chaucer, Surrey, Spenser, Milton, Gray, respectively:

That me *agasteth* in my dream.

The silence selfe of night *agast* my sprite.
 Neither of idle shews nor of false charmes *agast*. }
 So sore him dread *agast*. }
 With shuddering horror pale and eyes *agast*.
 Stout Glo'ster stood *agast* in speechless trance.

Milton's use favours the derivation from *gaze*. Fuller uses the expression, *stood a gaze*. Shaks. *Henry VI., Part I.* :

All the whole army stood *agaz'd* on him.

יִזְרֹא is commonly taken as fut. hiphil from יָזַר, *to sprinkle*. Against the rendering, 'he shall sprinkle,' there are two main objections: (i) its apparent incongruity; and (ii) the usage of the word, which means *to sprinkle* water, &c. *upon...*; never, *to sprinkle... with*. The Targum, adopting the former of these constructions, renders, by יִבְרֹר, 'he shall *scatter*' (*sc.* like drops of water) the persons spoken of. The rendering of the text harmonises with the LXX, θαυμάσονται, which the majority of commentators now seek to arrive at by different devices. The strength of the conviction that some such rendering is required, is best shewn by the various conjectures to which it has led: e.g. 1. *sic mirabuntur*, &c. οἱ, 'Non male, nam *mirari* est veluti aspergi fulgore alicujus.' 2. *Persperget* stupore. 3. He shall make them jump (the rendering now commonly received). 4. To sprinkle, is used for to surprise and astonish, as people are that have much water thrown upon them. And this sense is followed by the LXX. 'This is ingenious,' adds Lowth, 'but rather too refined. Dr Durell conjectures that the true reading may be יִחַזּוּ, *they shall regard*, which comes near to the θαυμάσονται of the LXX, who seem to give the best sense of any to the place.' Hereupon follows a suggestive citation from Dr Jubb: "I find in my papers the same conjecture which Dr Durell made from θαυμάσονται in the LXX. And it may be added that יִחַזּוּ is used to express 'looking on any thing with admiration' (Ps. xi. 7; xvii. 15; xxvii. 4; lxiii. 2; Cant. vi. 13). It is particularly applied to 'looking on God' (Ex. xxiv. 11; Job xix. 26). G. Cuper, in *Observat.* Lib. ii. 1, though *aliud agens*, has some observations which shew how nearly ὁράω and θαυμάζω are allied, which (with the peculiar sense of the verb יִחַזּוּ above noted) add to the probability of θαυμάσονται being the version of יִחַזּוּ in the text. Οἱ δὲ νῦν λαοὶ Πάντες ἐπ' αὐτὸν ὁρῶσι

(Hesiod.), i. e. cum veneratione quadam admirantur. Hinc ὀράω et θαυμάζω junxit Themistius *Or.* 1. : εἰτα παύσονται οἱ ἄνθρωποι πρὸς σὲ μόνον ὀρῶντες, καὶ σὲ μόνον θαυμάζοντες. Theophrastus, in *Charact.* Cap. III. : 'Ενθυμῇ ὡς ἀποβλεποῦσιν εἰς σε οἱ ἄνθρωποι. Hence the rendering of this verse seems to be, 'So many nations shall look on him with admiration,' &c." The conjecture in the text embodies the chief part of Dr Jubb's suggestion, but avoids any departure from the reading of the Hebrew. The word הוה is a *softened* form of הוה, and expresses, accordingly, a *refinement* of its meaning. The latter means simply *to regard*; the former, *to stare vacantly*. The participle הוה, in Is. lvi. 10 (the only other place where the root occurs), is variously rendered: ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι (LXX), φανταζόμενοι (Aquila), ὀραματισταί (Symmachus). These 'sleepy stagers,' be it remarked, are both *blind* and *dumb*; just as the kings and nations (Is. liii. 15) stand 'aghast in speechless trance.'

B. Rosenmüller urges that שוה cannot be construed with a simple accusative, and renders: 'Quod attinet ad coævos suos, quis meditatur: quando excisus esset,' &c. But Hengstenberg cites Ps. cxlv. 5, ודברי נפלאותיך אשיחה. If Rosenmüller's objection were valid, we might still render, 'As for his generation—who could tell, *or* form any conception' *sc.* of it? [Prepositions are often thus omitted when the verb follows its case.] The rendering adopted by Rosenmüller is harsh in respect of מי, who *of them?* and is not favoured by the use of the *future*, instead of either preterite or participle. The explanation, 'Who of them would have thought that he was cut off.. *for the transgression of my people,*' would require (by the law of emphasis) a different arrangement: 'Who would have thought that *for the transgression of my people,* &c.'

C. The first clause of ver. 8 (as on p. 76) implies that what 'they appointed' was not carried out. But it might perhaps signify no more than that they executed him as a criminal, without reference to any formal burial; in like manner as a person is said *ipso facto* to 'find his grave,' wherever he may chance to die. 'Lucem accipiet hic locus ex Nahum i. 14: *Domum ejus ponam sepulchrum tuum*: non quod ibi sepultus est Sennacherib, sed quod ibi occisus' (Poole, *Synops.* III. 519). The next clause speaks of an actual tomb, if the rendering in the text be the true one. Ewald *e. g.* considers that כַּמְתִּיו (as he would point it) *scheint nothwendig für Grabhügel zu stehen*. [See Is. xxii. 16.] There may be two

pointings of this word, as of סריס Gen. xl. 7; Esth. ii. 21. Aben Ezra mentions the rendering *tomb* or *monument*, which is perhaps preferable; the *plural* being appropriate in describing a *complex* superstructure. See Poli *Synops.*

Some make עשיר parallel and nearly synonymous with רשעים, arguing that the ideas of *riches* and *violence* are usually conjoined in scripture. But such connexion is fortuitous and non-essential. In Eccl. x. 20, עשיר is parallel to מלך, and (it may be repeated) the speakers in the verse before us are taken to be heathen *kings*. *Rich* rather than *righteous* would be the prophetic designation of a heathen dignitary. Riches, again, naturally associate themselves with *honourable burial*. The rich man dies and *is buried* (Luke xvi. 22), Kings, and princes *that have gold*, build desolate places (mausoleums) for themselves (Job iii. 14, 15). It may be added, that the words for *rich man* and *wrong-doers* contain the same root-letters; and that *paronomasia* commonly implies *contrast* rather than mere parallelism. The change of number favours the rendering of the text.

D. There is little difficulty in connecting the meanings, *dwelling, manner of life*. Compare 'Conversor. (1) To abide, live, dwell *somewhere*. (2) To live *somehow*, pass one's life.' So οἰκέω, which refers properly to dwelling (in the local sense), comes to be applied to the *manner* of living, and in this sense is susceptible of the modifications (οἶκον) εὖ, κακῶς (οἰκεῖν). In Hebrew, שכן may be used in describing a *condition*, or a *quality*. Thus: 'lay mine honour in the dust' (Ps. vii. 5); 'I wisdom *dwell with* prudence [κατεσκήνωσα βουλήν], and find out knowledge of witty inventions' (Prov. viii. 12). Compare the derived usage, πόρρω ἐσκήνεται [ἐσκήνηται] τοῦ θανάσιμος εἶναι (Plato, *Rep.*).

CHAPTER VI.

The sure Mercies of David.

Is. lv. 3; Acts xiii. 34.

THIS citation may be taken as the characteristic of two apostolic addresses¹, wherein the Resurrection of JESUS is described as consummating the 'sure mercies' of which David was, in some sense, the object. It is not indeed adduced by St Peter, but a cognate citation is common to the two addresses. St Paul continues (Acts xiii. 35): 'Wherefore he saith also in another psalm, Thou shalt not suffer thine *Holy One* to see corruption.' And St Peter (Acts ii. 25—28) quotes more at length from the same place: 'For David speaketh concerning him, I foresaw the Lord always before my face, for he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved. Therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue was glad; moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope: because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine *Holy One* to see corruption. Thou hast made known to me the ways of life; thou shalt make me full of joy with thy countenance' (Ps. xvi. 8—11). The citation from David, equally with that from Isaiah, deals with 'mercies of David,' which are apostolically referred to JESUS: but, more than this, there is a verbal similarity (not apparent to the English reader) which links the two passages still more closely to one another. Isaiah speaks

¹ By SS. Peter and Paul respectively: Acts ii. 14—40; xiii. 16—41.

of the 'sure mercies of David'¹: David represents himself as 'Thy favoured one,' the recipient of God's mercies². These citations are a natural starting-point for various critical and theological discussions, to which it is proposed to give some attention in the present chapter.

(1) It is needful, as a preliminary, to inquire in what cases a reference in the New Testament to the Old is to be taken as (directly or indirectly) testifying to the authorship of the passage cited. Is David declared to be the author of a passage because it is introduced by some such formula as 'David saith'? If not, under what circumstances does the mention of a name amount to a declaration of authorship? (2) What is the internal evidence for the Davidic authorship of Ps. xvi.? This question leads up to a discussion of the vexed title *Michtam*, by which Ps. xvi. is designated, in common with five others (lvi.—lx.). (3) Supposing Ps. xvi. to have been written by David, and with a reference to Christ, what was the nature and extent of the writer's prophetic consciousness? (4) What is the relation between the so-called *primary* and *secondary* applications of the second Psalm (Acts xiii. 33) and of other passages to which a DOUBLE SENSE has been assigned?

I. The Authorship of Passages cited.

In his comment on Prov. xix. 5, R. Shalom ben Abraham has some reflections upon *Truth* and *Falschhood*:—If you observe the spelling of the word for *truth*³, you will find that it contains the first, middle and last letters of the alphabet, shewing that truth is the groundwork of all society: whereas the word for *falsehood*⁴ has its letters consecutive, to intimate that false witnesses cannot make their accounts mutually confirmatory, without first meeting together, and agreeing upon what they shall say. Faithful witnesses on the contrary, however widely scattered, simply make up their minds to

¹ חסדי ר', τὰ δὲ ἔλεα Δ.

² חסידך, τὸν δασιόν σου.

³ אמת.

⁴ שקר.

speaking the truth, and have no occasion to meet together and compare notes. And then again, observe the stability of the letters in *truth*, which, unlike those of *falschood*, have a basis and pair-of-feet¹ to stand upon. 'And let not this thing seem trivial in thine eyes, for by the shapes of our letters great secrets are hinted at.'

The above serves to illustrate a tendency, which is not peculiar to Jews, but has shewn itself, in more insidious guise, in the works of Christian commentators: the tendency, viz. to see in Holy Scripture an authority for preconceived opinions, and instinctively to set forth those opinions as derived in the first instance from such passages as may be thought to give them countenance. The reflections cited are not, indeed, unlike what Bishop Butler has affirmed of the natural tendency of virtue, and of the consistence, and mutual harmony that would prevail in a community, if its members were one and all actuated by a single aim:—'Now, I say, virtue in a society has a like tendency to procure superiority and additional power: whether this power be considered as the means of security from opposite power, or of obtaining other advantages. And it has this tendency, by rendering public good an object and end to every member of the society; by putting every one upon consideration and diligence, recollection and self-government, both in order to see what is the most effectual method, and also in order to perform their proper part, for obtaining and preserving it; by uniting a society within itself, and so increasing its strength; and, which is particularly to be mentioned, uniting it by means of veracity and justice. For as these last are principal bonds of union, so benevolence or public spirit, undirected, unrestrained by them, is, nobody knows what?' But though R. Shalom's sentiments are irreproachable in themselves, they have an appearance of ludicrousness, springing from the form in which they are presented. They are not indeed inconsistent

¹ 'Apud Rabbinos, השקר אין לו רגלים, *Mendacium non habet pedes*, i.e. inconstans et evanidum est.' (Buxtorf.) *Lex. Chald.*
² *Analogy*, Part I. Ch. iii.

with any declaration of Holy Writ ; they might, on the contrary, be abundantly confirmed by its explicit declarations : but they are assuredly not contained in the words or letters from which the commentator has striven to evolve them. While professing to educe the inner mysteries of the sacred text, he is unconsciously seeking to corroborate his preconceived and independent (though in this case true) conclusions.

But the preconceived opinions which the Bible has been quoted to corroborate, have not always been so sound as in the case alluded to ; and, as a natural consequence, the increase of knowledge has shewn the incompatibility of such and such interpretations with observed facts. The appearance of antagonism between Scripture and Science, has given rise, first of all, to an attempted repression of the latter, and, in other quarters, to a repudiation of the authority of the former ; but more mature reflection has led to a change of *interpretation*, and thus removed the first difficulty which beset the reconciliation of superficially antagonistic claims. A divine authority has been claimed for the old popular astronomy, which made our earth a fixed centre for the sun's diurnal course. It is difficult indeed to determine to what extent the view in question was preconceived, and to what extent generated or developed by the language of the Bible, as once interpreted : but it may be affirmed that, if the modern astronomy could be conceived of as having preceded the Biblical statements which seem to bear upon the subject, the literal interpretation of those statements would not easily have gained general acceptance.

The astronomical controversy, now matter of history, may serve as a type of others which have yet to be decided. It may excite surprise that some of the more poetical passages adduced to prove that the sun moves round the earth, should have been accepted as evidence in the case ; and even in prosaic passages it is now seen that there is no necessity for regarding certain descriptions as other than phenomenal, and comparable with such as are still employed in chronicling the

results of scientific observations. The sun is still said to *rise* and *set*; and a modern writer who employs a language thus phenomenal, is not supposed to stand thereby committed to a faulty science. The same measure is at length meted out to the Biblical language, and it comes rightly to be denied that Scripture purports to be a Revelation of Science, or was designed to forestall and anticipate any conclusion that might in due time be arrived at by human industry, unaided by supernatural enlightenment.

It might be assumed, as a sequel to the preceding, that Holy Scripture would leave other things discoverable, in philology as in science, to be discovered, in like manner, by human reason. Its language may seem at first sight to sanction such and such critical conclusions; but experience should suggest the misgiving that those conclusions may be preconceived and extra-Biblical, while their Scriptural sanction is apparent and not real. In any case, it is incumbent upon the theologian to gather light from whatever source, and either to confirm, or to prove the fallacy of, his *prima facie* impressions.

The particular question now to be considered is, in what case a citation in the New Testament determines the authorship of the passage cited. The first impression is, doubtless, that the mention of a name is decisive, and that if a citation is introduced by such a formula as 'David saith,' David is thereby declared to have been the writer of the passage in question. By a commentator who brings to the discussion of such a formula of citation the *antecedent* conviction that the Psalm referred to was written by David, the *prima facie* interpretation would naturally be accepted as final; nor would it, for the most part, present itself as a fit subject for enquiry, whether the inspired writer definitely intended to give countenance to such conviction, or indeed to affirm anything whatever with regard to the authorship of the passage cited. When however independent research has suggested doubts about the authorship of a Psalm alluded to in the New Testament as Davidic, it then at length comes to be doubted

whether the *prima facie* meaning of the formula of citation¹ is the true one, or whether, as in modern phrase, the Psalm is styled one of '*the Psalms of David*,' for convenience of reference, and without critical intent. That such a practice is not repugnant to Jewish usage may be gathered from the following examples of their Biblical nomenclature.

Several books of the Old Testament are named by them after their opening word or the first distinctive word occurring. Thus, the five books of Moses are called, respectively, by the words italicized in their opening verses, as below. '*In the beginning* God created the heaven and the earth.' 'Now these are *the names of the children of Israel*, which came into Egypt.' '*And the LORD called* unto Moses.' 'And the LORD spake unto Moses *in the wilderness of Sinai*.' 'These be the *words* which Moses spake unto all Israel.' The book of Lamentations is called (*sc.* from its first word) '*How?*' Two other books are called by the name of an individual, although the former contains an account of the individual's death and burial (1 Sam. xxv. 1), and the remaining portion of it combines with the whole of the second book in the narration of subsequent events. These examples sufficiently evince a tendency, in the Jews, to name the scriptural books with a view to *convenience of reference*, and, this end being gained, to rest satisfied with a title more or less significant, but not exhaustively descriptive. The tendency thus manifested in the nomenclature of separate books, repeats itself in the general classification of Luke xxiv. 44: 'And He said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the *law of Moses*, and in *the prophets*, and in *the Psalms*, concerning me.' Where 'the Psalms' include the whole Hagiographa, and not only the *Psalms* properly so called.

¹ Aben Ezra, *e.g.* does not think the title *David-psalm* intended always to mark David as the actual author. If this be true of an *Inscription*, לדר, it is easy to understand that an Apostle

may have alluded to a Psalm, and that with every appearance of definiteness, as Davidic, without thereby intending to pronounce upon its authorship.

Remarks on special Formulæ of Citation.

In Heb. iv. 7, the expression, '*In David*,' might very naturally be taken as referring to what is called, in modern phrase, 'the Psalms of David,' but without any implied determination of the authorship of the passage: 'To-day if ye will hear his voice harden not your hearts.' Perhaps, again, St Paul's formula, 'David saith,' would be allowed by many to be itself a mere reference to the book of Psalms, leaving it still an open question whether the sixty-ninth Psalm was written by David. More difficulty, however, arises from St Peter's reference to this Psalm (in connexion with the hundred and ninth) in his address to the disciples before the election of Matthias. 'Men and brethren, this scripture must needs have been fulfilled, which the Holy Ghost *by the mouth of David*¹ spake before concerning Judas, which was guide to them that took Jesus' (Acts i. 16). But in ver. 20 he continues: 'For it is written *in the book of Psalms*, Let his habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein: and his bishopric let another take:' and he thus seems to interpret the preceding formula of citation as a simple reference to the book of Psalms. Whether or no this inference be thought a fair one, it may be doubted whether the phrase *διὰ στόματος* is so distinctly expressive of personality as appears at first sight; for the Hebrew language abounds in *pleonastic* prepositional usages, and the Greek words quoted may correspond to one of these; perhaps to an expression meaning *according to the mouth of*², which is used indiscriminately of persons and things. In later Hebrew, this phrase, in its merely prepositional sense, is so common that it is expressed by the initial letters of its two component words. Another expression meaning literally, *according to the mouth of this*³, is used pleonastically in the sense, *accordingly*; and so often, that the phrase is written as one word and usually abbreviated.

¹ Cf. Acts iv. 25: 'Who *by the mouth of thy servant David* hast said, people imagine a vain thing?'
² עַל פִּי, abbreviated, עַפִּי.
³ לְפִיכָּךְ, abbreviated, לְפִי.

On the indirect determination of the Authorship of Citations.

If in any case it remains doubtful whether the authorship of a citation is unpronounced upon by way of direct affirmation, it has still to be enquired whether it is determined implicitly by the requirements of the argument. The latter cannot be affirmed (a) of St Peter's citation in Acts i. 16: 'This scripture must needs have been fulfilled, which the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake before.' Where the *fulfilment of inspired Scripture* is the sum and substance of the argument, and 'the mouth of David' is but the channel of the Holy Spirit's utterance. Nor again, (b) of the conclusion: 'There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of God;' which is led up to (Heb. iv. 9) by a series of scriptural quotations, adduced to prove the non-finality of Joshua's rest. 'For if Jesus had given them rest, then would he not afterward have spoken of another day' (ver. 8). Amongst the quotations is one from Ps. xcv. 7, 8, of which the characteristic word is *σήμερον*:—*Again* he limiteth a certain day, saying in David, 'To-day,' as is *aforesaid*: 'To-day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts.' The argument is independent of the precise interval between the two occasions, and therefore, of the Davidic authorship. It would obviously not be weakened by extending the *τοσοῦτον χρόνον*, and setting its lower limit after the age of David. There seems in this case to be no obvious reason, deducible from the general argument, why the expression, 'in David,' should be taken as (necessarily) more definite than, 'in the book of Psalms.' Nor again (c) in the case of St Paul's citation from Ps. lxix.: 'And *David saith*, Let their table be made a snare, and a trap, and a stumblingblock, and a recompence unto them' (Rom. xi. 9), where the substitution of, '*It is written*,' for, 'David saith,' would leave the argument intact. (d) With the citation from Ps. xvi. by SS. Peter and Paul, the case is to all appearance different. St Peter, after quoting as from David: 'Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt

thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption' (Acts ii. 27); thus continues in ver. 29, 'Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption.' St Paul emphasises the same contrast in Acts xiii. 36, 37: 'For David, after he had served his own generation by the will of God, fell on sleep, and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption. But he, whom God raised again, saw no corruption.' The Davidic authorship seems here to be asserted; and accordingly we proceed to a consideration of the group of Psalms to which the sixteenth belongs.

II. *The Monumental Psalms.*

The sixteenth Psalm is bound up in one group with five others (lvi.—lx.) by the title *Michtam*, prefixed to one and all; a title which has given rise to much discussion, and to a variety of conjectures, for the most part unsatisfactory. The discussion of the title is one important element in an investigation of the authorship of the Psalms thereby designated; and upon this we accordingly enter, premising that the result will be a confirmation of the oldest traditions on the point, as embodied in the Targum and the LXX.

1. The LXX. rendering of *Michtam* is *σθηλογραφία*, which agrees with the Chaldee, *sculptura recta*¹, and is represented in the Vulgate by *tituli inscriptio*. In his *Sepher Shorashim*, R. Kimchi gives the meaning *stamp* or *seal*, agreeably with the requirements of Jer. ii. 22: "For though thou wash thee with nitre, and take thee much soap, yet thine iniquity is marked before me." Vain are all attempts to wash it out, for it is *graven* as in the rock for ever (Job xix.

¹ גליפא תריצא.

24). Gesenius connects Michtam with the common word used of *writing*¹, which itself means primarily *incidere*, 'nam primitus litteræ lapidibus insculptæ sunt;' and this view seems plausible enough to be accepted, in default of evidence pointing to any well-defined antagonistic conclusion.

The root of Michtam occurs once only (*supra*) in the verb form, though several times as a noun, which has been rendered, *gold*. But is it clear that the various contexts in which the noun occurs *require* this rendering? Is it not even more appropriate to attach to it the idea of *shape*, or *workmanship*, rather than of *material*; and to render it, not *gold*, but *jewels*, or *jewelry*? which necessitates no departure from the above-mentioned plausible hypothesis. The word occurs in Job xxviii. 16, 19, in connexion with gold and precious stones: 'It cannot be valued with the *gold* of Ophir, with the precious onyx, or the sapphire. The gold and the crystal cannot equal it: and the exchange of it shall not be for jewels of fine gold. No mention shall be made of coral, or of pearls; for the price of wisdom is above rubies. The topaz of Ethiopia shall not equal it, neither shall it be valued with pure *gold*.' In Is. xiii. 12, it is rendered, 'The *golden wedge* of Ophir.' In Lam. iv. 1, 2, the meanings *jewels*, and *jewellers' workmanship*, are not less appropriate than *gold*. 'How is the gold become dim! how is the most fine *gold* changed! the stones [gems] of the sanctuary are poured out in the top of every street. The precious sons of Zion, comparable to fine gold, how are they esteemed as earthen pitchers, the work of the hands of the potter!' In Cant. v. 10, 'the beloved' is likened to a banner towering above the host; he is set up like a banner, 'the chief among ten thousand'. His head is as the boss upon its summit; his locks are pendant, raven-black. In the Authorised Version, the meaning *gold* is, indeed, retained; 'His head is as most fine gold;' but the idea of *shape* is admissible, if not required. In Ps. xlv. 9, the queen-mother is said to be decked with '*gold*² of Ophir;' unless

¹ כתב.

² דגול מרבה.

כתם.

the phrase should be rendered *jewels*, or *workmanship* of Ophir, with reference to the texture and ornamentation of her robes. In ver. 13, the 'king's daughter' is arrayed, not in gold, but in '*wrought gold*'.¹ With this may be compared Dan. x. 5, 'Then I lifted up mine eyes, and looked, and behold a certain man clothed in linen, whose loins were girded with *fine gold*' of Uphaz.' There are two other occurrences of the disputed word, *viz.* in Prov. xxv. 12, and Job xxxi. 24. Its meaning in these and the preceding instances, may be ambiguous; but if not strongly confirmatory of, is on the other hand, not definitely opposed to, the foregoing conclusion, that the root signifies, firstly, *to engrave*, and may even be organically connected with the word *to write*. *Michtam* may itself be practically equivalent to *Michtab*, the title of Hezekiah's hymn, 'The *writing* of Hezekiah, king of Judah, when he had been sick, and was recovered of his sickness' (Is. xxxviii. 9).

2. The present state of the controversy on the applicability of *Michtam*, this or that way interpreted, to the Psalms thereby designated, may be gathered from the following statement by Dr Phillips:—

"This word occurs in the title to Psalms xvi., lvi.—lx. There are some persons who consider it to be identical with *chethem, gold*; and hence they understand either that it was a name given to these Psalms on account of their peculiar excellence, or that they were engraven in letters of gold for some public purpose, perhaps to be hung up in the sanctuary, that the people might become more generally acquainted with the truths which they teach, or with the events to which they may refer, and may be designed to commemorate. For a similar purpose, the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the ten Commandments, are found on the walls of our churches. With respect to the first-mentioned reason for the distinction which was thus conferred on these Psalms, it has been asked in what does their particular excellence consist, on what

account should they be regarded as subjects of greater interest than the others? If the term had been confined to the sixteenth, we might have replied, that this Psalm was eminently entitled to this distinguishing mark, because it communicates truths of vast interest and importance connected with the person and offices of the Messiah. But with respect to the other Psalms, we cannot assert that the instruction which they convey, valuable though it be, as indeed must all instruction which is derived from inspired Scripture, is yet of a higher order than that which is afforded by any other portion of the Songs of Zion. Mendelssohn, in his third preface to the Psalms, says that *Michtab* may be applied to any writing the object of which is to commemorate some event which happened either to the poet himself, or to one of his acquaintances; and in the titles to four out of the six Psalms above enumerated, the events which occasioned their composition are mentioned; thus to the fifty-ninth we have, *Michtam of David, when he fled from Saul in a cave*. He goes on to observe, that in the two, viz. the sixteenth and the fifty-ninth, which have no such headings, it is probable, owing to the long interval between the writing of these Psalms and of their titles, that the particular cause of their production was forgotten. But this explanation is certainly not sufficient; for in many of the titles to the other Psalms, as in that to the fifty-fourth, where Michtam does not occur, the event upon which it is founded is also stated at length. We are therefore disposed to concur with those who think Michtam is the same as Michtab..."

There are then two main currents of opinion, each carrying with it portions of truth, to be traced to their common source. According to one view, these Psalms are 'writings,' or commemorations of events which are for some reason or other to be specially kept in mind. According to the other, they are either 'jewel-Psalms,' so called from a peculiar (though undefined) intrinsic excellence; or such as, for this reason, are deemed worthy to be written in letters of *gold*, and exposed to public view. 'Sed non facile dicas,' urges

Gesenius, 'quibus virtutibus ista carmina præ reliquis emineant, neque ejus quem Harmerus respicit, moris ullum apud Hebræos vestigium est, ipsaque illa derivatio a nomine mere poëtico displicet.' From all this it appears that some characteristic mark or principle of classification is the great desideratum, without which it is impossible to determine accurately the relation of the Psalms in question to their title, however satisfactorily derived.

3. The title Michtam has been compared to that of Hezekiah's hymn; and this similarity of titles suggests a further comparison of the compositions themselves. Hezekiah had been restored to health after a dangerous illness, and wrote the hymn contained in Is. xxxviii. 10—20, as a thanksgiving for recovery. More than this, he provides for the lasting public commemoration of the great deliverance which he, the Lord's Anointed, had experienced¹. 'The Lord was ready to save me: therefore we will sing my songs to the stringed instruments all the days of our life in the house of the Lord.' The hymn contains no thoughts more specially deserving to be remembered, than such as may be found in many a Psalm of thanksgiving; but it treats of a matter of public interest, a crisis in the king's life, a fit subject for public commemoration. For this reason it is formally placed on record, which accounts for its being described by the title Michtab, or 'writing.' May not the title Michtam be similarly accounted for? There is the same kind of difference between Michtam (as above interpreted), and Michtab, as between *inscriptio* and *scriptio*, or between *στηλογραφία* and *γραφή*. If Michtab denotes a Psalm preserved among the public records, not solely for its intrinsic excellence, but with reference to an event which it is designed to commemorate, may not the Michtams be Psalms thrown into the form of monumental inscriptions; public manifestoes, and declarations of principle; records of

¹ Compare the public mournings in honour of Josiah, 2 Chron. xxxv. 25: 'And Jeremiah lamented for Josiah: and all the singing-men and the sing-

ing-women spake of Josiah in their lamentations to this day, and made them an ordinance in Israel; and behold they are written in the lamentations.'

events of national interest and importance? If the Michtams were thus known and read of all men, it may be surmised that tradition would be the more likely to have preserved the true account of their origin and reference; or in other words, that their inscriptions would be the more to be relied upon.

Four of the six Michtams are referred to circumstances in David's life, while the remainder are assigned to no specific occasion. The inscriptions as rendered in the English Bible, are as follows :—

Ps. xvi. Michtam of David.

Ps. lvi. To the chief Musician upon Jonath-elem-rechokim, Michtam of David, when the Philistines took him in Gath.

Ps. lvii. To the chief Musician, Al-taschith, Michtam of David, when he fled from Saul in the cave.

Ps. lviii. To the chief Musician, Al-taschith, Michtam of David.

Ps. lix. To the chief Musician, Al-taschith, Michtam of David; when Saul sent, and they watched the house to kill him.

Ps. lx. To the chief Musician upon Shushan-eduth, Michtam of David, to teach; when he strove with Aram-naharaim and with Aram-zobah, when Joab returned, and smote of Edom in the valley of salt twelve thousand.

The fifty-eighth Psalm is referred by Mr Mason to the occasion of Absalom's rebellion, which completes the cycle of references, in Psalms lvi.—lx., to the most noteworthy crises in the life of David; while the sixteenth is a general acknowledgment of Jehovah's sole being and protecting care. David, according to this hypothesis, is addressing his subjects through the medium of these Monumental Psalms; and, be it remarked in conclusion, there are expressions in the Michtams which borrow a new significance from this supposition.

By 'sons of men' are designated the undistinguished masses with whom David expostulates for their rebellion. 'Do ye indeed speak righteousness, O congregation'? do ye

¹ 'Proinde de hominibus e vulgo, &c.' Gesen. *Thesaur.* s. v. **םך**.

judge uprightly, O ye *sons of men*?' (Ps. lviii. 1). Again the Psalmist speaks in kingly phrase in Ps. lix. 11, 'Slay them not, lest *my people* forget.' But perhaps the most remarkable expression is one commonly passed over with no more than a grammatical discussion; 'the saints that are in the earth, and *the excellent, in whom is all my delight*' (Ps. xvi. 3). The royal Psalmist renders acknowledgement to JEHOVAH in the form of a proclamation to his subjects, and declares that none but worshippers of the LORD his God, shall be held in honour by him, or find favour in his sight.

III. *David the Prophet.*

The 'sure mercies of David,' which St Paul sees realized in Christ, are thus spoken of by Isaiah: 'Incline your ear, and come unto me: hear, and your soul shall live; and I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David. Behold, I have given him for a witness to the people, a *leader* and commander to the people' (Is. lv. 3, 4); where the 'Prince' to come is called by the name of David, as in other passages of Holy Writ. Thus: 'Therefore will I save my flock, and they shall be no more a prey; and I will judge between cattle and cattle. And I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd, And I the LORD will be their God, and my servant David a prince among them; I the LORD have spoken it' (Ezek. xxxiv. 22—24). 'And David my servant shall be king over them; and they all shall have one shepherd: they shall also walk in my judgements, and observe my statutes, and do them. And they shall dwell in the land that I have given unto Jacob my servant, wherein your fathers have dwelt; and they shall dwell therein, even they, and their children, and their children's children for ever: and my servant David shall be their prince for ever. Moreover I will make a covenant of peace with them; it shall be an everlasting covenant with them: and I will place them, and multiply them, and will set

my sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore' (Ezek. xxxvii. 24—26). 'But they shall serve the LORD their God, and David their king, whom I will raise up unto them' (Jer. xxx. 9). 'For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and without teraphim: Afterward shall the children of Israel return and seek the LORD their God, and David their king; and shall fear the LORD and his goodness in the latter days' (Hos. iii. 4, 5).

Such passages testify to a deeply rooted conviction that a promise remained to be fulfilled to David long after David 'had served his own generation by the will of God, and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption.' In the following, the allusion is more direct to the *promise* by which those mercies were assured.

'For thy servant David's sake turn not away the face of thine anointed. The Lord hath sworn in truth unto David; he will not turn from it; of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy throne. If thy children will keep my covenant and my testimony that I shall teach them, their children shall also sit upon thy throne for evermore. For the Lord hath chosen Zion; he hath desired it for his habitation. This is my rest for ever: here will I dwell; for I have desired it' (Ps. cxxxii. 10—14). 'I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn unto David my servant. Thy seed will I establish for ever, and build up thy throne to all generations....Then thou spakest in vision to thy *holy one*, and saidst, I have laid help upon one that is mighty; I have exalted one chosen out of the people. I have found David my servant; with my holy oil have I anointed him...My faithfulness and my mercy shall be with him: and in my name shall his horn be exalted. I will set his hand also in the sea and his right hand in the rivers. He shall cry unto me, thou art my father, my God, and the rock of my salvation. Also I will make him my first-born, higher than the kings of the earth. My mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with him. His seed also will I make to endure for ever, and

his throne as the days of heaven...My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David' (Ps. lxxxix. 3, 4, 19, 20, 24—29, 34, 35).

The promise to which these later passages refer is found in 2 Sam. vii. 12—16; and in 1 Chron. xvii. 11—14; where it is given to David personally, through Nathan the prophet. It is therefore to be assumed that David had an anticipation of what Isaiah and others still looked forward to after David's death, as the '*mercies of David.*' With reference to the same promise, David is called (*supra*) in Ps. lxxxix. 19, '*thy holy one*;' an expression connected etymologically, as above remarked, with the '*mercies*' of the foregoing phrase. What David is called in this later Psalm, with reference to those mercies, he may without difficulty be supposed to style himself, in Ps. xvi. 10, with conscious anticipation of the same; and indeed, thus only can its natural meaning be given to, '*thy holy one*;' which is a passive adjectival expression signifying, 'one in whom *mercies* are, or are to be, fulfilled.' The two expressions are brought into close proximity in 2 Chron. vi. 41, 42: 'Now therefore arise, O LORD God, into thy resting-place, thou and the ark of thy strength: let thy priests, O LORD God, be clothed with salvation, and let *thy saints* rejoice in goodness. O LORD God, turn not away the face of thine anointed: remember the *mercies of David* thy servant.' Where the *mercies of David* are, *favours* promised to him, and, '*thy saints*' are, literally, '*thy favoured ones*;' members of a favoured community which is summed up in its anointed king. Etymological reasons thus lead us to conjecture that there may be reference in Ps. xvi. 10, to the same '*mercies of David*,' as in Is. lv. 3, and elsewhere.

But, more than this, it is far simpler to suppose the conscious object of eternal mercies actuated, in one of his loftiest utter-

¹ In Ps. xvi. 10, there is a reading חסידך instead of the singular חסיד; but the latter is supported by the parallelism, the ancient versions, and a great

preponderance of MS. authority. In Ps. lxxxix. 19 there is a like various reading.

ances, by a sense of the promised blessing than, denying all such prophetic reference, to confine his words and aspirations within the limits of his individual personality. It seems natural, even apart from the citations in the Acts, to suppose in Ps. xvi. some prophetic reference; but to define the reference is hard, not to say impossible.

The words from the Psalm call in detail for brief remark.

1. It is disputed whether the Hebrew word corresponding to *διαφθοράν* should not rather be rendered *pit* or grave; a meaning which seems appropriate in almost all of the passages where the word occurs, and which Gesenius *e.g.* applies in Ps. xvi. 10, and even in Job xvii. 14: 'I have said to corruption, Thou art my father: to the worm, Thou art my mother and sister.' It may be that *διαφθορά* is a derived meaning, springing from the primary signification *grave*; but it cannot be affirmed with certainty that even the Greek word is always to be taken strictly in the sense *corruption*. That sense is not required, *e.g.* in Prov. xxviii. 10: 'Whoso causeth the righteous to go astray in an evil way, he shall fall himself into his own *pit*;' or in Hos. xi. 5, and elsewhere. The internal evidence of the passage in question is conflicting, for, on the one hand, the parallelism with 'hell,' favours the rendering 'pit'; while on the other, the following expression, 'to see *life*,' favours the abstract rendering 'corruption.' It may be added that the close affinity between the two renderings constitutes one main obstacle to a decision between them.

2. The word *nephesh* is no less disputed. According to some, it is here used generally, in the sense *person* or *self*: according to others, it means *soul*, as opposed to *flesh*. Thus David is understood as saying: 'Thou wilt not leave my *soul* in *hell*; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see *corruption*:' where the first hemistich is referred to the *spirit*, and the second to the *flesh*. It could not be inferred from the tenth verse alone that such a contrast is intended, for the word *nephesh* has a wide range of meanings, and does not

¹ εἰς διαφθοράν αὐτὸς ἐμπεσεῖται.

naturally oppose itself to that part of a man which is susceptible of 'corruption,' viz. the flesh. But in the preceding verse the contrast is apparent: 'Therefore my heart is glad, and my glory rejoiceth: my flesh *also* shall rest in hope.' By *glory*¹ is signified the soul, the highest and most glorious part of man's being; and the second hemistich is shewn to be supplementary to the first, not merely by the word *flesh* alone, but by the particle preceding it: '*yea* my flesh, my very flesh shall rest securely.' This distinction is dwelt upon by Rabbinic commentators, including Kimchi who explains, 'my glory rejoiceth,' as implying a confidence of the soul's being joined to its Maker, after separation from the body. The same commentator gives as the primary meaning of the next clause, that the flesh, while life lasts, shall find rest in the assurance that God will save it from all harm: and he adds, by way of *midrash*, that after death it was not subject to corruption².

3. It does not seem to be the *prima facie* meaning of the Hebrew³ or of the Greek⁴, that 'Thou wilt not leave my soul *in* hell,' &c.; but rather that 'Thou wilt not abandon my soul *to*⁵ hell.' The same construction recurs in the following passages (quoted by Bengel): 'And thou shalt not glean thy vineyard, neither shalt thou gather every grape of thy vineyard: thou shalt leave them *for* the poor and stranger' (Lev. xix. 10). 'For He seeth that wise men die, likewise the fool and the brutish person perish, and leave their wealth *to* others' (Ps. xlix. 10). Where the things left *come*, in each case, freshly into possession. The corresponding Hebrew words in Ps. xvi., exactly rendered by St Peter, do not then express directly that God's Holy One, having been given over to death and the grave, should be delivered therefrom;

¹ 'Denique כבוד פ', *honor alic.*
poët. dicitur de *animo, corde*, utpote
nobiliore hominis parte. Gen. xlix. 6,
&c.' Gesen. *Thesaur.* 655 b.

² ונדרש אחר מיתה מלמד שלא
שטה בו רימה ותולעה.

³ לא תעזוב נפשי לשאל

⁴ οὐκ εγκαταλείψεις τὴν ψυχὴν μου
εἰς ᾗδου.

⁵ Cf. Job xxxix. 14, 'She must en-
trust her eggs *to* the earth' (Bernard. *in*
loc.). See ver. 11, where אל replaces ל.

but, more generally, that He should not in the ordinary sense of the words, be subjected to death's power. 'It was not possible that He should be holden of it' (Acts ii. 24). David, on the contrary, was holden of death; 'his sepulchre is with us to this day.' By St Paul, the phrase, 'to see corruption,' seems to be used in Acts xiii. 34, with the implication that Christ once *εἶδε διαφθοράν*, and was raised from the dead, 'no more to return to corruption.' In ver. 37 it is affirmed, that He did *not* (sc. like David) 'see corruption.' 'For David, after he had served his own generation, by the will of God, fell asleep, and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption: but He whom God raised again, saw no corruption.' Christ, in one sense, 'saw corruption,' *ipso facto*, by taking *flesh and blood*; which, in Cor. xv. 50, stand in parallelism with *φθορά*. 'Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.' He became subject indeed to death, as the common lot of flesh and blood; but, unlike David, whom death still holds, 'Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over Him. For in that He died, He died unto sin once; but in that He liveth, He liveth unto God' (Rom. vi. 9, 10).

Psalm xvi., how applied to Christ?

The applicability of David's words to Christ demands further consideration. It has been maintained above that the Psalmist may most naturally be supposed to speak prophetically, with a view to the future fulfilment of the 'sure mercies' promised to him; but, on the other hand, seeing that he speaks in the first person, and so primarily of himself, on what principle are his words to be applied to Christ?

From the usual rendering of Acts ii. 31, it would perhaps appear that David is represented as uttering his prophecy, in its full particularity, as applied by St Peter. 'He seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ, *that* his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption.' But the *seeing*, and the *being left*, are here spoken of in the past,

whereas in the original, and in the direct citation (ver. 27), both verbs are in the future. Moreover, to render *ὅτι* *for* or *because*, instead of *that*, would accord with the usage of the same Apostle in the preceding chapter; where, speaking of Judas, he explains how he was brought within the range of the prophecy applied to him. 'The Holy Ghost by the mouth of David *spake before concerning Judas*....Let his habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein: and his bishopric let another take....*For* he was numbered with us, and had obtained part of this ministry' (Acts i. 16, 20, 17). Judas is shewn by the event to be included by the Psalmist; *for*¹, being numbered with us, he had obtained an *ἐπαυλις* and an *ἐπισκοπή*. With a like construction in Acts ii. 31, the Apostle's application of Ps. xvi. may be thus expounded: 'Men and brethren, it being competent to affirm as a plain fact, without risk of contradiction, that the patriarch David is dead, and has not in his own person corresponded to his utterances in the Psalm; it follows that he must have prophesied, *sc.* of Christ, *for* His soul was not left in hell, neither His flesh did see corruption. David's words could not fail. As regards himself they did fail, and therefore could not have been spoken of himself. They were fulfilled in Christ; and the event thus shews that they were spoken of Him.' According to this view of the argument, St Peter appeals to the event as the interpreter of prophecy; not assuming that before the event it could have been thus specifically understood, to his present hearers, or to the Prophet himself.

It may be concluded that David spoke indeed of himself, according to the natural interpretation of his words, and by the phrase, 'Thy favoured one,' intended to designate himself. This however he does, not limiting his utterances to his own natural life, but having regard to the organic oneness of his posterity with him². His personal deliverances are viewed

¹ 'Ratio, sub qua Judas hic memoratur, quia habuerat *munus*.' Bengel.

² And as I may so say, Levi also,

who receiveth tithes, payed tithes in Abraham. *Heb. vii. 9.*

typically as evidences of God's eternal purpose, which must somehow be fulfilled, but could not expend itself in him : and as an uninspired thinker is oftentimes conscious of aspirations, which are seen to be unfulfilled by such and such occurrences as successively present themselves, and are then only *understood* when the thing is found which truly answers to them ; so David the Prophet expresses hopes not to be grasped specifically apart from the event, in words which contain obscurely, as in embryo, all that should in after time be of necessity evolved therefrom.

The preceding may appear to some to imply an improper limitation of the prophetic consciousness ; but there is a passage in St John's Gospel, which goes further, and speaks of an altogether perfunctory and unconscious prophesying, or enunciation of the Divine purpose : 'And one of them, named Caiaphas, being the high-priest that same year, said unto them, Ye know nothing at all. Nor consider that it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not. And this spake he not of himself : but being high-priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation' (Joh. xi. 49—51). The difficult passage, 2 Pet. i. 20, 21, does not, according to some, define the limits of prophetic consciousness ; but affirms only that the prophets were borne irresistibly upon the Spirit's blast, leaving it undetermined whether or no they were fully conscious of the direction of their course. It was given them what they should speak, and they may or may not have understood their words ; but, its origin being divine, we have in prophecy a sure guide, 'whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your hearts.'

IV. *The Double Sense of Prophecy.*

The tendency to despiritualize the interpretation of the Old Testament language has sprung very naturally from an antagonism to the manifest extravagances of mystical exe-

genesis. To the historico-critical interpreter it seems, rightly or wrongly, that much of this extravagance owes its origin to a lack of acquaintance with Hebrew criticism, such as characterised portions of the theology of the early Christian Church : but that all was not traceable to this one source may be gathered from the coexistence of far greater extravagance in the systems of the Rabbinites, who aimed at evolving all science and philosophy, by this or that direct process, from the sacred page. With Jew, as with Christian, a superstitious regard for the very words and letters of Holy Writ, led by strangely tortuous ways to a practical disregard of the literal and historical sense. But it will be granted that a peculiar reverence for their Scriptures had ever existed in the Jew, and with it, must we not say, a proclivity to higher interpretations, rendered grotesque only in a later age by incongruous accretions ? The same psalm which seems to contain merely poetical allusions to historical events, may suggest to the worshipper, with no less ease and naturalness, not allusions to past events, but eternal truths. The mystical may be to him *the most literal* sense of all¹. If this be so, a further question at once suggests itself. How far back is the spiritual interpretation to be traced ? Is it not conceivable that it may be found as old, in some cases, as the psalm itself ?

One theory for the reconciliation of the literal and the spiritual interpretations is the theory of the *Double Sense* ; which assumes that " Scripture prophecy is so formed in some of its predictions as to bear a sense directed to two objects ; of which structure the predictions concerning the kingdom of David furnish a conspicuous example ; and I should say an unquestionable one, if the whole principle of that interpretation had not been by some disputed and denied. But the principle has met with this ill acceptance, for no better reason, it should seem, than because it has been injudiciously applied, in cases where it has no proper place ; or has been suspected, if not mistaken, in its constituent character, as to

¹ Lowth, *Is. lii.* 13.

what it really is. The double sense of prophecy, however, is of all things the most remote from fraud or equivocations, and has its ground of reason perfectly clear. For what is it? Not the convenient latitude of two unconnected senses, wide of each other, and giving room to a fallacious ambiguity; but the combination of two related, analogous, and harmonising, though disparate subjects, each clear and definite in itself; implying a two-fold truth in the prescience, and creating an aggravated difficulty, and thereby an accumulated proof, in the completion....So that the double sense of prophecy, in its true idea, is a check upon the pretences of vague and unappropriated prediction, rather than a door to admit them.

But this is not all. For if the prediction distribute its sense into two remote branches or systems of the divine economy; if it shew not only what is to take place in distant times, but describe also different modes of God's appointment, though holding a certain and intelligible resemblance to each other; such prediction becomes not only more convincing in the argument, but more instructive in the doctrine, because it expresses the correspondence of God's dispensations in their points of agreement, as well as His fore-knowledge¹."

The above statement presupposes a two-fold futurity of application; but may be taken, with some latitude, as including the cases, to be considered below, wherein the so-called primary application is to past or contemporaneous events. Such a 'double sense' is that described by Dr Phillips in the subjoined extract, and persistently opposed throughout his commentary on the Psalms.

"It may be proper to offer a few remarks on what is called the double sense of Scripture, on account of its having been adopted by so many and such able divines of the present as well as of past times. To enunciate their theory in a few words, they propose to give to the language of prophecy two meanings; a primary or lower one, which is extracted

¹ Davison, *On Prophecy*.

from the words of the passage taken literally, and with reference to the temporary circumstances under which it was written; and afterwards a secondary one, which they believe the same words will afford, and which teaches some event or some truth connected with the Christian dispensation.... But one grand objection to the theory in question is, that it admits all language to be so vague and ambiguous that persons engaged in interpreting it cannot possibly come to any settled conclusion. Another objection, equally strong, may be made to the practice in which the adherents to this theory indulge, *viz.* that of abandoning the primary sense in expressions which either from the loftiness of their language, or because they contain remarkable terms, seem exclusively to demand the secondary. Surely nothing can be more unsatisfactory than to apply, for instance, in the second Psalm, one verse to David or Solomon, and another to Christ. Such a system, which requires the student of prophecy to pass so abruptly from one personage to another, and back again, and this process to be gone through perhaps several times in the same composition, must be calculated to exercise a pernicious influence on his faith in the Word of God. Besides, the system obtains no authority from the New Testament: of all the quotations we find in it from the Old, there is not any which leads us to suppose that the sacred writer who made the quotation ever thought the passage he cited to have more meanings than one."

The objections to the *double sense* are, certainly, of great weight. Nor can the purely *historical* application be characterised as other than, in some cases, eminently unsatisfactory; for a Jew, with his depth of religious feeling, full of hopes for the future, and breathing an atmosphere of ceremonial symbolism, could scarcely fail to be transported far beyond the thought of this or that historic event by terms and expressions which if referring simply to that event would be the language of hyperbole. Hence a third theory, well deserving of consideration, *viz.* 'that the literal sense is to be regarded as a kind of vehicle' for the spiritual. This theory is advocated by Mr Mudge:—"As God is ever the same, and His

doings uniform, His conduct towards mankind must exactly be proportioned to His conduct towards the Jewish nation. Let us therefore place God in common over them both, and there will be on the one side the Jewish nation; and on the other mankind: on one side national and temporary saviours, kings, prophets, &c.: on the other all this universal and eternal: on one side the Law, and every branch of it adapted to a favoured nation; on the other the everlasting Gospel suited to all mankind. It is impossible therefore that God can say anything to David, under the quality of king of the chosen nation, which He does not speak at the same time to Jesus Christ as king of all the elect, and that in a truer and nobler sense. If He says to one, for instance, 'Thou art my Son,' and 'Sit on my right hand till I make thy enemies thy footstool,' He says it to the other too; to each of them in a sense adapted to the nature of their respective kingdoms. Nor is this latter a bare accommodation of words, but the first and highest meaning of them, and which only, absolutely speaking, can be the true sense of God, the other being this sense confined to a particular circumstance; in other words, *an absolute truth made history and matter of fact*. This is a principle which shews that, far from denying the Christian application, I consider the literal and historical sense only as a kind of VEHICLE for it."

This theory may be exemplified by the later use of the name of *David* for Him in whom the 'mercies of David' were still to be realised, or, as Rabbinic commentators join with others in affirming, for the MESSIAH. Thus the name of David is used as the 'vehicle' of a higher sense: and as with his name, so with the circumstances of his life, which might with no less propriety be thus applied, as the vehicles of spiritual conceptions. A mode of expression has, in general, a proportion to the definiteness of the thought expressed, and hence this question connects itself with that of the limits of prophetic consciousness, above considered. In default of such definiteness of conception as was granted only in the retrospect, the prophets depict CHRIST as an ideal David,

and in like manner idealize the circumstances of his temporal principedom, out of the sphere of history, into the Messianic future.

This relation between the *primary* sense of prophecy and the *secondary* may be illustrated by a reference to the analogy of language. As is the literal meaning of a word to its metaphorical usage, so may be the temporal imagery of a Psalm to its spiritual application; and in such cases, the discovery of the historical allusions is explanatory, not subversive, of the higher sense. It must be remembered that the Biblical writers, were, so to say, the framers of a spiritual language, which we still, in substance, retain, although some of its expressions may have lost no little of their *objectivity*. They represented by concrete types, what in the later stage of the *spiritual* language as of any other, is expressed abstractly. We speak *e.g.* of the 'service of sin,' using an abstract term, where they would have inclined to a special type (perhaps the bondage in Egypt or the Babylonian captivity) as representing the same idea. We speak, broadly, of 'a contest with evil,' where they would have drawn in detail the picture of a battle, perhaps a specific battle with some living foe. So too they would naturally choose out some special circumstance as a vehicle for the description of this or that attribute of the Messiah; or would address their words directly to a present king, not personally, but as an official type, from which the thought glanced upward to the half-grasped antitypical idea. In their spiritual metaphors the constituent parts are clearly distinguishable; while our later usages seem at first sight to defy analysis, but yet involve what could only be expressed *completely* by such detailed pictorial representations as above described¹.

The Messianic application of Psalms ii., xlv.

That portions of these Psalms are applicable to Christ is

¹ Their modes of thought might be described as *pleonastic*, in great matters, as in small [*supra*].

not disputed; but whether each application is primary or by way of accommodation is contested by modern writers. The Messianic interpretation was favoured in each case by antiquity¹, and continued to hold its own even with the mediæval Rabbis. The merely historical interpretation does not commend itself as exhaustive to the modern reader, and must have been still less compatible with the Messianic aspirations of the ancient Jew.

I. The second Psalm is thought to have been written after the building of the temple, from the occurrence of the expression, 'my *holy* hill of Sion;' and a correspondence of its phraseology with that of 2 Sam. vii. 14, has been thought to mark Solomon as the king described. If the allusion be to any one temporal monarch, it is perhaps to Solomon; but this application is very precarious, however preferable to any other of the same class. Many commentators, accordingly, agree in the conclusion, that it 'probably applies to no particular king, but is a glorification of the theocratic kingdom in general, with poetic reference to the universal dominion promised to it.' Mr Perowne, who assumes that 'the poem was *occasioned* by some national event,' admits that 'we must not confine its application to that event, nor must we even suppose that the singer himself did not feel that his words went beyond their first occasion. He begins to speak of an earthly king, and his wars with the nations of the earth, but his words are too great to have all their meaning exhausted in David, or Solomon, or Ahaz, or any Jewish monarch. Or ever he is aware, the local and the temporal are swallowed up in the universal and the eternal...The picture is half ideal, half actual. It concerns itself with the present, but with that only so far as it is typical of greater things to come.' This

¹ Rosenmüller thus concludes, on Ps. ii.: 'Quare tutissimum erit, vetustiorum Hebræorum sententiam sequi, canere Psalmum magnum illum regem, משיח, *Unctum kar' ἐξοχῆν* dictum, quem Hebræi sperabant, &c.,' and on

Ps. xlv.: 'Verum optime omnia in hoc Psalmo inter se congruent, si antiquiorum Hebræorum sequuti sententiam... magni illius regis, Messiae, virtutes et laudes... carmine hoc celebrari statuamus.'

is to grant, indirectly, the Messianic interpretation which Rosenmüller adopts explicitly. It seems unnecessary to suppose that the Psalmist, engaged in the same historical description, found his words outrun the occasion. May not the Messianic idea have *sought to express itself* through the medium of contemporary fact, and thus have produced a picture corresponding in outline to the present, but in richness of colouring to the more glorious future?

The forty-fifth Psalm may perhaps be similarly characterised. Mr Perowne, who describes it as 'evidently a Marriage-song composed for some day of royal espousals,' and thinks it 'more justly applicable to Solomon than to any other of the Jewish monarchs, so far as we are acquainted with their fortunes,' is not insensible to the difficulties which beset this application. 'Nor is it necessarily,' he continues, 'an objection to this view, that the monarch in the Psalm is spoken of as a warrior, whilst Solomon was peculiarly *a man of peace*. Something must be allowed to poetry. An extended dominion would naturally be associated with ideas of conquest. And, with the recollection of his father's exploits fresh in his mind, the Poet could not but regard warlike virtues as essential to the glory of the son. Besides Solomon himself does not seem to have been deficient in military spirit . . . But a greater than Solomon is here. Evident as it is that much of the language of the Poem is only properly applicable to the circumstances of the royal nuptials which occasioned it, it is no less evident that much of it greatly transcends them;' as may well be explained on the above-mentioned hypothesis, that the circumstances therein described were used as exponents of an antecedent spiritual idea.

Dr Phillips again adopts the Messianic sense, to the exclusion of any definite so-called *primary* allusion. 'It must be mentioned that the testimony of these [Rabbinic] writers, as well as that of the Christian Fathers, and a great part of modern commentators, is not only in favour of Christ being the subject of the Psalm, but farther, of His being *exclusively* the subject. They give no countenance whatever to a pri-

mary interpretation with respect to Solomon, or any other king of the Israelitish nation . . . In many of the grand leading characteristics such interpretation entirely fails; and hence I cannot but remark, that to introduce another person as the primary object of representation is fearfully weakening a prophecy of such magnitude and importance as the present; for it is throwing a vagueness over language which is in reality as strict and accurate as prophetic language can possibly be.'

But it may be questioned whether such primary allusion to particular events would of necessity be thus detrimental to the higher interpretation. The Hebrew Prophets oftentimes prophesied *by* typical actions, and may have prophesied, no less appropriately, *through* contemporary events. In any case, it is granted that their general conceptions of regal state &c. formed a vehicle for the Messianic idea; and that such conceptions were not *innate*, but had come to them in the course of natural experience (whether directly or by hearsay) from without. They were, then, ultimately referable to one or more of individual monarchs, and it is a question of not prime moment, whether the sacred writer, in his prophetic delineation of King MESSIAH, used some special type of royalty, or an abstraction gathered from successive types.

Is Psalm ii. 7 applied to the Resurrection?

The seventh verse of this Psalm is quoted by St Paul in Acts xiii. 33: 'as it is also written in the second psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.' The reference is commonly supposed to be to the Resurrection, but this view is not without its opponents, who consider that the application is to the 'raising up' of JESUS, not from the dead, but in the sense of Deut. xviii. 15, 18, 19, quoted by St Peter in Acts iii. 22, 33: 'For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the LORD your God *raise up* unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you:' and quoted by St Stephen in Acts vii. 37: 'This is that Moses, which said unto the

children of Israel, A prophet shall the LORD your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; Him shall ye hear.' The latter view is adopted by Mr Humphry, who remarks on Acts xiii. 32, that ἀνίστημι, in the New Testament, 'only refers to the resurrection when ἐκ νεκρῶν is added, as at ver. 34, or the context in some other way defines that to be the sense¹; as at ii. 24, *whom God hath raised up having loosed the pains of death.*' Dean Alford is of opinion that 'the meaning, *having raised him from the dead*, is absolutely required by the context: both because the word is repeated with ἐκ νεκρῶν (ver. 34), and because the Apostle's emphasis throughout the passage is on the Resurrection, as the final fulfilment of God's promises regarding JESUS . . . Meyer well remarks that this meaning would hardly in our passage have been thought of or defended, had it not been that the subjoined citation from Ps. ii. had been thought necessarily to apply to our Lord's mission upon earth.'

1. The applicability of Ps. ii. 7, to the Resurrection would probably have occurred to few, apart from the supposed exigencies of St Paul's citation now to be considered. If this application be a true one, then the passage in the Acts will have thrown a new light upon the Psalm; but seeing that it has been powerfully controverted, it becomes necessary to examine the Apostolic address, with a view to determine, so far as may be, whether the disputed words are there so applied or not.

St Paul, responding to the request of the rulers of the synagogue, stands up to propound his word of exhortation to the people. "The God of this people Israel chose our fathers. With an high arm brought he them out of Egypt. And when he had destroyed seven nations in the land of Chanaan he divided their land to them by lot. He gave them judges, and the prophet Samuel, and king Saul, and David—'a man after mine own heart, which shall fulfil all my will.' Of this man's seed hath God according to his promise *raised* unto Israel a Saviour Jesus.

¹ But see Joh. vi. 39, 40; xi. 23, 24.

But they that dwell at Jerusalem, and their rulers, because they knew him not, nor yet the voices of the prophets which are read every sabbath-day, they have fulfilled them in condemning him. And though they found no cause of death in him, yet desired they Pilate that he should be slain. And when they had fulfilled all that was written of him, they took him down from the tree, and laid him in a sepulchre. But God *raised him from the dead*" (Acts xiii. 15—28). St Paul, having thus laid the historical foundations of his argument, now shews the fulfilment of ancient prophecies in JESUS. He is addressing himself, be it remarked, to *unbelievers*, and so does not begin by assuming a general belief in Christ, and pass on without prelude to the doctrine of His resurrection; but first affirms that in Him the promise had its end; He was the seed of David, and that Prophet which should come into the world. God fulfilled this promise by the raising up of JESUS; 'as it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. *But* that he raised him *from the dead*, now no more to return to corruption, he said on this wise, I will give you the sure mercies of David. Wherefore he saith also in another psalm, Thou shalt not suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.' The occurrence of the adversative particle *δέ* indicates that the Apostle is about to introduce something in a manner contrasting with what had gone before; some detail (might we not anticipate?), some sequel to the general *raising*. This surmise is at once confirmed by the immediate occurrence of *ἐκ νεκρῶν*. Psalm ii. is applied to the *raising up* of the promised seed; 'but that he raised him *from the dead*, he said on this wise . . .' The same citation from Ps. ii. recurs in Heb. i. 5, in close connection with the bringing in of the Christ into this lower world. 'For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son. And again, when he bringeth in the first-begotten *into the world*¹, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him.' In Heb. v. 5, the

¹ εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην.

verse in question is made the source of the collateral deduction, that '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.'

2. The application of Ps. ii. 7 to the resurrection is advocated by Bishop Kidder¹:—

'To this purpose belong those words, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee*. That that Psalm did relate to the Messias we are able to prove from the Jewish Doctors, who do acknowledge it: And therefore when it was alledged to this purpose they cannot say that it was an allegation out of a place which did not belong to the Messias. The Apostle applies these words to this sense; he assures us that God hath fulfilled His promise in that He *hath raised up Jesus again*, as it is also written in the second Psalm, *Thou art my Son, &c.* It being confessed by the Jews themselves that the Psalm out of which these words are cited, is to be understood of the Messias; I need not go about to justify and make good that it belongs to the matter for which it is alledged. I shall only consider how fitly these words are applied to the resurrection of the Messias. For, *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten Thee*, seem rather to relate to the birth than to the resurrection of the Messias.

'For the clearing of this matter it is to be considered, that it is no unusual thing to call the *earth* our Mother, as well as our *Parent* from whom we are born; it is very common to call each of these by the same name: the earth, out of which we are *taken*, and to which we *return*, is our Mother, as well as our Parent from whom we spring....Philo the Jew tells us that the earth seems to be a Mother, and that thence it was among the Ancients it was called by a word² that at once signifies the *Earth* and *Mother*. ... After this manner do the writers of the Old Testament speak, with whom the grave which receives the dead is called the *womb*; and therefore a resurrection from hence may well be called a new birth....And we find among the Jewish writers that the Mother's womb

¹ *Demonstr. Messias*, I. 289.

² Δημητρίρ.

is called a *sepulchre*. He that is born, and dies, and is buried, does but pass from *one* Tomb to *another*. And he that rises out of the *womb* of the *earth*, or his *grave*, may be **said** to be *born anew*; and therefore it may well be said of our Saviour, when He rose from the dead, that He was then begotten. And when the Apostle applies those words, *this day have I begotten Thee*, to our Saviour's resurrection, he does but speak the language of the Hebrew writers; and the Jews, who own this Psalm to belong to the Messias, have no reason to complain that those words of it should be applied to His resurrection.' In further confirmation of this usage, the same writer instances *the sign of the prophet Jonas*¹, 'who was *three days and three nights* in the *whale's belly*, to which the heart of the earth, in which *Jesus* was, and from which he rose, answers.'

V. An expression in the forty-fifth Psalm, quoted in Heb. i. 8, has given rise to much controversy, and is confessedly difficult, not from any peculiarity in the words themselves or in their arrangement, but from the relations of the clause, in itself simple, to the context. If the original of the clause in question had occurred only as a fragment, and the remainder of the Psalm had not been preserved, there would have been no difficulty in accepting the words, '*Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever*,' as a literal rendering of the passage cited; but, seeing that the original context diminishes the naturalness of the rendering, it may be well first to state some of the conjectures to which the passage has given rise; and secondly to examine the context of the citation, with a view to determining whether the argument depends upon the disputed word, so exclusively as is now commonly supposed.

I. The Psalmist thus opens his address to the King, whose praises are his theme: 'Thou art fairer than the children of men: grace is poured into thy lips: therefore *God hath blessed thee for ever*;' and, further on, occur the

¹ See Note A., p. 165.

words, as commonly translated, '*Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever*': the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre. Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness: therefore *God*¹, *thy God, hath anointed thee* with the oil of gladness above thy fellows' (Ps. xlv. 6, 7). If the vocative rendering ['O God'], which is supported by the concurrent testimony of antiquity, be correct, there are still two modes of application to be distinguished. The clause may either be taken as a parenthetic address to God breaking in upon the address to the King, to whom the *second person* is appropriated in the context; or it may be an address to the King (*as God*) who is spoken of before and after as blessed and anointed *by God*. There is no difficulty, apart from the context, in this application of the title *God* to the King. The word *Elohim* stands in parallelism with *rulers*, in Ex. xxii. 28: 'Thou shalt not revile the gods, nor curse the ruler of thy people;' and in a passage quoted by Rashi (who adopts the explanation, '*Thy throne, O prince and judge*') it is said by the Lord to Moses: 'See, I have made thee a *god* to Pharaoh' (Ex. vii. 1). It occurs too in Ps. lxxxii. 1, and again in ver. 6, which is cited by our Lord in Joh. x. 33—36: 'The Jews answered him saying, For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God. Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, *Ye are gods*? If he called them *gods*, unto whom the word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken; say ye of Him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?' But although there may be no difficulty in the application of the word *God*, taken singly, the context seems repugnant to either of the vocative renderings.

Another rendering, frequently adopted, supposes an ellipsis, thus: '*Thy throne is God's*,' it is a throne Divine. This view of R. Aben Ezra is thought [Kimchi] to be supported by 1 Chron. xxix. 23: 'Then Solomon sat on the

¹ See Note B, p. 166.

throne of the LORD as King instead of David his father.' Others, with slight variation, render, 'Thy God-throne *is* for ever,' but there is some force in the objection of Dr Ewald¹, that elsewhere in the Psalm, the phrase, *for ever* is not used as a predicate, but as qualifying a statement upon which it follows, thus: 'God hath blessed thee *for ever*' (ver. 2); 'Therefore shall the people praise thee *for ever*.' It may be mentioned, in passing, that the rendering, '*Deus ipse est sedes tua*,' is given by Erasmus, and thus paraphrased by Grotius: 'Deus te semper in regno sustentabit.'

The meaning, 'Thy throne *shall* God *establish*,' is indeed well suited to the context; but by what construction is it to be obtained? Such a meaning might be arrived at by the (unsupported) conjecture, that the word for *thy throne*, elsewhere occurring only as a noun, is here to be taken as a verb: 'God *hath enthroned thee*.' This rendering of the disputed clause agrees very well with the antecedent and following statements; 'God *hath blessed thee*' (ver. 2); 'God, thy God, *hath anointed thee*.' Again, a parallelism is developed between the sixth verse and the seventh. 'God hath enthroned thee for ever.' *And wherefore?* (it may be asked in the words of Rashi). *Because 'the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre'; &c.* Thus the sixth verse corresponds, by introversion, to the seventh: 'Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness: therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.'

2. It remains to consider what rendering is required, or admitted, by the context of the citation in Heb. i. 8. 'But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, *O God*, is for ever and ever;' where the vocative rendering of 'the LXX. and all the old versions' is adopted. The rendering 'Thy throne is *God's*' would also harmonize with the context, although not agreeing literally with the rendering there adopted. This latter form of words would but assert indirectly what is im-

¹ 'Das ewig immer, ist auch in unsern liedern immer bloss begleitend, nie selbst prädicat, &c.' והגאון אמר כסאך יבין אלהים

plied by the direct use of the title *God*. But the conjectural rendering (of the Hebrew) which stands last in order, seems at first sight irreconcilable with the argument of Heb. i. 8, where the chief stress is usually laid upon the application of the Divine name to Christ. The application is, however, parenthetical, and does not seem to be absolutely essential to the argument, which ought therefore to remain unimpaired when the words, '*O God*,' are omitted¹ as in the subjoined transcript of Heb. i. 5—14.

'For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? (Ps. ii. 7). And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son? (2 Sam. vii. 14). And again, when he bringeth in the first-begotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him? (Ps. xcvi. 7). And of the angels he saith, who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire (Ps. civ. 4). But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne ...is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows (Ps. xlv. 7, 8). And, thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth: and the heavens are the works of thine hands: They shall perish; but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail. (Ps. cii. 26—28). But to which of the angels said he at any time, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool? (Ps. cx. 1). Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them that shall be heirs of salvation?'

The angels pass to and fro to do His bidding; the Son sits enthroned eternally. They are coordinated with the

¹ They are omitted only to test their essentiality to the argument. Their use amounts to an assertion of our Lord's divinity. But see, on the passage,

Pusey, *Daniel the Prophet*. Further remarks on the Psalm will be found in Note C, p. 166.

² Deut. xxxii. 43 (lxx).

agencies of perishable nature ; Thou art the unchanging LORD, and Maker of all. The words, '*Thy throne is for ever*,' sustain the argument, independently of the omitted parenthesis, and would seem, moreover, to appropriate the chief emphasis of the clause itself, when taken singly, and viewed without reference to the context. Lastly it may be asked, are not ver. 13, 14, a brief *résumé* of the argument, thus expounded ? To the Son—*Sit thou on my right hand*; to the angels—*Go forth and minister*.

It is doubtless intended in Heb. i. 8; to address Christ as God, but it may be questioned, as above, whether the words *ὁ Θεός*, are the *characteristic* of the citation. If not, they may still, according to the common usage, have been retained, as appropriate in themselves, and in harmony with the special purpose of the citation, yet without furnishing 'a key to the interpretation of the whole Psalm.' All that could be implied by the form of address *ὁ Θεός*, is implied unequivocally by ver. 10, 'Thou Lord, in the beginning, &c.'

The word *Lord* does not indeed occur in the particular verse here cited, but, except as regards perspicuity, it is immaterial whether the word be expressed or understood, the significant fact being, that the hundred and second Psalm is addressed throughout to JEHOVAH, as the Redeemer of Israel, and is, in Heb. i. 10, transferred to Christ.

NOTES ON CHAPTER VI.

A. When our Lord shadows forth His resurrection by a reference to the history of Jonah, is He attaching a new meaning to the familiar narrative ; or is He applying it in a way that would be recognized by His hearers, as in harmony with its original significance ? The latter view derives strong confirmation from the words of the Prophet's prayer. He substitutes, *belly of hell*, for *bowels of the fish* ; and describes his deliverance in words borrowed from the Psalms, as a return from death to life. 'Out of the belly of hell cried I, and

thou heardest my voice...I went down, to the bottoms of the mountains; the *earth* with her bars was about me for ever: yet hast thou brought up my life from corruption, O Lord my God' (Jon. ii. 2, 6).

B. If **משחך אלהים אלהיך**, were rendered: 'Thy God, *O God*, hath anointed Thee;' the abruptness of the preceding **אלהים**, taken vocatively as an address to the king, would be diminished. Pearson, *Creed, Art. II.*, quotes from Jerome *in loc.*: 'Duas personas, ejus qui unctus est Dei et qui unxit, intellige.' 'Quod sequitur, *Unxit te, Deus, Deus tuus*, primum nomen Dei vocativo casu intelligendum est, sequens nominativo; quod satis miror cur Aquila non, ut coeperat in primo versiculo, vocativo casu interpretatus sit, sed nominativo, bis nominans Deum, qui supradictum unxit Deum.'—See Field's *Origenis Hexaplorum quæ supersunt*.—But against this vocative rendering it may be urged, that the repetition, *God*, even *Thy God*, has its counterpart in other places where a like collocation occurs; *e. g.* 'Then will I go unto the altar of God, unto God my exceeding joy: yea upon the harp will I praise thee, *O God, my God*,' (Ps. xliii. 4); 'I am *God, even thy God*,' (l. 7); '*God, even our own God*, shall bless us,' (lxvii. 6). See li. 14; lxiii. 1; lxviii. 8; lxxii. 18.

C. Saadiah's rendering of Ps. xlv. 6 [p. 163, note] might be explained as follows. In ver. 8 the true construction is perhaps a *zeugma*, thus: 'myrrh, &c.—all thy garments: [myrrh, &c.] have gladdened thee;' where some verb governing 'garments,' and having 'myrrh, &c.' for its nominative, is to be anticipated from **שמחך**. So in ver. 7, 8 there may be a *zeugma*: 'God—thy throne...God, thy God, hath anointed thee;' where a verb (*e. g. hath established*) applicable to 'throne,' is to be anticipated from **משחך**. But this would be further complicated by the explanatory parenthesis: 'Thou hast loved righteousness, &c. &c.' For the verb-rendering of **כסאך**, all that is to be said is, that it agrees with the context of the Psalm, and that **כסא**, elsewhere a noun, is of the same form as the 3rd pers. past piel. This is far from convincing to the writer, and seems only sufficiently plausible to be recorded; regard being had to the acknowledged difficulty of the passage. The possessive rendering is ill-supported. The vocative rendering, adopted in Heb. i. 8, is, grammatically, as Dr Pusey contends, no doubt the simplest.

P.S. Scaynus Salodiensis writes: 'etiam sic Filius super Angelos insinuatur, ut *ille cujus Thronus sit Deus*.'

CHAPTER VII.

He gave gifts unto men.

Ps. lxviii. 18; Eph. iv. 8.

THE difficulties of this citation are fully recognized by commentators, and by none more fully than by Bishop Elliott; who, comparing Eph. iv. 8, with the LXX. rendering of the clauses corresponding to it in Ps. lxviii. remarks, that 'the difference in St Paul's citation is palpable, and, we are bound in candour to say, does not appear diminished by any of the proposed reconciliations.'

The citation is thus introduced:—'There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling . . . But unto every one of us is given grace, according to the measure of the gift of Christ. Wherefore he saith, *When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men*¹. (Now that he ascended², what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things.) And *he gave* some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of

¹ διὸ λέγει, 'Ἀναβὰς εἰς ὕψος ἤχμα- τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.
λώτευσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν, καὶ ἔδωκεν δῶματα ² τὸ δὲ ἀνέβη. See note A, p. 175.

Christ: Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ' (Eph. iv. 4—12).

The Apostle here substitutes ἔδωκεν for the LXX. ἔλαβες, which corresponds more directly to the original expression. This variation it is usual to account for as *explanatory*, and intended to set forth explicitly the implied meaning of the Hebrew. In the Authorized Version, which presents the received arrangement of the clauses, the verse runs as follows: 'Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive, *thou hast received gifts for men*; yea, for the rebellious also, that the LORD God might dwell among them;' and it is admitted that the receiving of gifts *for* men, and the giving of gifts *to* men, are so intimately connected, that the latter expression might naturally replace the former. The real difficulty arises in the reconciliation of either of the foregoing with the original Hebrew. It is usual to cite passages in which the word *to take* imports a taking with *the intention of giving* to another; thus, in Gen. xviii. 5: 'I will *fetch* a morsel of bread, and comfort ye your hearts;' and in Ex. xxvii. 20: 'And thou shalt command the children of Israel, that they *bring thee*' pure oil-olive beaten for the light, to cause the lamp to burn always.' But such illustrations are insufficient, not to say illusory; shewing only that the word may mean generally *to take, fetch, obtain*, &c. (for one's own use or for another's, *as the context may require*) but not establishing its practical equivalence to δοῦναι in such a context as that of Ps. lxviii. where the preposition following is *in*, not, *to* or *for*. Moreover, when the usual explanation of these particular words is accepted, there remains a general inconsecutiveness, best evinced by the many attempts which have been made to force the clauses of the verse into harmonious sequence. It seems best therefore to reconsider the whole verse *ab initio*,

ויקחו אליך ¹

and in particular to subject the clause above considered to a fresh analysis.

The preposition *in* does not follow naturally upon the word, *to take*, in the sense required by the Authorized Version : 'Thou hast received gifts for men.' To receive *among*¹ (i. e. *from*) would be a more natural rendering, and some accordingly have taken this to be the true construction; but an abruptness would still attach itself to the concluding words, and the whole verse would present itself as ill-balanced and unsymmetrical. If the extreme clauses of the verse be read in close connection, and the last mentioned explanation of the *reception* of gifts *in* men be adopted, the whole verse will run as follows: '*Thou hast gone up on high—Thou hast led captives captive; Thou hast received gifts from men; yea from the rebellious also—to dwell, O LORD God!*' But the rendering is still abrupt and unsymmetrical; and since much of the difficulty felt in adopting it arises from its lack of symmetry, it may be asked whether a rearrangement of the clause, be not possible. Is it necessary to join the words, *Thou hast received gifts*, with the following expression, *among men*? would not the latter read better in connection with the word *to dwell* (which now stands elliptically), as serving in that connection to define the locality wherein the LORD God is about to dwell?

The expression 'to *dwell* among men,' is aptly illustrated by Ps. lxxviii. 60, where the same verb is used: 'So he forsook the tabernacle of Shiloh the tent which *he had placed* among men'; and again, no less explicitly, by Rev. xxi. 3: 'And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the

¹ 'Thou art gone up into Thy sanctuary on high; Thou hast led Thy captivity captive; Thou hast received gifts among men, yea even the refractory, that the LORD God may be lodged.' *Mudge.*

² 'Hunc verum, parum feliciter a

superioris ætatis interpretibus tractatum, ...primus recte explicavit Schnurrerus: *Conscendisti altum, captivos ducens victos hostes, accipiens munera inter homines, rebelles etiam, ut habites hic JAH, Deus.* (Rosenm.)

אחל שכן באדם

tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God.' The same thought is expressed¹ in Ex. xxv. 8: 'And let them make me a sanctuary; that I may dwell among them;' and again, in Ex. xxix. 45, 46: 'I will dwell among the children of Israel, and will be their God.' While in other passages, this 'dwelling' is predicated of the same locality as in Ps. lxviii. 18, viz. of 'Zion, my holy mountain' (Joel iii. 17, 21; Zech. viii. 3; Ps. lxxiv. 2). Moreover, the rendering, '*to dwell among men*,' which is thus abundantly illustrated, falls in with a more symmetrical arrangement of the verse before us:

Thou hast gone up on high—
Hast led captives captive,
Hast received gifts—
With men², yea backsliders,
O LORD God, to dwell³.

Where the primary allusion is to the ascent of the Ark from the house of Obed-Edom to 'the tabernacle that David had pitched for it' (2 Sam. vi. 17) on Mount Zion; while the typical allusion is to the celestial heights, in accordance with the analogy of Ps. lxxviii. 67—69: 'Moreover He refused the tabernacle of Joseph, and chose not the tribe of Ephraim: But chose the tribe of Judah, the Mount Zion which He loved. And he built his sanctuary like high palaces⁴, like the earth which he hath established for ever;' where for 'high palaces,' should be read (as one word) *high-places*, in the sense of *heavens*, as the parallelism suggests. This is the interpretation of Rashi, who remarks quaintly, that, as it is written: 'Mine *hand* also hath laid the foundation of the earth, and my *right hand* hath spanned the heavens' (Is. xlviii.

¹ Compare Numb. v. 3; xxxv. 34; *colon* in our Prayer-Book Psalms. See 1 Kings vi. 13; Is. xxxiii. 5; Ezek. ver. 9, 14, 21,² 22, 29. xliii. 9; Zech. ii. 11.

² קָאֲדָם. In the books אֶתְּ, *Eth-*
nach is often a slight stop, like the

³ Or: 'that JAH God may dwell.'

⁴ כִּמְוֹ רִמִּים. Cp. לְמַרוֹם, *supra*, Ps. lxviii. 18.