

**CHRISTOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT**  
**and a Commentary on the Messianic Predictions**

BY

**E.W. HENGSTENBERG**

Preface by Merril F. Unger, Th.D., Ph.D.

COMPLETE IN FOUR VOLUMES

VOL. IV

KREGEL PUBLICATIONS

GRAND RAPIDS 6, MICHIGAN

1956

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 55-9467

This reprint edition is an exact reproduction of the latest British Edition printed in 1872-79. Translated from the German by Theod. Meyer and James Martin

PHOTOLITOPRINTED BY CUSTING--MALLOY, INC.

ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 1956

**MESSIANIC PREDICTIONS IN THE PROPHETS**

**THE PROPHET ZECHARIAH**

***CHAPTER 11***

Hitherto the prophet has chiefly confined himself to the bright side of the picture in his announcement of the future which awaits the covenant nation (compare, especially, chap. 5); but another scene suddenly presents itself, and it is only when he has communicated this to his hearers and readers that his description of the future, which has thus far, though true, been only one-sided, is fully completed, and sufficient precaution taken to prevent the abuse which a carnal mind might make of this partial representation.<sup>1</sup>

This section is divided into three parts. The first three verses, which serve as a prelude, describe the ruin of the entire land by foes from without. A deeper insight into the cause of this is given by the prophet in an account of a twofold symbolical process which took place within his mind. In the first (vers. 4-14), the prophet takes the place of the angel of the Lord, and depicts his future proceedings. Israel, which is doomed to be destroyed by the judgments of God, appears as a flock destined for the slaughter. The prophet makes an effort to save it. He takes upon himself the office of shepherd, and tries to rescue it from

the wicked shepherds who would lead it to destruction. But the obstinacy of both shepherds and flock compels him to give up his office, and leave the flock to that utter misery which he alone has hitherto been the means of averting. He now asks for his wages; and they give him the contemptible sum of thirty pieces of silver. In this manner the last manifestation of mercy on the part of God towards his people through the Messiah, and their subsequent rejection, are typified. By the command of the Lord the prophet then exhibits in a second symbolical action the wicked shepherds themselves, who will worry and destroy the flock after the good shepherd has been rejected by it. Hofmann (*Weissagung und Erfüllung*, i. p. 316) regards vers. 1-3 as forming the conclusion of the foregoing prophecy, whilst Bleek supposes these verses to “contain a small and separate prophecy.” But both are wrong, as is evident from the fact that the *shepherds* mentioned in ver. 3 are spoken of again in ver. 8, and that הָעֹרֵר, “feed,” occurs in ver. 4, where it also refers to the same shepherds. The good shepherd, the angel of the Lord, is to make another attempt to rescue the people whom the evil shepherds, the shepherds who are also *lions*, have led to destruction. Again, in vers. 15-17, the end of the section returns to the subject of its commencement. We see there the *lion-shepherds*, on whom judgment is represented (in ver. 3) as having already fallen, in full action again, after the good shepherd has been removed out of the way. Moreover, both opinions, Hofmann’s as well as Bleek’s, may be shown to rest upon a mistaken interpretation of vers. 1-3.

Ver. 1. “*Open thy gates, O Lebanon, and let fire devour thy cedars.*”

The style is quite dramatic. The prophet, instead of *announcing* to Lebanon its future destruction, commands it, as the servant of God, to open its gates. The meaning therefore is, “Thou, Lebanon, wilt be stormed and devastated by the foe.” The question is, whether this verse and those which follow are to be interpreted literally or allegorically?<sup>2</sup> As a general reply, we may say, there can be no doubt that Lebanon is used here in a figurative sense. Bleek’s opinion, that we have here the description of “a devastation of nature itself, and that by the hands of violent men,” is proved to be incorrect by ver. 2, where the *cedars* of Lebanon are expressly called “*the mighty*” and also by the earlier passage, Jer. 25:34-38, where the shepherds and the mighty of the flock are the princes and magnates of the nation. The rest, therefore, must also be interpreted figuratively. But what are we to understand by Lebanon? We are not left to *conjecture* here, to which Hofmann has recourse, but can give an answer based upon a surer foundation. In the symbolical language of Scripture, and particularly in Zechariah (chap. 4:7), *mountains* denote *kingdoms*. Now, Lebanon, as being the nearest range which met the eyes of the sacred writers, and the border mountains between Palestine and the heathen world, might be taken as a symbol of the imperial power in the hands of the Gentiles. But it might also be regarded as a symbol of that kingdom of which it originally formed a part, namely, the kingdom of Israel. We find the symbol employed in the Scriptures to represent both of these. Lebanon and anti-Lebanon are employed as symbols of the imperial power in the Song of Sol. 4:8 (see the remarks on this passage) and Isa. 37:24, 14:8. In Isa. 10:34 and Hab. 2:17, Lebanon is used to denote the Assyrian empire. It occurs in connection with the mountains of Gilead, as a symbol of the kingdom of Judah, in Jer. 22:6, 7: “Thus saith the Lord concerning the house of the king of Judah, Thou art Gilead unto me: surely I will turn thee into a wilderness, into cities which are not inhabited; and I sanctify over thee destroyers with their weapons, and they exterminate thy choice cedars, and cause them to fall together over the fire.” In Ezek. 17:3, the family of David is represented as a lofty cedar upon Lebanon. In this case, therefore, Lebanon must be a symbol of the kingdom of

Israel, which only existed in that of Judah in the time of the prophet. In the verse before us the symbol is used in the latter sense.—Hofmann’s opinion, that this section contains the announcement of a *universal* judgment, is proved to be incorrect by the parallel passages in the two nearest prophets, Ezekiel and Jeremiah, by the fact that all the names employed as symbols are names of places in the Holy Land (Lebanon, Bashan, the pride of Jordan); by chap. 10:10, “I will bring them to the land of Gilead and Lebanon, and they will not have room,” where the land of Lebanon is the land of Israel (the threat in the verse before us is evidently intended as a contrast to the promise in the passage just quoted, in fact the same contrast may be traced throughout between chap. 11 and chap. 9, 10); and, lastly, by the connection which has been shown to exist between vers. 1-3, and ver. 4 sqq.—If Lebanon, then, is the kingdom of Judah, not as contrasted with the ten tribes, but including them (chap. 10), the cedars of Lebanon can only represent the chief men of the kingdom. We are led to this conclusion by the express declaration in ver. 2. Stately trees are *generally* the symbols of great men. In Ezek. 31:3 sqq., Asshur is introduced as a cedar in Lebanon (compare Isa. 10:18, 19, 14:8, and my commentary on Rev. 7:1).

Ver. 2. *“Howl, cypress; for the cedar is fallen; the glorious ones being made desolate: howl, ye oaks of Bashan; for the wood is felled, the defenced one.”*

The *cypresses*, it is true, are inferior to the cedars; but on account of the hardness and strength of their wood, and its suitable qualities for the building of palaces and ships, they are placed in the second rank; and there are other passages (e.g. Isa. 14:8, 37:24, and Ezek. 31:8), in which the two are connected together. The oak-forests of Bashan were also celebrated, the oak being generally classed among the noblest trees. Compare Isa. 2:14, where the oaks of Bashan are classed with the cedars of Lebanon, as they are in this passage. Both in substance and in the expressions employed, there is a resemblance to the passage before us in such passages as Isa. 23:14, “Howl, ye ships of Tarshish, for your fortress is destroyed;” and Jer. 49:3, “Howl Heshbon; for Ai is in ruins.” It is a general custom with the prophets, when the strong has fallen, to call upon the weaker to tremble and mourn, and in this manner to give expression to the thought that for the latter there is no longer any hope of deliverance (compare the remarks on chap. 9:5).—The relative אשר is equivalent here to “because,” or “inasmuch as,” and is introductory to the *explanation*. That עירידיא are not glorious *trees*, but the nobles of the nation, is evident from the earlier passage on which this is founded (Jer. 14:3), “their nobles (glorious ones) have sent their little ones to the water,”<sup>3</sup> and 25:34-38, where the leading men are called the glorious ones of the flock. ירך is also applied to wood which has been felled, in Isa. 32:19. His proud and lofty trees come down, as it were, from the throne into the dust. The words of Isaiah are: “It hails, when the wood comes down.” The *world* is represented there as visited by the judgments of God; and Michaelis interprets the words as referring to the time “when the kingdom of Antichrist will be destroyed.” In the passage before us, on the other hand, the judgment falls upon the faithless covenant nation. It is the more natural to conclude that there is some connection between this passage and the one in Isaiah, since there is a link of connection in chap 10:11, “And the pride of Asshur is thrown down, and the sceptre of Egypt departs,” to which the words before us evidently refer. The leaf is turned. The judgment which was formerly inflicted upon the world for the good of the Israelites—now falls upon the faithless covenant nation itself.—“*The wood, the strong one*” is equivalent to “the wood notwithstanding its strength.” In the symbolical language of Scripture, the *wood* denotes the whole nation, as the lofty trees represent its leaders. Compare Isa. 9:17, 10:19, 34, 23:19, 37:24, 44:23, “Break forth, ye mountains, into

singing, O forest, and every tree therein,” where the mountains are the kingdoms, the wood the nation, and the trees men. The passage upon which this is more immediately founded is Ezek. 20:46 sqq. The nation of Judah is described there as “the forest of the south.” The forest of the south, says *Hitzig*, is devoured by the fire of Jehovah (vers. 46-50), *i.e.* his sword will exterminate *the inhabitants of the land of Judah* (chap. 21:1-5); the men are trees, therefore the nation is a forest.” The explanation is given in ver. 2, “Prophecy against the land of Israel.” The marginal reading רִיבֹב, which is only used of the vintage, in the place of רִבֹב, which is very commonly employed in the sense of “firm, inapproachable” (in Ezek. 21:26, Jerusalem is called הַרִיבֹב), probably arose from the passage being compared with Jer. 6:9, for which there is no warrant.

Ver. 3. “*The voice of the howling of the shepherds; for their ornament is spoiled: the voice of the roaring of the lions; for the pride of Jordan is spoiled.*”

The prophet is describing what took place in a vision, and this will explain the absence of the verb, which could not be accounted for merely on the supposition of an *ellipsis*. The passage on which this is based is Jer. 35:34 sqq. Jeremiah is speaking there of the Chaldean judgment, a repetition of which is announced by Zechariah here; hence the connection between the two passages is a purely internal one. In Jeremiah, the judgment falls upon Judah and the surrounding heathen world. But Judah is the central point. Ver. 36 agrees almost word for word with the first half of the verse before us, “The voice of the crying of the shepherds and the howling of the glorious one of the flock: for the Lord lays waste their pasture.” Ver. 38 corresponds to the second clause: “They leave, as a lion, their camp; for their land will be for a desolation.”<sup>4</sup> The only thing which is peculiar to Zechariah is the fact that the lions are represented as being frightened out of the *pride of the Jordan*, the noble wood, which covers its banks, and prevents you from seeing the water till you have passed it, and which still affords shelter to innumerable wild beasts, though there are no longer any lions among them (Burckhardt, ii. p. 593; Rosenmüller, *Alterthumskunde*, ii. 1. p. 196 sqq.). Even this has been taken from other passages of Jeremiah.<sup>5</sup> —The connection in which the allusion to the *shepherds* at the end of the introduction stands to the prophecy generally (“feed,” ver. 4; “ye shepherds,” ver. 5, etc.) has been correctly pointed out by Ewald: “The prophecy has thus by a sudden leap approached the shepherds, of whom it treats in a much more serious tone after this lively prelude.” As the shepherds referred to afterwards (in vers. 4, 5, 8, 15) are the rulers of the nation, it must also be to them that reference is here made, in harmony with the original passage in Jeremiah. What we are to understand by the *ornament* of the shepherds may be gathered from Jeremiah, where we find “their pasture” instead. According to this, we are not to restrict it to the pasture, as Maurer does, or to understand it as meaning the things of which they are proud and make a boast, as *Hitzig* does; but must refer it simply to the good of the land, flowing with milk and honey, which was at their disposal, their proud possession.—*Lions* are frequently employed as symbols of strong and despotic men (compare Job 4:10 and Ps. 34:11), especially of tyrannical rulers (see the remarks on Rev. 13:2 and Song of Sol. 4:8). But the most deserving of attention is Ezek. 19, where the tyrannical princes of Judah are called לִיֹּנִים (lions). Schmieder has justly observed,—“A very sharp reproof is implied in the fact that the shepherds of the nation are compared to lions, a shepherd and lion in one being something very similar to a wolf in sheep’s clothing. This prepares the way for what follows, where the pious (?) sheep are mentioned whom the shepherds will not spare.” The shepherds are also lions; this is the clue to the catastrophe depicted in vers. 1-3. Where the leaders are so degenerate, the whole life of the nation must have been deeply corrupted. The *pride of the Jordan* corresponds to the

*pride of Jacob* in Ps. 47:5, Amos 6:8, Nah. 2:3, and means the glorious possession and inheritance bestowed upon him. The issue of the whole is, that the threat of Ezekiel in chap. 33:28, "I lay the land most desolate, and the pomp of her strength shall cease, the mountains of Israel shall be desolate that none shall pass through," receives a new fulfilment.

Ver. 4. The prophet, having given a pictorial description in vers. 1-3 of the judgment to be inflicted upon the covenant nation, proceeds now to the manner in which this result would be brought about. The first three verses bear much the same relation to the rest of the chapter as Isa. 52:13-15 to chap. 53.—*Thus saith the Lord my God, feed the flock of the slaughter.*<sup>6</sup> The question arises here, to whom are these words addressed? Who is it who is here commissioned to feed the flock? (1.) Very many of the earlier expositors assumed that these words were addressed, without the prophet's intervention, to the angel of the Lord, who was essentially one with God himself, in other words, *to the Messiah*, in whom, according to the teaching of the Old Testament, this angel was eventually to appear. The fact that there is something forced in the assumption that another person is introduced in this sudden manner, and without further notice, is not sufficient to prove that the opinion is incorrect. The abrupt introduction of new persons, whose presence is merely indicated by their speeches and actions, is a thing of frequent occurrence in the prophecies, and was a necessary result of the dramatic character of the prophetic writings. And there is the less ground for objecting to the sudden appearance of the angel of the Lord in the present instance, from the fact that throughout the whole of the first part he is constantly represented as one of the persons employed. But a comparison of ver. 15 sqq. is amply sufficient to overthrow this exposition. The person who is referred to in these verses must be the same as the subject of ver. 4 sqq. This is evident from the expression, "Take unto thee *again* the instruments of the evil shepherd." The word עִוֵּה, *again*, is a proof that the person who takes the instruments of the evil shepherd in this case is the very same as the person who took the instruments of the wicked shepherd in ver. 7 sqq. But the contents of ver. 15 sqq. do not apply in any way to the angel of the Lord or the Messiah, as the supporters of this view are obliged to confess. It cannot therefore be to him that reference is made in the fourth and following verses.

(2.) Others (including Hitzig, Ewald, Hofmann, and Bleek) suppose that *the prophet* is addressed, not as the representative of another, but in his private capacity. But ver. 15 sqq. demonstrates the incorrectness of this view quite as much as that of the former. If the prophet is introduced there, not in his private capacity, but as the representative of another, this must also be assumed to be the case here.<sup>7</sup> Moreover the very first words go beyond the ordinary vocation of a prophet. No prophet was ever appointed to be the shepherd over the whole covenant nation. How could a prophet be the chief shepherd of the whole flock (ver. 7), by whom all the other shepherds or rulers of the nation were deposed (ver. 8), who kept the nation in safety from all its outward foes,<sup>8</sup> who preserved internal peace, and at whose all-powerful word both peace and safety came to an end? What sense is there in the account of the thirty pieces of silver, if the prophet himself is intended? We may also appeal to the parallel passages, which are of such peculiar importance in the case of Zechariah. When the prophets pointed the people to the Good Shepherd of the future, they either spoke of the Lord himself, who would act as a shepherd to the nation which the wicked shepherds had ruined (compare Isa. 40:11, "He will feed his flock like a shepherd; he will gather the lambs in his arm, and carry them in his bosom, and gently lead those that give suck"), or of the Messiah (*e.g.* Ezek. 34:23, "And I will set up one Shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, my servant David, he

shall feed them and he shall be their shepherd,” chap. 37:24, compare Jer. 3:15, 23:4, 5). The manner in which these two passages are to be made to harmonize, namely, by assuming that the Lord would discharge the duties of a shepherd through the Messiah, is especially evident from Ezek. 34, where the allusion to Christ as the Good Shepherd of the future is preceded by the declaration that *the Lord himself* will visit his flock and take it under his care (vers. 11, 12). There must be an intimate connection, therefore, between the Lord and the second David. But how could we conceive it possible that the very same position which is occupied everywhere else by the Lord and his anointed should be here assigned to the prophet? Lastly, the idea that the passage refers to the prophet, generally goes hand in hand with the assumption that the narrative relates to some past event, and that the prophet is describing an attempt which had been made by him to rescue the unhappy kingdom of the ten tribes from destruction. But this opinion is thoroughly inadmissible. It is evident from vers. 1-3, ver. 7, and the allusion made to the brotherhood of Judah and Israel in ver. 14, that the section does not relate to the *Ephraimites*. Moreover, no analogy can be adduced in support of the reference to anything *pasty* which is also overthrown by the correspondence between the threat of punishment in the fifth chapter and the emblematical portion of the present prophecy.

(3.) The only remaining view is, that ver. 4 commences an account of a symbolical transaction, in which the prophet represents another person, and typifies his conduct and circumstances. That this is commonly the case with the symbolical actions of the prophets, may be seen from every one of them. In this manner Isaiah, for example, in chap. 20 sets forth the coming fate of the Egyptians and Ethiopians. And thus do Jeremiah in chap. 20 and Ezekiel in chap. 4 depict the future condition of the covenant nation. In the symbolical procedure related in the first three chapters of Hosea, the prophet represents the Lord, and his actions show forth the treatment which the covenant nation would receive from the hands of the Lord. In determining who is the person represented by the prophet on this occasion, the choice can only be between the Lord and his angel or revealer. It cannot be argued in defence of the latter, that on several occasions the Lord is distinguished from the subject of the address, as in vers. 4, 13. Such a distinction forms an essential part of a symbolical transaction, as we may easily see if we compare Hosea; it belongs to the drapery, not to the substance. The person represented tells his representative what he is to do, in order that the representation itself may correspond to the reality. There is, however, just as little force in the argument which may be adduced on the other side, that in ver. 13 Jehovah calls the miserable wages paid to the shepherd the goodly price at which he, the Lord, was priced. Just as in other prophecies the angel of the Lord, who is connected with him by unity of nature, is sometimes distinguished from him as the messenger from the sender, and at other times participates in both his name and actions, so is it also with Zechariah. The most striking example is chap. 2:8, 9, “Thus saith *Jehovah Zebaoth*, after the glory<sup>9</sup> hath he sent me unto the heathen which spoil you; for he that toucheth you toucheth the apple of *his* eye. For behold I will shake my hand upon them, and they shall be a spoil to the servants, and ye shall know that *Jehovah Zebaoth* hath sent me.” The speaker is here distinguished from *Jehovah Zebaoth* who had sent him; nevertheless, the prophet calls him *Jehovah Zebaoth*, and he attributes to himself a divine work, namely, the destruction of the enemies of the covenant nation (see the remarks on the passage itself).

The decision of this question is rather dependent upon the result to be obtained from the general contents of Zechariah’s prophecies, with reference to the relation in which the Lord and his angel stood to the covenant nation. Now we very soon discover that all the

intercourse between the Lord and his people was carried on through the medium of his revealer, who was furnished with all the fulness of his power; that all the blessings imparted to the nation proceeded from him,—that he in fact was the real protector and covenant God of the Israelites. It was he who was in the midst of the myrtle-bush, the symbol of the covenant nation, attended by a company of angels (chap. 1:8). He promises to dwell in the midst of the people (chap. 2:14), and it is he who rebuts the charge brought by Satan against the covenant nation in the person of its representative Joshua, and on his own authority bestows upon him the forgiveness of sins (chap. 3:1 sqq.). To whom, then, but to him, the constant shepherd of the nation, could the last and greatest attempt to prove his fidelity as a shepherd, which is depicted in this section, be possibly attributed? This result, which is thus independently obtained, is confirmed by the fact that in the history of the angel of the Lord, who appeared in the Messiah, we meet with the thirty pieces of silver again, and that in the New Testament he is represented as the subject of this prophecy, and actually hints at the fact himself (John 21:15-17).— We need scarcely stop to inquire whether the symbolical transaction here described was an inward or an outward one. The former is very obvious, as Maimonides has shown (*Mor. Neb.* ii. 46, *Buxt.* p. 324). The tending of the sheep, the destruction of the three shepherds, the payment of the thirty pieces of silver as wages,—it is impossible that any of these should have taken place outwardly, especially as the literal meaning is sometimes seen behind the symbol, for example in ver. 11, where the miserable sheep are spoken of, who waited upon the great Shepherd, and knew that it was the word of the Lord; also in ver. 12, where the prophet treats with the flock itself respecting his wages, both of which would be inexplicable if the prophet had been tending a real flock of sheep. Moreover, the supposition that the symbolical action was a purely inward one, is favoured by the analogy of the visions in the first part, which differ from the present only so far that in the latter the prophet appears upon the scene as one of the leading actors, whereas in the former he seldom takes any part, except when he receives information as to the meaning of the symbolical representations (compare, however, chap. 3:5). The department of visions is generally the most predominant in such prophets as appeared subsequent to the intercourse of the nation with the Chaldeans, especially Ezekiel and Daniel, and in the case of both of these there is everything to indicate the internal character of the events narrated.

So far as the meaning of this symbolical action is concerned, we must reject at the outset every interpretation in which, whilst the authenticity of the second part is admitted, reference is supposed to be made to some event that occurred before the captivity. They are most of them the inventions of Jews who were actuated by hostility to Christians, and are all of them so absurd as to be utterly undeserving of any minute investigation.<sup>10</sup> The argument adduced in support of them, namely, the use of the preterites, loses all its force when once it is shown that the prophet is here describing a symbolical action. For this had already taken place whilst the thing typified was still future. If, then, it is clearly established that reference is made to the time of the second temple, the choice must be between two interpretations. According to one of these, the whole of the dealings of God with the covenant nation under the second temple are alluded to here; according to the other, the symbolical representation sets forth one particular effort which was to be made in the time of the second temple, to save the nation from destruction, namely, the pastoral work of Christ, and the rejection of the people which followed the rejection of the Messiah. The first view is held by Abarbanel, whose words we must quote if only for the purpose of showing that the power of truth was superior to doctrinal prejudices in his case, much more than in that of other Jewish expositors, and allowed him to grasp at least

the fundamental idea of the prophecy.<sup>11</sup> The same opinion is also adopted by Calvin. According to his interpretation, the Lord discharged the duties of a shepherd by means of all his faithful servants in the time of the second temple, but most perfectly of all by Christ.<sup>12</sup> An elaborate defence of this view is to be found in Abicht, p. 1092 sqq.<sup>13</sup> On the other hand, the opinion that the prophecy relates exclusively to the office of shepherd to be filled by Christ, has predominated to such an extent that nothing would be gained by mentioning the names of its supporters. If we examine the arguments adduced in support of the first opinion, it will be obvious at once that the reason assigned by Abicht has no force whatever. For how does it follow, from the fact that the prophecy contained in chap. 9 and 10 embraces the whole period of the second temple, from the favours conferred upon the Jews in connection with Alexander's triumphs to the coming of Christ, that the prophecy before us must be equally comprehensive? It is restricted rather to the *principal object* of the foregoing prediction, namely, the coming of Christ (see chap. 9:9, 10), which it presents in another point of view, in order that its meaning may be fully understood and not be so perverted by a one-sided and worldly interpretation as to become pernicious instead of salutary. Reference might also be made to Jer. 23:4, where the Lord promises to give to the people *good* shepherds in the place of the bad ones it had before, and to Ezek. 34, where the announcement that the Lord will undertake the office of shepherd relates to the entire period extending from the return from Babylon to the coming of Christ. But even in these prophecies, which Zechariah evidently had in his mind, peculiar prominence is given to the mission of the Messiah, as the highest and most perfect manifestation of the faithfulness of the Lord as the shepherd of his people. In Ezek. 34:23, the Lord says, "I will set up one Shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and shall be their shepherd. And I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David, a prince among them." And in Jer. 23:5 he says, "I will raise unto David a righteous branch, who will be a king, and will govern well, and execute judgment and justice in the earth." Now, why should not Zechariah, with these prophecies before him, have given prominence to the highest and last manifestation of the fidelity of the Lord as a shepherd, and to that alone, especially when the subordinate manifestations of this fidelity, which were depicted by Jeremiah and Ezekiel at the same time, had already taken place to a great extent in the return of the people from captivity, and the raising up of those two excellent rulers, Zerubbabel and Joshua, whose praises Zechariah had already sounded in the first part of his book? It is not possible, therefore, to adduce even a plausible argument in favour of this view; on the other hand, a *decisive* argument may be adduced against it. According to this explanation, the office of shepherd undertaken by the Lord, and consequently the destruction of the three shepherds described in ver. 8, must have been a continuous act, which lasted from the return from captivity till the Roman catastrophe, that is, for several centuries. But it is stated in ver. 8, "I cut off the three shepherds in one month." We have here a distinct explanation on the part of the prophets, that his symbolical representation depicts one single manifestation of the faithfulness of the Lord as a shepherd, which is to be completed in a comparatively brief period of time. To this we may add, that the term applied to the covenant nation, "the flock of the slaughter," is very appropriate to the condition of the people at the time when Christ came, but not during the whole period of the second temple, and least of all to the prophet's own days. It is true that Calvin refers it to the last of these.<sup>14</sup> But if we examine the description given in ver. 5, we shall quickly perceive that the state of the people depicted there is very different from their poor, no doubt, but yet peaceable condition on their return from captivity.— Lastly, the breaking of the staff called mercy, denoting the withdrawal of the protection hitherto afforded by the Lord to his people against the heathen nations, and the breaking of the staff "of the bound ones," which



represented the dissolution of the unity existing in the nation itself, are both of them apparently single acts with lasting consequences (compare ver. 11, “and it was broken in that day”). The Lord does not give up his nation to passing judgments, as in the previous history, to receive it back again when it has repented; but a peremptory decree of rejection is issued against them. And yet, if the announcement related to the whole of the dealings of the Lord with the covenant nation during the period of the second temple, we should expect to find the former. If, then, the rejection is one single act, the conduct of the people which occasions it must be the last and greatest exhibition of its hardness of heart; and this was seen in the rejection of Christ. A comparison of ver. 4 and ver. 6 will also show that this is the case: “Feed the flock of the slaughter, . . . for I will no more pity the inhabitants of the land, saith the Lord.” The feeding is represented here as the *last* attempt to rescue the unhappy nation, whose utter destruction would *immediately* follow, if, as was actually the case, the attempt should be unsuccessful.

A difference of opinion has still to be mentioned with reference to the meaning of צֹאֵן הַבְּרִיחַ. *The flock of the slaughter* may mean a flock already being slaughtered, or one which is to be slaughtered at some future time. The Lord may call the covenant nation by this name, either for the purpose of showing that he has undertaken the office of shepherd, on account of his compassion for the miserable condition into which the people had fallen previous to his becoming their shepherd, or because of his pity for the nation on account of the judgments which still impended over it. It is best to combine the two. The wretched condition of the nation at the time, governed as it was by evil rulers both native and foreign, was the effect of the just judgment of God. This condition would not only continue, but be heightened in future, if the nation did not sincerely repent; and it is to furnish it with the means of repentance that the Lord himself undertakes the office of shepherd, and comes to save the lost one.—There can be no doubt that the Lord alludes to this passage when he says to Peter in John 21:15, “Feed my lambs,” and in vers. 16, 17, “Feed my sheep.” (τὰ ἀρνία which answers to the Hebrew מִיֵּאֲלֵם, may be explained on the supposition that the Saviour had also Isa. 40:11 in his mind, which he combines with the passage before us.) When Jesus is leaving the earth, he transfers to Peter, as his representative, the office which the Father has entrusted to him according to the words of prophecy. “Jesus is the Lord of both lambs and sheep. He loves his flock, and commends it to one who loves him” (Bengel). But it is remarkable that *Jesus* speaks of *his* sheep, whereas the passage on which his words are based mentions the *flock of the slaughter*, the whole nation which is devoted to destruction. The office of shepherd over *this*, however, the Lord had already relinquished. Hence he could not transfer it to Peter. He simply refers to the office of shepherd over the little flock, the elect of the old covenant nation, “The poor of the flock, who wait upon me,” as they are called in ver. 11.<sup>15</sup>

Ver. 5. “Whose buyers slay them, and hold themselves not guilty: and whose sellers say, Blessed be the Lord; for I enrich myself: and their own shepherds spare them not.”

The futures in this verse are all to be taken as signs of actions, which had indeed already commenced, but would also be continued. They are sufficient in themselves to show that it is not merely with reference to the present and the past that the Israelites are called sheep for the slaughter. מִשְׁפָּחֵי לֹא לֹא is rendered by many commentators “they are not punished;” by others, “they do not feel themselves guilty.” In a similar manner, the words “blessed be the Lord, I enrich myself” are understood by most expositors as indicating the greatest cruelty and harshness on the part of the sellers. But this view is decidedly incorrect. מִשְׁפָּחֵי can neither mean “they regard themselves as guilty,” nor “they are not

punished.” It is true that עָשָׂה like all the verbs denoting sinning, has also a subordinate meaning indicating punishment for sin, but the leading idea of guilt is never lost sight of. The untenable character of this rendering is still more apparent from a comparison of the parallel passages. From these we learn that the idea which the prophet intends to express is this, “The wretched condition of the people is not the result of human caprice, but of the just judgment of God.” Jer. 2:3 is particularly applicable here: “Israel was holy to the Lord, the first-fruits of his increase. All that devoured him *were guilty*, evil came upon them, saith the Lord.”<sup>16</sup> The prophet contrasts the former time, when no one could have injured the nation which walked in the fear of God without incurring guilt and exposing himself to punishment, with the present time, when it is given up by the Lord himself as a *just* prey to its foes, who act as his instruments. Jer. 50:6, 7, is equally in point, “My people are lost sheep, their shepherds lead them astray; they let them wander about upon the mountains; they go from mountain to hill, they forget their fold. All who find them devour them, and their adversaries say, *we incur no guilt*, because they have sinned against the Lord, the habitation of righteousness, against the Lord, the hope of their fathers.” The reason why their enemies are not guilty is here expressly stated to be, that the nation has fallen away from its God, who has given them up to the tyranny of their enemies as *a. just act of divine judgment*. Jer. 25:9 also deserves to be quoted, although not so distinctly referred to by the prophet as the two already mentioned: “Behold, I send and take all the families of the north, saith the Lord, and Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, *my servant*, and bring them upon this land, and upon all these nations round about, and I *place them under the ban*, and lay them waste,” etc. Nebuchadnezzar is represented here as the minister of divine justice, who might have executed its decrees upon the covenant nation in an irreproachable manner if this appointment had been the motive by which he was actuated, just as the war against the people of the covenant is described as a holy war in chap. 22:7 (“I sanctify destroyers upon thee”).

“*Thy sellers say*” is equivalent to they might say. A person is often represented as having said what he might very naturally have said under the circumstances. But if we compare Isa. 36:10, where Sennacherib says, “Am I now come up without the Lord against this land to destroy it? the Lord said unto me, Go up against this land, and destroy it,” we shall see that the enemies of the Israelites had some conception at times of their high vocation. Gain which can lead a man to say, “*bless or praise the Lord*” in other words, for which he can thank God, is righteous gain.<sup>17</sup> קִיְיָוֹן is not their possessors, as many suppose, but *their sellers*, as the antithesis to מְכַרְיָהוּן clearly shows (compare Isa. 24:2). The *buyers* and *sellers* of the flock are those who do just as they please with the covenant nation. We cannot follow Theodoret, Cyril, and many others, who imagine that wicked rulers belonging to the nation itself are intended. The expression must rather be referred to foreign oppressors, as it has been by Jerome, who correctly explains it as denoting the Romans. This is obvious from the parallel passages just quoted, and still more so from the circumstances themselves. How could the flock of Israel be a *lawful gain* to its native shepherds? They were the principal cause of its rebellion, and the punishment fell with peculiar severity upon them (compare ver. 17 and Jer. 23:1). On the other hand, the shepherds who do not spare the flock are most probably the native rulers exclusively, as we may gather from ver. 8 and vers. 15-17. The former of these also furnishes conclusive evidence that by the shepherds we are not to understand merely the civil rulers, as Abarbanel and Grotius do, but the ecclesiastical rulers also, particularly those whom the Lord had appointed in any way to be the leaders of the nation. There is a gradation in the passage, therefore; not only will the people continue to groan, as they do now, under the oppression of foreign tyrants, but their own rulers will also be irretrievably ruined as well

as they. The apparently feeble expression, "They spare not," is stronger than any positive statement as to the nature of their conduct would be, especially when applied to the native shepherds, since it indicates at once that both nature and duty required them to spare their own flock, and therefore it was a severe judgment on the part of God when they denied it.

Ver. 6. "*For I will not spare the inhabitants of the land, saith the Lord: and I will give one into the power of another, and into the power of his king; and they lay waste the land, and I will not save out of their hand.*"

ו at the commencement of this verse might refer to ver. 5. In this case the futures would have to be taken in the sense of ordinary futures, and the flock of the slaughter would mean one which was afterward to be slaughtered, and not one whose slaughter had already commenced. The present verse would then assign the reason why the nation was to be given up to destruction without its destroyers being chargeable with guilt, provided it resisted this last attempt at its rescue. The Lord, who has long waited for fruit from the bad tree, must at last cut it down. But as the flock is represented in ver. 7 as being already in a miserable condition, at the time when the Lord enters upon his office as shepherd, we have no reason to restrict vers. 4 and 5 to the future. It is better, therefore, to refer ו to the injunction "*feed the flock of the slaughter*" Make a last attempt to save it, for I cannot and must not any longer suffer its fearful apostasy to go unpunished. ארץ, the land, viz. the land of Israel, already referred to. "He is speaking of the land to which he has already referred, and not of the whole world, as the Jewish commentators have falsely interpreted in their wish to turn the sentence of God away from themselves to some other quarter" (Jerome).

The explanation of this verse also depends upon a parallel passage in Jeremiah (chap. 19:9): "And I cause them to eat the flesh of their sons, and the flesh of their daughters, and they eat every one the flesh of his friend in their distress and want, which are brought upon them by their enemies and those who seek their life." A twofold cause of their ruin is given, a twofold punishment from the Lord is mentioned, namely, the strife among the people themselves, which is heightened by suffering and the oppression of the foe. "We find precisely the same thing here; the former is indicated in the expression, "I give them to one another," and the latter in the words, "I give them up to their king." That we are to understand by the king a foreign oppressor, and not a native ruler, is evident from the fact that the covenant nation had no native king in the time of the prophet, and that he never speaks of any such king in his descriptions of the future, with the exception of the Messiah. Contention within and foes without are not only mentioned in the passage quoted from Jeremiah, and in Isa. 9:7 sqq. (compare especially vers. 18, 19, and chap. 3:4), but they are also linked together by our prophet himself in chap. 8:10, as the two principal methods of punishment employed by God for the chastisement of his people, "For before these days . . . there was no peace from the enemy, and I set every man one against another." This miserable state of things, which existed in the nation previous to the commencement of its captivity, is here represented as returning with still greater force on account of its base ingratitude for repeated forgiveness, and its relapse into apostasy. If we turn to the fulfilment, we may see at once that the king is the Roman Emperor. (Compare John 19:15, where the Jews say, "We have no king but Caesar.") We need not stop to show how literally this prophecy applies to the fate of the Jews subsequent to their rejection of Christ, to the passionate contests of parties within the city, and eventually its conquest by the Romans; much less is there any necessity to bring forward the well-known passages from Josephus, which Jahn has provided with so liberal a hand. Bleek is

of opinion that the expression “*of his king*” is a proof that the reference can only be to a native king. But he has overlooked Hosea 11:5, “Assyria is his king.” There is probably a distinct allusion to this passage in the words before us, and there is the greater reason for supposing this from the fact that Assyria is mentioned in chap. 10:10, with evident reference to Hosea, as the representative of the imperial power. This passage also furnishes a refutation of Hofmann, who most strangely interprets this verse as denoting the ill-treatment of the whole human race (see *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, i. p. 318). Schmieder says, “We cannot regard these words as relating to the king of the whole land, for every one is to be given into the hand of *his* king, not of the king who is king of *all*” But the king of the whole land is also the king of every individual. The mode of expression employed is a peculiar one, which would certainly appear strange if it stood by itself; but it is to be explained from its connection with the previous clause, “I give them into the power of one another.” Those who refer the expression to a native king, however, must fail to notice vers. 1-3, where foreign foes are described as laying waste the land, and also ver. 10, where the principal danger is represented as coming from without, in consequence of the covenant with the nations being broken.—To the word כִּנְיָו, “the neighbour and the king,” might be supplied as the subject. But it is better to understand the king alone as being the subject, or rather the heathen foe concealed behind him. For apparently the words, “*and they lay the land waste*” are simply an abridgment of the account of the hostile invasion in vers. 1-3. כָּרַת, *to smite in pieces*, may be more suitably applied to a hostile invasion than to internal contentions. In other passages it is always used in connection with foreign foes (Num. 14:45; Deut. 1:44; Isa. 24:12). The words, “I will not deliver out of their hand,” also point to heathen oppression.

Ver. 7. “*And so I fed the flock of the slaughter, therefore the most miserable sheep. And I took unto me two staves; the one I called Loveliness, and the other I called the United Ones; and fed the flock.*”

There can be no doubt that כִּלְיָו means *therefore on this account*. Other renderings have all been adopted without any foundation. The simplest explanation is that given by Hitzig, who supposes the expression to refer to vers. 5, 6, in which case the word *therefore* merely repeats in a more distinct and emphatic manner what has already been said at the commencement, “and so I fed.” As the directions to feed the sheep are explained by what follows in ver. 6 which commences with “*for*” so does the account of the execution of the order point back to the same explanation through the word *therefore* (I fed), with which it begins. *The miserable of the sheep* are the most miserable sheep, those whose miserable condition is such that the rest in comparison are not miserable at all. The question arises, however, where are we to find the whole, the flock generally, with which the part is here compared. If we suppose the former to be one particular flock, the nation of Israel for example, *the miserable* would then be a portion of that nation, which was peculiarly miserable. If, on the other hand, we understand the former as denoting sheep generally, meaning thereby all people and nations, the *most miserable sheep* would then be the whole of the covenant nation. The former is the more customary view; and it is generally supposed that an antithesis is intended here, similar to Ezek. 34:16: “I will seek the lost, and bring back the strayed, bind up the wounded, and strengthen the sick; but the fat and strong I will destroy.” It is also added that the most miserable are those who are made humble by their misery, and long for salvation. But on closer examination it is evident that the latter view is the correct one. It cannot be objected to this that in ver. 11 “the most miserable sheep” are only the God-fearing portion of the nation. For the limitation does not arise from the expression, “the most miserable sheep,” but from the clause which

follows, “who adhered to me;” and this modifying clause rather tends to show that “the most miserable sheep” is in itself a general expression not limited to any particular class, but referring to the whole nation. The most decisive evidence in favour of the latter, however, is to be found in two parallel passages of Jeremiah, viz. chap. 49:20, “Surely they (the children of Edom) tear the lowliest sheep:” and chap. 50:45, where the same statement is made with reference to the Chaldeans. In both passages, “the lowliest sheep” is an expression applied to the Israelites, in contrast with all the nations round about. Moreover, the Lord is described in vers. 4 and 9 as undertaking the office of shepherd not merely over a portion of the nation, but over *the whole*, and for the good of the whole. The expression “most miserable sheep” is identical with “*sheep of the slaughter*,” by which the whole nation is designated. The fact that two shepherds’ staves are taken is supposed by many expositors to denote the various ways in which God dealt with the nation. But this idea is founded upon an erroneous interpretation of the names of the staves. A shepherd’s staff is the instrument with which the shepherd defends his flock and ensures their wellbeing; “thy rod and thy staff they comfort me” (Ps. 23:4). Hence the two staves taken on this occasion indicate the protection afforded by the Good Shepherd against a twofold danger, from outward foes and inward contention; the two sources of danger referred to in ver. 6, as those which would lead to the ruin of the nation in the event of its hardness of heart continuing. But now, so long as the last attempt to lead it to repentance continues, the danger is averted by the faithful Shepherd. After this it breaks in with fearful violence.

צֶפֶן is rendered by most commentators *loveliness* or *beauty* (Sept., κάλλος; Aquila and Symmachus, εὐπρέπεια; Jerome, *decus*). At first sight the word, as thus interpreted, appears to have but little meaning: and, according to ver. 10, the staff represented the mercy of the Lord, by which he protected the nation from being destroyed by outward foes. But the usages of the language are decisive in favour of this rendering, and every objection is removed by the fact that the expression, which is indefinite in itself, is more precisely defined by the two earlier passages to which this refers, viz. Ps. 90:17, “The loveliness of the Lord be upon us” (may it show itself in our history), and Ps. 27:4, “One thing have I desired of the Lord, that will I seek after, that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life, to *behold the loveliness of the Lord*, and to inquire in his temple.” According to these passages the staff loveliness can only denote the *lovely aspect in which the Lord manifests himself to My people*, and therefore is identical with the staff *mercy*. We cannot agree with Bleek, who explains the name as denoting the loveliness of the people, an explanation at variance alike with the passages quoted and also with ver. 10, where the staff denotes an act of God; nor yet with Maurer, who renders it *amoenitatem, vitam commodam*. The singular נֶפֶס indicates the relation of the One God to his nation; the plural הַבְּלִים that of the members of the nation to one another.—The second name הַבְּלִים is supposed by many to be used in a bad sense, denoting either *perdentes* or *dolentes*. Thus in contrast with the first staff *grace*, the second is the staff *woes*, with which the nation is to be punished in case it should refuse to receive the Lord as its shepherd.<sup>18</sup> But the following proofs are sufficient to establish its incorrectness. (1.) הַבְּלִים does not mean *to destroy* or *to be destroyed* either in the Kal or Niphal, much less *to feel pain*?<sup>19</sup> (2.) This rendering, as Calvin has already observed, is shown to be incorrect by the fact that the Lord makes use of the staff to feed the flock *during the day of grace*, and that he is represented in ver. 14 as *breaking* it when the period of grace is over. From this it is evident that the staff must be a symbol of *blessings*, and not of *punishments*. The breaking of the first staff denoted the withdrawal of a divine blessing, and that of the second does the same. Taking the staff, therefore, must represent the bestowal of a

blessing; and as the harmony of the nation is destroyed when the staff is broken, this harmony must be the blessing bestowed when the staff is taken in the hand. (3.) It is difficult to understand the use of the plural if this explanation be adopted.

Other expositors, who are convinced that this rendering is inadmissible, have taken the word in the sense of *binding*. Three different modifications of this meaning have been suggested. Many of the early translators have rendered the word *cord*, either because they regarded לַבַּיִת as merely another form of לַבַּיִת, a cord, or because they pointed it differently. Thus in the Septuagint, Aquila, and Symmachus we have καὶ τὴν ἑτέραν ἐκάλεσα σχοίνισμα. Jerome translates it *et alterant vocavi funiculos*. Calvin, who points the word לַבַּיִת, adopts the same rendering.<sup>20</sup> Others (e.g. Drusius, Fuller, and Marck) take the word as an active participle, “*the binders*.”<sup>21</sup> And others again, with De Dieu as their leader, regard it as a passive participle, and render it “the bound” or “the allied.” There can be no doubt whatever that the word is generally used in Hebrew in the sense of binding, and that not merely in a literal, but also in a metaphorical sense.<sup>22</sup> There can also be just as little doubt that לַבַּיִת has both an active and passive signification. This is sufficiently evident from the metaphorical use of the term *Pfändung*, which has the double meaning of binding another, and binding oneself, or being bound. (Compare the passages quoted from Job and Nehemiah.) In the Arabic the two corresponding verbs, which originally formed but one root, have not only an active meaning in the first conjugation, but a passive and reflective sense as well, to pledge and to destroy, both from the idea of *binding*, the latter as being in a forced condition, or one of restraint, *demens, maniacus fuit*, to be mentally bound, *foedus inivit*, and *proegnans fait*, a state of physical bondage, as madness is one of mental. Now from this we may see that the choice between the three modifications mentioned is not a difficult one. The first is too arbitrary to merit any notice. The second is untenable, because it furnishes no explanation of the use of the plural; for who could the *binders* be? The third has everything in its favour. The second staff, in perfect harmony with ver. 14, represented the brotherly union which continued to exist in the covenant nation during the period of grace through the interposition of the Lord. The words “and so I tended the flock,” are not merely a superfluous repetition, but show that the tending took place by means of the staves. The rendering adopted by many, “with which I fed the flock,” is correct as far as the sense is concerned.

Ver. 8. “*And I cut off the three shepherds in one month; and I was weary of them, and their soul also rebelled against me.*”

We shall inquire, first of all, who are to be understood by the three shepherds. We reject at the outset the view expressed by Calvin, Jahn, Rosenmüller, and others, who suppose that we have here a definite number for an indefinite, three for several. Instead of “*the three shepherds*” (Sept. τοὺς τρεῖς ποιμένας), we should have in this case simply “three shepherds.” The article is just as decisive against those who understand by the three shepherds *three distinct individuals*. If this were the meaning, we should either find the individuals mentioned before, in which case a simple allusion would be sufficient (but no such shepherds have ever been mentioned), or they must have been so well known to the prophet’s readers that he might safely assume that they would readily understand him.<sup>23</sup> But it is impossible to find three individuals to whom the words would apply. This is evident from the fact that, of all those who support this explanation, hardly two are to be found who agree as to the persons referred to. Moreover, the views advocated by the majority of these expositors must be rejected at the outset, on the simple ground that they seek the three shepherds among those who lived before the Babylonian captivity, whereas

it is to a future event that reference is here made.<sup>24</sup> There can be no doubt, therefore, that the prophet is speaking not of three individuals, but of *three orders of shepherds*. Those who hold this opinion are divided again into various classes. Junius, Piscator, and Lightfoot conjecture that the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes are referred to, a notion which must be rejected on the simple ground that these Jewish sects could not possibly be called the *shepherds* of the nation. Marck imagined the civil, ecclesiastical, and military authorities to be intended; but he has not brought forward any proofs that the latter are ever represented as belonging to the shepherds of the theocracy. *If it may be regarded as certain, that the three shepherds represent the three classes of shepherds existing in the theocracy, in other words, the leaders of the nation, the only correct method of procedure is to inquire whether Zechariah himself, or any other of the Old Testament writers, especially those who lived about his time, has anywhere referred to three classes of shepherds as the sole leaders of the theocracy.* Now, if we adopt this course, we shall see that Zechariah cannot possibly have thought of any others than *the civil authorities, the priests and the prophets*. This is the oldest interpretation in existence.<sup>25</sup> We may see how natural it is from the fact that, whilst Christ was to combine in his own person all the offices which existed in the Old Testament, these three are the only ones which the Church has ever attributed to him, a proof that they must occupy a very prominent position in the Old Testament, and that there is no foundation for Schmieder's assertion that it cannot be shown that this threefold division of the offices was distinctly recognised either before or during the time of Zechariah. The fact that this explanation was not universally adopted in later times may be easily accounted for, on the ground that it was difficult to prove the existence of the prophetic office in the time of Christ. What else could have led any one to seek for other shepherds than those which are constantly associated together in this capacity, to the exclusion of every other, *and which are also represented, as in this passage, as having been together the main cause of the misery and destruction of the nation?* There are numerous passages in Jeremiah which might be compared with this. For example, Jer. 2:8, "*The priests said not where is the Lord, and they that handle the law (also priests) knew me not; the shepherds (with special reference to the civil authorities), sinned against me, and the prophets prophesied by Baal;*" ver. 26, "*As the thief is ashamed when he is found, so is the house of Israel put to shame, they, their kings, their princes (the two together constituting the civil authorities), and their priests and their prophets.*" Jer. 18:18, "*And they say, come and let us devise devices against Jeremiah; for the law cannot perish from the priests, nor counsel from the wise, nor the word from the prophets.*" If we examine the prophecies of Zechariah himself, we find the other two classes of shepherds most distinctly noticed in connection with the prophetic order, of which he was the representative, in chap. 4:12-14. To the inquiry, what the two olive branches were which fed the lamp (the kingdom of God) with the oil pressed from their fruit, the prophet receives the following reply: "*These are the two sons of oil, which stand before the Lord of the whole earth.*" The two orders through which the Lord communicated his mercy to the Church are here said to be the priesthood and the civil authorities, the former being at that time represented by Joshua, the latter by Zerubbabel. It is very obvious from a comparison of chap. 3 that it is not in their individual capacity that these two are referred to here, for throughout that chapter Joshua's always spoken of as a representative, sometimes of the priesthood, and at other times of the whole nation. This passage is so far analogous to the passage before us therefore, *that in the latter the orders into which the leaders of the nation were divided are also personified as individuals.* Compare also Mal. 2:7, where the priestly order is called the messenger of the Lord of hosts.

The only difficulty which remains is how to explain the fact that the prophetic order should be introduced as one of the three, seeing that this had been extinct for a long time before the period of fulfilment. We reply that, in accordance with the essential character of prophecy, the prophet represents the future by means of the analogous circumstances of his own time. Just as the order of the civil shepherds continued to exist though kings had ceased to reign, so did the order of prophets continue, so far as everything essential was concerned, even after the suspension of the gift of prophecy. The vocation of the prophet was to make known to the people the word and will of God (Jer. 18:18). Before the completion of the canon this was done by means of revelations made directly to the prophets themselves, but after this it was accomplished by the investigation of earlier revelations under the guidance of the Spirit of God, and the application of the results to the peculiar circumstances of the age. The place of the prophets was occupied by the scribes, on whom, according to the book of Ecclesiasticus, chap. 39, the Lord richly bestowed the spirit of understanding, who studied the wisdom of the ancients, investigated the prophets, delivered instruction and counsel, and who were noted for wise sayings. They stood in the same relation to the prophets of the Old Testament as the enlightened teachers of the Christian Church to the prophets of the New, The three constituent elements of the Jewish Sanhedrim answer to the three shepherds mentioned here, namely, the leading priests, the scribes, and the elders, ἀρχιερεῖς, γραμματεῖς, πρεσβύτεροι (Matt. 26:3).

*What are we to understand by the cutting off and extermination of the three shepherds?* In the opinion of many commentators the literal destruction of the individuals themselves. But a difficulty arises here from the fact that the extermination of the shepherds precedes the breaking of the staves. It cannot, therefore, be a literal extermination that is intended, for *the shepherds are represented immediately afterwards as still in existence*. It is they who provoke the Good Shepherd to impatience, and assume the attitude of greatest hostility to him; and from the use of the future with Vav conversive, this must be regarded, not as preceding the extermination, but rather as the result of it. It is their obstinate resistance, by which all his pastoral efforts are frustrated, that leads him to break the staves and lay down the office of shepherd. We can only think, then, of an *extermination of the shepherds as shepherds*, that is, their *deposition* from their office, the tacit assertion of their nonexistence, which was followed by their outward removal in due time. To effect this deposition of the shepherds was the leading object of the Lord during his term of office. But the very disposition which made them deserve to be deposed also prevented the sentence, which was pronounced upon them with absolute authority, from being carried out in its fullest extent. Only the most miserable of the sheep which hearkened to the Lord (ver. 11) withdrew from their pernicious guidance. It was not till the rejection of the whole nation, which was blind to its own interests, *that the sentence was executed in its full extent by foreign foes*, and without its receiving good shepherds in the place of the bad, which would have been the case if it had obeyed the Good Shepherd, and carried out the decree of extermination itself. Bleek asks, “How can it possibly be said of the Redeemer, that the object of his efforts was to liberate the people—*externally* or *internally*— from the rule of their civil authorities, and consequently to exempt them from obedience towards them?” But it is not to “civil authority” in its ordinary sense that reference is made here (the political power was then in the hands of the Romans), but to an order of shepherds resting upon a theological foundation. We have, in fact, the sentence of deposition formally pronounced in Matt. 23:2, 3: “The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses’ seat: all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not ye after their works.” Respect for the ecclesiastical authorities is here



torn up by the roots. Henceforth the hands alone are to be moved, not the heart. To render inward obedience is not a duty, but a sin. The whole chapter will show us what the extermination of the shepherds means. The second passage in the New Testament is John 10. The evil shepherds, whom the Good Shepherd will remove out of the way when he undertakes the care of the flock, are the “strangers” in ver. 5, the “thieves” in ver. 8, the “hirelings” in ver. 12. Of these the Lord says in ver. 8, “All that ever came before me are thieves and robbers, but the sheep did not hear them,”—words which, in their cutting severity, correspond exactly to the expression, “I cut off” in the passage before us. The very fact that Jesus invariably addresses himself to the ὄχλοι is a practical declaration that the shepherds are no more. We never find the Lord or his apostles attempting to effect a reform of the ruling power. On the contrary, this is always regarded as under sentence of condemnation. The destruction of the shepherds was accomplished *in one month*. This cannot be merely equivalent to a short space of time,” as Kimchi, Calvin, and others suppose, there would be good ground for Hitzig’s question, “Why should a month be spoken of when most likely a day or an hour would have been more appropriate?” That the prophet would have said “in one day,” if he had simply meant within a very short time, is evident from the parallel passage in chap. 3:9, where the reconciliation to be effected by the Messiah is thus described, “I will remove the iniquity of that land *in one day*” The month is to be reckoned from the commencement of the shepherd’s ministry; and the expression “*in one month*” is to be taken as denoting a period, which is long when compared with “one day,” but brief as contrasted with other periods of time. It shows that the extermination of the three shepherds is not to be regarded as a single act, like the expiation, but as a continuous act, which occupies *some time*. It sets before us in an appropriate manner *the repeated efforts on the part of Christ to deliver the poor nation, the lost sheep of the house of Israel, from the spiritual tyranny of its blind and corrupt guides*. “I was weary of them,” lit. my soul was short with them, I lost all patience with them.<sup>26</sup> נָהַל is usually rendered “*to feel disgust*” according to the analogy of the Syriac. But this is not quite correct. Schultens has already shown that the verb denotes the hostile and malignant disposition of the three shepherds, regarded both as condemned by God and as springing from an evil moral source, and therefore could not be applied to the feelings cherished by the Good Shepherd towards them. In Arabic נָהַל denotes a low and corrupt state of mind generally, and is then specially applied to avarice as a base passion. In Hebrew this is evidently the idea in the only other passages in which the verb occurs, Prov. 20, 21. נִתְּחַלָּה קָבֹץ הֶחָלָה is an inheritance acquired in a despicable manner. The evil shepherds are inflamed with contemptible hatred towards the Good Shepherd, because he exposes their wickedness and seeks to deprive them of their power. They do all they can, therefore, to prevent the execution of his commission. “*Their soul*” is not merely a substitute for the personal pronoun, but denotes the intensity and depth of the abhorrence. Maurer would refer the words נָהַל and נִשְׁפָּנוּ to the *sheep* rather than the shepherds, but evidently for no other reason than that his false views respecting the shepherds require it. If these are to be regarded as individuals, and not as orders, their extermination must necessarily consist in their death, and nothing more can be predicated after this. If the sheep are intended, it is difficult to see what gives rise to the impatience and weariness. Both of these presuppose that some contention has already been described as taking place between the Good Shepherd and those to whom the words refer. The latter do not wish to be deposed. Hence the impatience, and the efforts made by the Good Shepherd to effect their deposition excite the most malignant feelings on their part.

Ver. 9. “*And I will not feed you; the dead thing shall die; that which is exterminated shall be exterminated, and the rest will consume every one the other.*”<sup>27</sup>

Schmieder has very properly compared this passage with John 8:21, "I go away, and ye shall seek me and shall die in your sins." But there is a still closer resemblance in Matt. 23:37, 38, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem. . . how often would I have gathered thy children together, . . . and ye would not! Behold your house is left unto you desolate." The determination not to feed the "poor sheep" any more, which is based upon the discovery made in ver. 8, presupposes that they resemble the shepherds. There are many who follow the Septuagint (ἀποθνήσκέτω) and Jerome, and understand the futures as expressing a wish. But the very form of the words shows that this cannot be the case. They are predictions. The "*dead thing*" and "*that which is exterminated*" denote something which is devoted to so certain a destruction that it may be regarded as dead and exterminated already. The only thing that could have averted this destruction would have been their following the Good Shepherd; but now that he has been obliged to give up his office, things are left to take their natural course. There are three kinds of destruction referred to here, as a comparison of the parallel passages will show; *plague*, such as usually breaks out in besieged cities (the dead will die), *violent death* from foreign foes, and a *terrible strife* among the citizens *themselves*, in consequence of the existing distress. Compare, for example, Jer. 15:1, 2, "Then said the Lord unto me, though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my mind could not be towards this people; cast them out of my sight, and let them go forth. And it shall come to pass, if they say unto thee; Whither shall we go forth? then shalt thou tell them, thus saith the Lord: Such as are for death, to death; and such as are for the sword, to the sword; and such as are for the famine, to the famine; and such as are for captivity, to captivity." Also, Jer. 34:17, "Ye have not hearkened unto me, in proclaiming liberty, every one to his brother, and every man to his neighbour; behold I proclaim liberty for you *to the sword, to the pestilence, and to the famine*" See also Ezek. 6:12, "He that is far off shall die of the pestilence; and he that is near shall fall by the sword; and he that *remaineth* and he that is preserved shall die by the famine." No proof need be adduced that the destruction of the Jewish state was really effected by the combination of all these three.—*And those who remain will eat the flesh one of another.*<sup>28</sup> A similar description is given of the manner in which the citizens of the kingdom of Israel fought one against another, in consequence of the distress which preceded its fall. See Isa. 9:19 sqq. "No man shall spare his brother. They devour on the right hand, and are hungry; they devour on the left hand, and are not satisfied; every man eateth the flesh of his arm" (rages, that is, against his own flesh, inasmuch as those who destroy one another are members of one community, of one national body).

Ver. 10. "*And I took my staff, Loveliness, and broke it, that I might put an end to my covenant which I had concluded with all nations.*"

The same event which we find predicted in plain terms in the foregoing verse is exhibited here under a twofold symbolical action. The desolation caused by foreign nations is represented by the breaking of the staff Loveliness or Grace, and the contention within by the breaking of the staff of the bound ones; or to speak more correctly, the announcement contained in the previous verse is followed here by an account of its fulfilment. The figure of the flock is not strictly preserved. In the words "with all nations," the figure is dropped; in figurative language it should have been "with all wild beasts" (cf. Isa. 56:9, "All ye beasts of the field come to devour"). The thought, that hitherto the covenant nation has been preserved from being destroyed by foreign enemies, in consequence of the secret interposition of the omnipotence of God, is expressed thus: the Lord has concluded a treaty with all nations on behalf of Israel, and this treaty is now to be brought to an end by the breaking of the staff Favour. A similar figure is employed elsewhere. In

Job 5:23, the fact that no creature can injure the man who is at peace with God is stated thus: "For thy league shall be with the stones of the field, and the beasts of the field shall be at peace with thee." In Hos. 2:18, the safety of the covenant nation from earthly foes, when once it has been forgiven by its chief enemy, the Lord, is described in these terms, "And in that day will I make a covenant for them with the beasts of the field, and with the fowls of heaven, and with the creeping things of the ground: and I will break the bow, and the sword, and the battle, and make them dwell safely." But the passage which Zechariah had immediately before his mind was Ezek. 34:25, "And I will make with them a covenant of peace, and will cause *the evil beasts* to cease out of the land; and they dwell safely in the desert, and sleep in the woods," which differs from the one before us simply in the fact that the figure of the flock is more stringently preserved. Zechariah announces that the covenant, which is here declared to have been concluded by the Lord for the good of his people, will now be brought to an end as a punishment for its fearful apostasy. If proper attention had been paid to these parallel passages, the words "all peoples" would never have been referred to the tribes of Israel, as they have been by Marck, and latterly also by Umbreit (see Bleek's reply). A sufficient objection to this explanation is to be found in the fact that the breaking of the staff *Favour* must indicate some *special* manifestation of the divine displeasure; otherwise the breaking of the staff of the united ones could not have been mentioned as *co-ordinate* with it. Moreover, even if "the peoples" could denote the tribes of Israel, this meaning would be excluded here by the addition of the word כָּל־ (all). But the assertion, that עַמִּים is not infrequently used in connection with the tribes of Israel, is thoroughly unfounded. עַמִּים by itself is *never* used in this sense. In chap. 12:6, "all nations" are the heathen nations; and in Mic. 4:5, "all nations" form the antithesis to Israel. The New Testament parallel to this passage is to be found in Luke 19:41-44, where Christ says to Jerusalem, which knew not the day of its visitation, "The days shall come upon thee, that thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side; and shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee." Compare also Luke 21:24, "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles."

Ver. 11. "And thus the treaty was brought to an end in that day: therefore the poorest sheep which adhered to me learned that this is the word of the Lord."

It is obvious from this verse that the efforts of the Good Shepherd are not altogether in vain, but a small company of true disciples attach themselves to him. These ("his own sheep," who follow the true Shepherd, but flee from a stranger, and who know the true Shepherd, as Christ says in John 10:4, 5, 14) are described as those who observe him, keep their eye constantly fixed upon him, and always act according to his direction and will. When the enemy broke into the land after the treaty was brought to an end, they perceived that the announcement which had already been made, of the destruction to be effected by the Lord, was not a mere human threat, but really a divine prediction. The prophet speaks of the event as past, because in the vision which passed before his mind the things described had actually occurred. If the prophecy had been couched in literal terms, instead of being clothed in symbol, it would have run thus: When, therefore, my treaty is brought to an end, those who fear me will discern in the fulfilment the divine character of this sentence of mine upon Israel. אָמַר refers to the announcement already made in vers. 9 and 10. There is a parallel to the words of the last clause in Jer. 32:6-8, "The Lord said to me, behold Hananeel comes to thee, saying, buy my field; and Hananeel came to me and said, buy my field, I pray thee. Then I knew that this was the word of the Lord." By the fulfilment of the word of God, Jeremiah is still more firmly

convinced that he has not mistaken a human idea for a divine revelation. A remark to this effect, that the fulfilment of his prophecies will furnish the proof of their divine character, is frequently met with in Zechariah; compare chap. 2:13, where the angel of the Lord says, "Then shall ye know that the Lord of Sabaoth hath sent me." (See also chap. 2:15 and 6:15.)—*In that day*, namely, the day on which I had broken my staff, or without a figure, "after I had withdrawn my favour from the people, the hostile nations, which I had hitherto restrained, fell at once upon them."—*Therefore*; namely, from this very fact.

Ver. 12. "*And I said to them. If it seemeth good to you, give me my wages; if not, let it be. And they weighed to me as my wages thirty pieces of silver.*"

"*I said to them.*" Jahn observes that this must refer not to the flock, but to the shepherds, since it was only from them that the wages could be demanded. But in this he is wrong. By the fact that the shepherd treats with the flock itself, whereas in other cases it is the owner who is treated with, he shows that this flock is endowed with reason. He leaves out the smaller and more despised portion of the people, among whom the desired success had been obtained, as was stated in the previous verse, and treats with the larger and more powerful portion, whose obstinacy had compelled him to lay down his office. No doubt the leaders of the nation are more particularly intended as taking part in this negotiation, not as shepherds, however, but as part of the flock itself; just as we find them described in Ezek. 34 at one time as shepherds, at another as goats, and then again as fat sheep in contrast with the lean. The Lord could not demand his wages from the shepherds as such, for he had never entered their service; but, on the contrary, had endeavoured to deliver the flock out of their hands. Most of the commentators (*e.g.* Theodoret, Eusebius, Jarchi) understand by the *wages*, repentance and faith, or piety of heart. This is in fact the only return which is worthy of the Good Shepherd. The great object of his coming was to secure these fruits. It is no valid objection to this, that the Good Shepherd does not ask for his wages till he has entirely given up the people, till the Lord has withdrawn his favour, and the people therefore are no longer able to bring forth the fruits of repentance, but are devoted to destruction. For the form of the demand (compare Jer. 40:4; Ezek. 3:27) shows that the Good Shepherd does not expect it to be complied with, but makes this just demand, with which we may compare the Lord's looking for figs on the fig-tree of the Jewish nation, at a time when it had lost its capacity for bearing figs, in order that an opportunity might be afforded for the manifestation of the disposition of the nation and its hard ungrateful heart. They weigh to him as his wages thirty pieces of silver. Instead of wages they offer him an insult. Thirty pieces of silver are so contemptible a sum<sup>29</sup> that the very offer, for *such services* as he had rendered, especially from the quarter from which it came, was more insulting than a positive refusal. In Hos. 3:2, thirty pieces of silver are represented as the sum for which a slave might be purchased (see vol. i. p. 189). According to Ex. 21:32, thirty pieces of silver was the compensation to be paid *for having killed a servant*. This passage suggests the thought that they intend to take away the life of the Good Shepherd (a fact which comes out still more distinctly in chap. 12:10 and 13:7), and avail themselves of the opportunity to offer him this insult.

Ver. 13. "*And the Lord said to me, Throw it to the potter: the noble price at which lam valued by them. And I took the thirty pieces of silver, and threw them to the potter into the house of the Lord.*"

The Lord addresses the prophet, who is his representative. This is evident from the words, "at which I have been valued." תְּשַׁלְּךָ, to throw away, sometimes with the idea of contempt implied (compare Jer. 22:19, 52:3, and Ezek. 20:8). We should not have so

many erroneous explanations of the expression “*to the potter*,” nor would the attempt to explain the verse have been altogether given up on account of these words if more attention had been paid to the clue furnished by Jeremiah, who affords the same help in the interpretation of this book as Ezekiel and Daniel in that of the Revelation. It would then have been seen that “*to the potter*” is the same as “*into an unclean place, or to the hangman*.” The potter referred to here, as the constant use of the article in this passage in the prophecies of Jeremiah and in the Gospel of Matthew leads us to conclude, was probably the potter employed about the temple, for we cannot imagine that there was only one potter in all Jerusalem. His workshop was in the valley of Hinnom, most likely because the earth which he required was very plentiful there, or that the earth in the valley was peculiarly good. The following reasons are sufficient to establish this conclusion. That the workshop was not only outside the city, but actually in the valley which runs beneath it, is evident from Jer. 18:2, where the prophet, who was in the temple at the time, receives instructions to “*Arise, and go down to the potter’s house*.” Compare ver. 3, “*Then I went down to the potter’s house*.” But Jer. 19:2 points especially to the valley of Hinnom, “*Go down to the valley of Ben Hinnom, which lies by the brick-gate, and proclaim there the words which I shall tell thee*.” From this it follows that the gate which led to the valley of Hinnom was called the brick or pot-gate, from the pottery which stood in the valley. That שַׁעַר הַהַרְסוּת, literally the gate of the pottery, must be rendered thus, is evident from the allusion to ver. 1, where הַרְשׁ would be, strictly speaking, superfluous; and also from the fact that Jeremiah would not have mentioned the gate leading to the valley of Hinnom by name, seeing that it was generally known, and is described elsewhere simply as the gate of the valley, if there had not been something in the name itself bearing upon the subject in hand.<sup>30</sup> (Compare Neh. 2:13, 15 with Jer. 2:23 in the latter of which passages the valley of Hinnom is called *the valley* κατ’ ἐξοχήν.) But from the time of Josiah, by whom the valley of Hinnom, at that time the scene of idolatrous abominations of the most fearful description, was polluted by carrion, human bones, and other things of a similar kind, it was regarded by the Jews with disgust and abhorrence as an unclean place; and eventually the opinion was expressed in the Talmud, that the mouth of hell was there.<sup>31</sup> When Zechariah represents the contemptible wages as having been cast into the valley of Hinnom, and mentions the particular spot in the valley, the workshop or field of the potter, we see in each of these a special reference to a prophecy of Jeremiah, with which he supposes his readers to be already acquainted. In the first there is an allusion to Jer. 19. The prophet is represented there as going with several of the elders of the nation and the leading priests to the valley of Hinnom, where he breaks to pieces an empty earthen vessel. The meaning of this symbolical action is described as follows: “*Because they have filled this place with the blood of the innocents; . . . I will empty the counsel of Judah and Jerusalem in this place, and I will make them fall by the sword of their enemies, and by the hands of those that seek their lives; and their carcasses will I give to be meat for the fowl of heaven, and for the beasts of the earth. . . . Thus will I break this people and this city as one breaketh the potter’s vessel, which cannot be healed any more, and they shall bury in Tophet, because there is no more room. Thus will I do with this place and to the inhabitants thereof and make this city like Tophet. And the houses of Jerusalem, and the houses of the kings of Judah, shall be defiled as the place of Tophet.*” Zechariah describes the contemptible wages as having been thrown into the valley of Ben Hinnom or Tophet, partly because this was an unclean place, but more particularly *for the purpose of renewing the prophecy of Jeremiah*, and to show that a second fulfilment of this prophecy would take place, inasmuch, as the justice of God, which dictated the threat and its first fulfilment, would be again provoked, and even in a still more fearful manner. The sign of the base ingratitude of the Jewish nation, the *corpus*

*delicti*, is carried to the very same spot from which their former abominations cried to God and called down his vengeance. A new pledge, as it were, is deposited there which the nation will be obliged to redeem at the proper time. The selection of the potter's ground, in particular, is made with reference to chap. 18. The prophet is represented there as paying a visit to the potter's house at the command of the Lord, just at the time when the potter was at work. "And the vessel that he made of clay was marred in his hands; then he made another vessel out of the clay as it seemed good to him." The meaning of the symbol is thus described: "O house of Israel, cannot I do with you as this potter? saith the Lord. Behold, as the clay is in the potter's hand, so are ye in my hand. Behold, I frame evil against you, and devise a device against you; return ye now every one from his evil way, and amend your ways and doings." This truth, that the Lord could and would cast off his rebellious people, without acknowledging any claim on their part if they did not repent in due time, is here made prominent once more by Zechariah when he describes the contemptible wages as being brought to the spot where the truth was first uttered by Jeremiah, and which was quite as well adapted to set forth the truth in symbol in the time of Zechariah, seeing that the potter had opened his workshop there again. The circumstances also were such as to recall *this* prophecy of Jeremiah in all its force; for the former apostasy which had directly occasioned it was but slight in comparison with this, their base ingratitude towards the Lord, who had taken charge of the flock *himself*.—The explanation we have given sustains and completes the surmises of Grotius. The objection, that after השליך אל we expect to find a thing and not a person, does not apply; for "to the potter" is just the same as to the potter's house or potter's ground. Casting to the potter is used here in precisely the same sense as casting to the moles and bats, viz. to their place of resort, in Isa. 2:20. Schmieder's objection that it is impossible, or rather inconceivable, that a potter should have either his house or his workshop in an unclean spot, only shows that the passage in Jeremiah has been overlooked where it is expressly stated that the potter's workshop was in the valley of Hinnom. The valley was theologically unclean, that is, unsuitable for the performance of acts of worship (2 Kings 23:10), but in a civil point of view it was not so. So much was not conceded to theology, even in the immediate vicinity of the capital. If the valley of Hinnom was used as a burying-ground (see Krafft, *Topographie Jerus.*, p. 190 sqq.), the potter might also settle there, if it contained the proper earth for his purpose. Now Krafft (p. 193) has shown that this kind of earth is really to be found there: "Then follows the Aceldama or field of blood, as it is called in tradition, with a few graves or natural grottoes and quarries in the corner. The testimony of tradition as to the exact site is confirmed by the fact, that a little higher up there is a considerable bed of white earth or pipe-clay, where I frequently saw people employed in digging."—The most widely adopted of the interpretations which differ from our own, is "to the treasure," or "to the treasurer," and appeal is made to the authority of the Syriac, where the word is translated *treasury*. Of the advocates of this exposition, some maintain, with Kimchi, that יוצר is synonymous with אוצר; others, with Jonathan, that יוצר means *treasurer*; and others again, for example Jahn and Hitzig, suggest the reading יוצר, which they regard as synonymous with אוצר. But this explanation could hardly have been defended by any one who was acquainted with the passages already quoted from Jeremiah. For no one could place these passages side by side with the verse before us without surmising at once that there was a connection between them, though he might not be able to determine its precise nature, especially if he observed how nearly every verse in the chapter is related in some way to Jeremiah, and that there are traces in other parts of the chapter of the use which has been made of Jer. 18 and 19 (compare ver. 9 with Jer. 18:21 and 19:9). It does not even give a good sense, or rather it gives no sense at all. For how could the temple-treasures be introduced in this connection? It would have

done *honour* to the thirty pieces of silver to place them among these. Dishonourable gains were not allowed to be brought into the treasury of the temple (Deut. 23:18; Matt. 27:6). Moreover, the root רצו is never used interchangeably with רצי. There are more than forty other passages in which this word *jozer* occurs, and it always means an image-maker or potter. It is used with peculiar frequency in this sense in Jer. 18 and 19, and also in Zech. 12:1.—Again, the expression *throw it* does not harmonize with this rendering. It evidently denotes a contemptuous action, and there would have been nothing contemptuous in depositing the money in the treasury of the temple. What is thrown away in disgust cannot be placed among the temple-treasures. Maurer's rendering, "*mittitur in templum pecunia*" is simply a proof of inability to explain the words as they stand in the text. In this case it would have been better to leave the explanation in the hands of the Jews! In Hofmann's opinion, the meaning of the passage is, "He regards the money as worth no more than the clay that is used by the potter." In this case *the* potter would be equivalent to *a* potter. But Jeremiah, on the one hand, and Matthew, on the other, both point to one potter in particular. And what a singular mode of expression it would be, if "to the potter" meant "to the clay."—*The glory of the price, which I have been valued at by them:* in other words, "the glorious price (ironically, *egregium scilicet pretium*) at which they have estimated my person and my work." (Compare Deut. 32:6, "Do ye thus requite the Lord, O foolish people and unwise.")—*And I threw it, the amount (or it, the price), into the house of the Lord, that it might be carried thence to the potter.* There can be no doubt in this case that the money could not possibly be taken to the temple and the potter at the same time. For the potter did not work in the temple, nor even in the city; but, as we have already seen, in the valley of Hinnom. From the very nature of the case, there cannot have been any potter in the house of the Lord. We must suppose, therefore, that it was taken first of all to the temple and then to the potter; and this is very clearly indicated by the use of אָל before הַיּוֹצֵר "away to the potter," in other words, "to be carried thence to the potter." But the question arises here, why was the money taken first of all to the temple when it was ultimately to be left on the potter's ground? Evidently, *because the temple was the place where the people appeared before the Lord.* There, therefore, the nation was to be upbraided with its shameful ingratitude by the return of the contemptible wages. The money was then to be carried away to the potter, because dishonourable money could not remain in the temple, Deut. 23:19. *Talm. tract. Sanhedrim*, f. 112.

We have hitherto been seeking to solve the difficulties connected with vers. 13 and 14, altogether apart from the fulfilment. And the following is the explanation obtained. The Lord has once more undertaken the office of Shepherd over the flock which is devoted to the slaughter, the unhappy nation of Israel; and when he lays the office down again, on account of its determined unbelief, he demands his wages. They give him thirty pieces of silver. He is not content with such miserable pay, and throws it down in the temple. It is carried thence, as being unclean, and taken to the potter's ground, where it is left as a pledge of divine vengeance, until the day when judgment falls upon the nation. The meaning of this symbolical representation we found to be, that after the Lord had given up his people on account of their hardness of heart, their obduracy would be displayed once more in some striking act of ingratitude towards him, and by this they would render themselves completely ripe for judgment.

The agreement between the prophecy and its fulfilment is so striking in this instance that it would force itself at once upon us, even if no reference had been made to it in the New Testament itself. What else could the last and most fearful manifestation of ingratitude towards the Good Shepherd predicted here possibly be, but the murderous attack by

which the Jews rewarded the fidelity of Christ as a shepherd, and for the execution of which Judas was bribed? It is not merely in the event regarded as a whole, however, but even in the details there is the closest connection between the history and the prophecy. The miserable payment of thirty pieces of silver is introduced here primarily, as a figurative representation of the blackest ingratitude and the most supreme contempt on the part of the Jews. Yet one cannot but be struck with the fact, that of all the small sums possible, the very one which Judas the traitor actually received should have been singled out. Nor can this have been altogether accidental. Whilst the bribery of Judas the traitor was in itself a proof of the basest ingratitude, the fact that when Judas left it to the priests to fix the terms (Matt. 26:15), they only gave him the contemptible sum of thirty pieces of silver, was a manifestation of the greatest contempt towards the Lord himself. There is no force in the objection brought by Paulus (*Comm.* iii. p. 683), that Zechariah represents the thirty pieces of silver as paid to the shepherd, not to his betrayer. The insignificant remuneration paid to the betrayer was really an expression of contempt towards the shepherd. And thus also it came to pass, under the superintending providence of God, whose secret influence extends even to the ungodly, that Judas threw the money into the temple, so that what Zechariah had witnessed inwardly took place here outwardly, the people were upbraided with their ingratitude by a symbolical action in the place where they were accustomed to appear before the Lord. The priests carried the money away from the temple as being impure, and bought a wretched piece of ground in the very same valley which had once before been defiled by innocent blood, and had called down the vengeance of God upon Jerusalem as predicted by Jeremiah, and on the very same spot where Jeremiah had formerly proclaimed to the people their rejection by the Lord. Here, then, was the blood-money deposited, the *τμηὴ αἱματός* (Matt. 27:6), the reward for betraying innocent blood (ver. 4), from which the field received the name of “field of blood” (ver. 8; Acts 1:19), and here did it lie as a witness against Israel, a pledge by which the nation had bound itself to submit to the punishment of God; and inasmuch as it resembled the former one, which they had already been obliged to redeem, the threat uttered by Jeremiah in connection with these earlier abominations had now recovered its full force again. Compare Jer. 19:4 sqq., “They have filled this place with the blood of innocents, . . . therefore, behold the days come, saith the Lord, that this place shall no more be called Tophet, nor the valley of Hinnom, but the valley of slaughter.” There are words to the same effect in chap. 7:32. Tradition also places the field of blood in the valley of Hinnom, in perfect accordance with the results which we have obtained from a comparison of the accounts in the New Testament with the words of Jeremiah and Zechariah (see Lightfoot in *Acta Ap. Opp.*, ii. p. 690, and Krafft *ut supra*).

The results, which we have so clearly obtained from a comparison of prophecy and history, are confirmed by the express testimony of the Apostle Matthew (chap. 27:9). But there are certain difficulties connected with this passage.

The first occurs in the introductory clause, in which the prophecy is attributed to Jeremiah (“then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet saying”).

Many of the earlier commentators (Sanctius, Glass, Frischmuth) conjectured that the passage as given by Matthew was compounded from the two prophets Jeremiah and Zechariah, and that the name of the former alone was mentioned, as the more distinguished of the two. But to this it was very properly objected, that the passages of Jeremiah, to which they referred, ought certainly to have some connection with the event narrated by Matthew. To this objection they were unable to reply, partly because they did



not perceive in what relation the prophecy of Zechariah stood to the passages cited from Jeremiah, and partly also because they did not observe the profound meaning which Matthew detects in the fact that the potter's field was purchased as the field of blood. Grotius is the only one of all the commentators who has in the slightest degree hinted at this. "When Matthew," he says, "quotes this saying of Jeremiah, which is repeated by Zechariah, he tacitly declares that the Jews are threatened with the same judgments as these prophets had foretold to the men of their own times." But the objection is fully answered by the remarks we have already made. We have shown that the prophecy of Zechariah is for the most part simply a renewal of that of Jeremiah, that he announces a second fulfilment, which will not merely be accidentally associated with the first announcement, but essentially connected with it, inasmuch as it rests upon the fundamental idea of the justice of God, which is sure to bring about a fresh fulfilment whenever it receives a fresh provocation.

Matthew might certainly have quoted *both* prophets. But such lengthened quotations are contrary to the custom of the writers in the New Testament. For this a twofold reason may be assigned. They could justly presuppose a very accurate acquaintance with the Scriptures on the part of their readers; and they placed the human instrumentality employed far behind the divine author, the spirit of God and of Christ, which spoke equally in all the prophets. Very frequently, therefore, in fact almost universally, the human author is not mentioned by name at all. The writer contents himself with the simple formula of quotation, "The Scriptures saith," "as it is written," "for it is written," "as the Holy Spirit saith," or "as God hath said." It not infrequently happens that two or even three passages from different authors are combined together into one, and yet the name of only one author is given. The passage which presents the closest analogy to the one under consideration is Mark 1:2, 3: "As it is written in the prophet Isaiah, Behold I send my messenger before thy face, who shall prepare thy way before thee. The voice of one crying," etc. In this case two predictions are quoted under the name of Isaiah, one from Malachi and the other from Isaiah himself; and more than this, the prophecy of Malachi stands first. Isaiah was the more celebrated prophet; and it had become so much a custom to refer to the minor prophets as a whole, in consequence of their having been united together in a single collection, that it is very rarely indeed that any one of them is mentioned by name. (Compare Matt. 21:5 with Isa. 62:11 and Zech. 9:9; and Matt. 21:13 with Isa. 56: 7, Jer. 7:11, Rom. 9:27, 1 Pet. 2:6 sqq.)

If Matthew had simply intended to call attention to the fulfilment Zechariah's prophecy, he would have contented himself with a general formula of quotation. This is evident from the analogy of the other quotations from Zechariah, in not one of which the Prophet is mentioned by name. Thus, in John 19:37, the words of chap. 12:10 are introduced in this general way, "and again another Scripture saith;" in John 12:14, where a quotation from chap. 9:9 occurs, we merely find, "as it is written;" in Matt. 26:31, where Zech. 13:7 is quoted, "for it is written" (compare Mark 14:27); and in Matt. 21:4, 5, a quotation from chap. 9:9 is headed thus, "that which was spoken by the prophet," where the article shows that Matthew could take for granted that all his readers were well acquainted with the prophet referred to. But although it might appear to him unnecessary to mention Zechariah by name, this was not the case with Jeremiah. The fact that there was a fulfilment of his prophecy in the event narrated, and the extent to which this was the case, were not so immediately obvious as to render directions for further research unnecessary. And yet, if this was overlooked, the meaning of Zechariah's prophecy would be involved in obscurity, and the most essential features of the fulfilment misunderstood.

It only remains to show that the quotation in Matthew fully coincides with the passage before us, in substance at least, if not in words. We must, first of all, endeavour to determine the meaning of the words καὶ ἔλαβον τὰ τριάκοντα ἀργύρια, τὴν τιμὴν τοῦ τετιμημένου ὃν ἐτιμήσαντο ἀπὸ υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ. We render them thus: “They took the price of him who was valued, at which they had valued him on the part of the children of Israel.” To obtain this meaning we do not supply the τίνες before ἀπὸ τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ which Fritzsche has very properly rejected, though he has not thereby established his own extremely forced interpretation. We rather apply the Hebrew and Aramean usage, according to which the third person indefinite, which again takes the place of the passive, is expressed by the third person plural. We may cite as an example from the New Testament, Luke 12:20, τὴν ψυχὴν σου ἀπαιτοῦσιν ἀπὸ σοῦ. The words ἀπὸ υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ, “on the part of the children of Israel,” answer to מִיַּד יִשְׂרָאֵל in Zechariah. (Compare Jas. 1:13, ἀπὸ θεοῦ πειράζομαι: I am tempted on the part of God.) The name is given in Matthew in the place of the pronoun, to call attention to the shameful character of the valuation. It was not the heathen from whom it proceeded, but the people of the covenant, who had received such innumerable proofs of the love and mercy of the Lord. The apparent discrepancy, arising from the fact that in Matthew it is the rulers of the Jews who are said to take the pieces of silver, and throw them upon the potter’s field, whereas Zechariah attributes this to the shepherd, is removed by Matthew himself in the words καθὰ συνέταξέν μοι κύριος, which he introduces at the end, and which answer to the יְהוָה אֱמַר יְיָ of Zechariah. He evidently intimates in these words that he regards the rulers of the nation not as acting independently, but merely as instruments through whom the Lord accomplished his purposes. Moreover, Matthew had the words of our verse in his mind for a long time before he actually quoted them. Compare chap. 26:15, “What will ye *give* me (answering to the words ‘*give* me my wages’ in the verse before us; the evangelist looks upon Judas as an instrument in the hands of Christ, who demands his wages, as it were, through him at the hands of the Jews), and I will deliver him unto you. And they covenanted (ἔστησαν, the Septuagint rendering in this passage) with him for thirty pieces of silver.”

Ver. 14. “*And I broke my second staff, the United Ones, to destroy the brotherhood between Judah and Israel.*”

(Compare ver. 7.) There is no intimation of the staff having been originally composed of two distinct pieces of wood. Its fitness as a symbol was purely ideal, and it was only when it was broken that there was an actual resemblance between the sign and the thing signified. It is not without a reason that the payment of the wages of thirty pieces of silver is placed between the breaking of the first and second staves. It served at the same time to justify the first judgment and provoke the second. The meaning of the prophet is this: after the Lord has forsaken his people, the most pernicious discord will arise among them, discord as destructive in its character as the former conflicts between Judah and Israel. He expresses this in his usual figurative style (see the remarks on vers. 10, 11) in these terms, “The Lord will cause the brotherhood between Judah and Israel to cease,” which is equivalent to the declaration in ver. 9, “They will eat one another’s flesh.” The prophecy was fulfilled, as we have already observed, in the time of the Roman war, when the Jews destroyed one another in the fury of their party contentions.<sup>32</sup> In Zechariah’s days the severe wound inflicted upon the nation by the separation of Judah and Israel (Isa. 7:17) began to heal, and in chap. 10 he predicts a perfect cure. The restoration of unity is one of the most delightful prospects which Ezekiel sets before the nation (chap. 37:15 sqq.). But

at a still later period a fresh sin on the part of the nation would again deprive it of the blessing.<sup>33</sup>

Ver. 15. "*And the Lord said to me, Take unto thee again the instruments of a foolish shepherd.*"<sup>34</sup>

*Again:* that is, still continuing to set forth in symbol the fate which awaits the nation. Ewald renders the passages, "take to thee *still further*." לָקַח links this action to the previous one, and shows that they are to be looked at from the same point of view. If the prophet acts as the representative of a coming shepherd in the first instance, he must do the same in the second. It is very evident, that by the foolish shepherd we are not to understand any one individual<sup>35</sup> but the whole body of bad rulers who brought about the destruction of the nation after the rejection of the Good Shepherd. We must not refer the expression to foreign rulers, however, but to the governors at home. Such threats of divine punishment as we find in ver. 17 could only be directed against the latter, since they were both instruments and sharers in the punishment, as well as the apostasy. Of the apostasy, in fact, they were the leading instigators. The former, on the other hand, are represented in ver. 5 as entirely free from sin. We have already seen that in the verse just referred to, the native governors are called shepherds, and as such are opposed to the foreign rulers, who are described as buyers and sellers.<sup>36</sup> The foolish shepherd is not identical with the wicked shepherds in ver. 8 as Schmieder supposes. The appearance of the shepherd is expressly described as *future* in ver. 16, and we naturally understand this as meaning future in relation to the ideal present; which, as we have already seen, was the time of the appearance of the Good Shepherd. "The Good Shepherd has withdrawn from the flock, the bad shepherd takes his place" (Hitzig). The reason why the actual plurality of the bad rulers is exhibited in the form of an ideal unity, is to be found in this antithesis to the one Good Shepherd. The term applied to the shepherd "foolish," not wicked, directs attention to the fact that the rulers of the nation are so blinded by the judicial punishment inflicted by God, as to be unable to see that, whilst their fury is directed against the nation, they are undermining their own good. This aspect of wickedness, viz. the folly associated with it, is frequently referred to. Compare, for example, Jer. 4:22, "For my people is foolish; they know me not; foolish children are they and without understanding; they are wise to do evil, but to do good they have no knowledge. By the *instruments of a foolish shepherd* we may understand merely the shepherd's staff if we regard the expression simply as in antithesis to what precedes, or the other instruments employed by a shepherd as well. We may imagine the shepherd's instruments as consisting of a strong stick mounted with iron, with which he wounds the sheep, whereas the Good Shepherd keeps them in order with a thin staff and gentle strokes. We may also picture to ourselves a shepherd's bag full of holes, and containing nothing of any use to either shepherd or sheep. In any case Bochart's notion must be rejected, that "There is nothing in either the appearance or attributes of the bad shepherd to distinguish him from the good; his actions alone betray him." (*Hierozy.* i. 455).

Ver. 16. "*For behold I raise up a shepherd in the land, those that perish he will not visit, the tender thing he will not seek out, nor heal that which is wounded; the strong he will not nourish, and the flesh of the fat one he will eat, and split their claws in pieces.*"

The foolish shepherd does the very opposite of what Christ the Good Shepherd is represented as doing in Isa. 42:3, "The bruised reed he will not break, and the smoking flax will he not quench." Zechariah had also several passages from Jeremiah and Ezekiel in his mind. Compare Ezek. 34:3, 4, "Ye eat the fat and ye clothe you with the wool, ye

kill the fat one and ye feed not the flock; the weak ye strengthen not, the broken ye bind not up, ye bring not back that which has broken away, neither do ye seek out that which is ready to perish;" and Jer. 23:1, 2, "Woe be unto the shepherds which destroy and scatter the sheep of my pasture, saith the Lord; therefore, thus saith the Lord God of Israel against the pastors that feed my people; ye have scattered my flock and driven them away and have not visited them." The connection with these passages is not merely an outward one. By a just judgment of God the nation had been punished by means of bad rulers before the captivity. Jeremiah and Ezekiel had promised deliverance from them, and after the captivity, namely, in the time of Zechariah, this had actually taken place when the nation was ruled in a truly paternal spirit by Zerubbabel and Joshua. Zechariah, however, announces that at a future period the same cause will again produce the same effects, and that in a heightened degree. The word "for," at the commencement, may be explained on the supposition that it assigns the reason why a symbolical action had been enjoined. רענָה, according to the current opinion, means that which has burst or broken away; Gesenius and Maurer: "*dispulsio, concr. Dispulsum.*" But as רענָ, written in precisely the same way, is used to denote "the young" in every other passage in which it occurs, there is no reason to make an exception in this instance; but on the contrary there is every reason to assume that the radical signification of tender and weak is the leading notion here, and to this the idea of *seeking* is very appropriate. We must imagine the tender one, which needs the greatest care of all the flock, as having been left behind. The verb רענָ, which is certainly also the root of רענָ, "a boy," does not suit well as the root of רענָ with the meaning *strayed*, if we consider the sense in which it is generally used. Its only meaning is *to shake*. The form also is not suitable, as we may see at once from the fact that Hitzig proposes to change the vowel points, and alter the participle into a Niphal. But the occurrence of the masculine רענָ in the midst of feminines is perfectly decisive. It is impossible to account for this if we regard the word as part of the verb. On the other hand, the noun רענָ, according to the early usages of the language, for which Zechariah has a great preference, is employed for both genders (compare Gen. 24:16 and Job 1:19). It is a matter of but little importance that רענָ is never used of animals, whether we consider the age in which Zechariah wrote, or the fact that the prophecy really relates to men. The two clauses relating to the weak and the strong are separated by Athnach. From its connection with the *fat one* it is better to explain רענָ as meaning, not that which stands still and cannot move from its place on account of hunger and exhaustion, but "that which stands upright." The analogy of the language is in favour of this, as רענָ does not mean to stand still, but to stand. The Septuagint rendering is τὸ ὀλόκληρον; that of the Vulgate: *id quod stat.*<sup>37</sup> The words "he will split their claws," do not refer to the extreme cruelty of the shepherds, as many commentators suppose, but to the avarice which is no doubt accompanied by cruelty to the sheep. There is a climax intended; he will eat, etc., he will even break the claws one from another, that not a shred of flesh may be lost.<sup>38</sup>

Ver. 17. "Woe to the worthless shepherd who leaves the flock! a sword over his arm, and over his right eye: his arm will be entirely lamed, his right eye will become quite dim."<sup>39</sup>

The arm and the right eye are mentioned as individual examples of the objects of punishment, and as the two parts of the body which are most needed by a good shepherd for tending and guarding his flock, and most shamefully abused by a bad shepherd to the ruin of the sheep. The arm is the organ of strength, the right eye of prudence. An apparent difficulty is presented by the fact that two kinds of punishment are mentioned in connection with each member, and that the two are incompatible with each other. The *sword* is first of all threatened to both; then κατὰληψις to the arm (Calvin, "The arm will

dry up, *i.e.* its strength will so thoroughly depart, that it will become like a rotten stick”), and *dimness* to the eye. But the punishments mentioned merely serve to particularize the general notion of punishment, and the prophet connects several together, to give greater distinctness to the magnitude of the punishments as well as of the crime. He was the better able to do this here, since the shepherd was not one individual, but many.

### CHAP. 12:1-13:6

A new scene opens here. The nation of the Lord, which is at war with all the nations of the earth, though weak in itself, is strong in the Lord, and is everywhere victorious (vers. 1-9). The Lord breaks the hard hearts of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and gives them the grace of repentance; so that they repent with bitter sorrow of the sins which they have committed against him. (vers. 10-14). In him they now find forgiveness for their sins (chap. 13:1), and this is followed by an earnest effort to attain to sanctification, and to remove everything of a wicked and ungodly nature in their life and conduct (vers. 2-6). The prophecy is divisible, therefore, into two parts, the victory of the people of God over the hostile heathen world (chap. 12:1-9), and the conversion of the children of the kingdom.

Commentators are divided in opinion as to the period of fulfilment, and also as to the subject of chap. 12:1-9. With regard to the former,—not to mention those who agree with Ewald in referring the prophecy to the Chaldean invasion, which took place before the time of the prophet,—there are many, with Grotius at their head, who imagine that the period of the Maccabees is here referred to. But the relation in which the present chapter stands to the preceding one is a sufficient proof that this cannot be the case. The restoration of the people of God depicted here is evidently contrasted with their rejection mentioned in the previous chapter; and if the rejection took place after the coming of Christ, the restoration cannot belong to an earlier period. This is also confirmed by chap. 12:10. The penitential and believing look, which is there described as being turned to the murdered Messiah, belongs to a later period than the Maccabean era, and points at once to the Messianic age, of which alone the forgiveness of sins and universal desire for holiness referred to in chap. 13 can possibly be signs, whether we regard them by themselves or in connection with the parallel passages. Lastly, in the earlier prophecy relating to the Maccabean era, only one nation is mentioned as hostile to the covenant nation (chap. 9:13), namely, the Greeks; but here, on the other hand, all the nations of the earth are represented as its foes.

The second difference relates to the subject of the prophecy in chap. 12:1-9. The opinion is a very old one, that the Christian Church is referred to. Jerome speaks of it as relating to the Christian Church in general and particular, in contradistinction to the Jewish. “Some of the Jews,” he says, “imagine that this prophecy was partly fulfilled in the period extending from Zerubbabel to Cneius Pompeius, who took Judea and the temple, of which occurrence an account has been written by Josephus. Others, again, suppose that it will be fulfilled when Jerusalem has been restored at the end of the world, an event which the miserable race of the Jews anticipates along with its ἡλειμμένῳ, the foolish shepherd of whom we have read above.—Lastly, there are others, *ourselves for example, who are called by the name of Christ*, who regard it as being fulfilled every day in the Christian Church, and as destined to continue to be so to the end of the world.” Cyril, Marck, and

many others adopt the same opinion. That this explanation, in the form in which it is generally given, is inadmissible, cannot for a moment be doubted. The expounders of the prophets alone, not the prophets themselves, know anything of a spiritual, as distinguished from the outward Israel. It can only be adopted in a modified form, viz. when the covenant nation is understood as meaning that portion of Israel which welcomed and believed on the Messiah when he came, and which received the heathen nations into its bosom, instead of merely uniting with them as an independent body and on an equal footing, so as to form together one Church. There would still be one view which might be adduced in opposition to this, namely, that the subject of the prophecy is not the Church of the New Testament generally, of which the first-fruits of Israel formed the kernel and stem, but the Church of the last days, when the *whole* of the people of the ancient covenant will have been delivered by the mercy of God from the sentence of hardness passed upon them, and will again be received into the kingdom of God, of which they are to form the centre. At first sight, there is something very plausible in this view, which is supported by Vitranga (*Observv. s. 1. ii., c. 9, p. 172*), C. B. Michaelis, Dathe, and others. The principal argument in its favour is founded upon chap. 12:10 sqq. “According to this passage, those who now receive the powerful assistance of the Lord are those who formerly put him to death. With the *national guilt*, which is depicted in chap. 11 in connection with the punishment that follows, there is here contrasted *national lamentation* on account of it; and such strong expressions are employed to indicate its universality, that it cannot possibly relate to the few Israelites who turned to the Lord immediately after the crucifixion.” But it is erroneously assumed here, that the persons represented in chap. 12:1-9 as receiving the powerful help of the Lord, are the same as those who are described in chap. 12:10 sqq. as mourning in bitterness. A proof to the contrary, however, may be found in the circumstance, that the conversion is *preceded* by the victorious conflict with the heathen world. Again, the people, as we see them at the end of chap. 11, cannot possibly be those referred to in chap. 12:1-9. The former can only be the objects of punitive justice, not of saving grace. The conclusion to which we are brought, therefore, is rather that the persons referred to in chap. 12:1-9 are the poor sheep, who are represented in chap. 11 as giving heed to the Good Shepherd, along with such believing Gentiles as had been received as part of Israel. But it is unnatural to suppose that Zechariah passes all at once from the death of Christ to the final history of the kingdom of God; that he makes no allusion to the glorious events which lie between, to the splendid triumphs over the heathen world which have already taken place, and that he says nothing further about the intimation given in chap. 9:10, he speaks peace to the heathen, and his dominion is from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth.” It cannot be said that the fact may be explained from the peculiar interest taken in the history of Israel. *The Christian Church is from its very commencement the legitimate continuation of Israel*, the wicked having been rooted out from the nation, and those who were Gentiles by birth having been incorporated into Israel on the ground of their faith. The Saviour himself clearly indicated this at the very outset by calling his Church “Israel” (Matt. 19:28); and it was from this point of view alone that the number of apostles appointed for the whole Church (Matt. 28:19) corresponded to that of the tribes of Israel. According to Paul, there is but one olive tree, one people of God, one Israel from the beginning to the end. In Rom. 11:18, Israel is represented as the root of the Christian Church. In Rom. 11:7—“the election hath obtained it, the rest are hardened”—the emphasis must not be laid upon the latter in a one-sided manner. According to Eph. 2:12 and 19, when the Gentiles come to Christ, they are incorporated into the “commonwealth of Israel,” as “fellow-citizens with the saints” (“Israelis;” Bengel). That Israel is the root of the Christian Church is also apparent from the intercessory prayer of Christ (John 17:6-

8), where he refers to the Church on earth as founded already, before a single Gentile had been admitted into it<sup>40</sup>—There is just as little ground for restricting the second part of the prophecy to the final history of the Church as for limiting the first in this way.

The first day of Pentecost, which it evidently included in chap. 12:10, enters a decided protest against such a limitation. *In both parts there are combined into one picture both that which is gradually realized in history, and that which takes place in a series of distinct events.*—We have a repetition of the first part in the prophecy of the fall of Rome, as the heathen mistress of the world, in Rev. 17, and in the announcement of the victory of Christ over the ten kings, the instruments employed in inflicting his judgments upon Rome, in Rev. 19:11-21, where the means employed by Christ are hunger, pestilence, and especially murderous discord. Even chap. 17:14 of the book of Revelation, where the victory obtained by Christ over the heathen through the power of the word is thus described, “These shall make war with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them: for he is Lord of lords and King of kings; and they that are with him are called, and chosen, and faithful,” is to be regarded as included in this prophecy. Our remarks on Ps. 97 are also applicable here, “The coming of Christ partook of the character of a judgment, even with regard to those of the heathen, who submitted to the gospel: the worthlessness of their whole existence was thus brought to light, and deep shame took the place of pride and haughty contempt of Zion.”

We must call attention here to the strict agreement between the first and second portions of Zechariah, to which we have already alluded. Chap. 9 and 10 correspond exactly to chap. 1-4. In both we have a description of the blessings to be bestowed upon the covenant nation previous to the coming of Christ, but still more especially of those to be enjoyed in consequence of his coming. Chap. 11 answers to chap. 5. In both we find an account of the divine judgments which would be inflicted upon the unbelieving and ungodly portion of the covenant nation after its ungodliness had been, most openly displayed in the rejection of the Messiah. Chap. 6:1-8 contains a brief notice of the events which are more fully described in the prophecy before us and in chap. 14.

Ver. 1. “*The burden of the word of the Lord upon Israel; Thus saith the Lord, which stretcheth forth the heaven and layeth the foundation of the earth, and formeth the spirit of man within him.*”

We have already seen (chap. 9:1) that  $\text{נִשְׁבַּע}$  never means utterance, but always *burden*, and that it only occurs in the superscription of prophecies containing threatenings of evil. In such cases the proper name, which follows it in the construct state, or is connected with it by  $\text{כִּי}$  or  $\text{עַל}$ , indicates the object of the threats contained in the prophecy, or of the coming judgments. It is without ground, therefore, that some propose to render  $\text{נִשְׁבַּע}$  *prophecy* in this one passage, and to give to  $\text{עַל}$  the meaning *of*. The double  $\text{לֵעַל}$  in ver. 2, which points to the pressing calamity, and also the  $\text{לֵעַל}$  in ver. 3, correspond to  $\text{אֲשֶׁר}$  in the sense of *burden*. An exceptional rendering of the word here is all the more inadmissible, when we compare the perfectly analogous superscription in chap. 9:1, and that in Mal. 3:1, which is almost word for word the same. It is also equally indisputable that Israel can only refer to the covenant nation. This was its highest and holiest name, which could not be transferred to any other. How, then, are we to explain the fact that the announcement which follows holds up before the people of the covenant the prospect of salvation? “We reply, that severe calamities, to be endured by the people of God, form the starting-point of the section (chap. 12-14), to the whole of which, in a certain sense, the heading “burden over Israel” belongs, in contradistinction to the burden of Hadrach in chap. 9:1. In the words of

Christ in Matt. 24:9, “Ye shall be hated of all men for my name sake,” we have the New Testament version of this prophecy. There is a mitigation of the announcement, however, in the name “Israel.” The word of the Lord cannot press as a burden upon Israel in the same sense as upon Hadrach. The words of the Psalms are applicable here: “Many are the afflictions of the righteous; but the Lord delivereth him out of them all.” In Ps. 73:1 it is said, “Truly God is good to Israel, even to such as are of a clean heart,” notwithstanding the severe afflictions with which they are visited,—a passage which bears upon the verse before us, inasmuch as the limiting clause shows that by Israel we are to understand the election alone, the true Israelites in whom there is no guile, to the exclusion of the false seed.—In ver. 1, Israel is mentioned; in vers. 2-9, Jerusalem and Judah; in ver. 10 sqq., the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem. The reason of this variation, which is evidently not accidental, is the following: Israel, the most sacred name, is placed, with the strongest emphasis, at the head. It is afterwards scrupulously avoided, to render it the more conspicuous, that it is used here in an emphatic sense. In vers. 2-9, the covenant nation is designated Judah and Jerusalem,—a combination for which Zechariah shows a strong predilection in the first part also. (Compare 1:12, 2:2, where Israel, the sacred name, is placed side by side with Judah and Jerusalem, and 2:16.) This may be accounted for from the circumstances of the times succeeding the captivity, when Judah took the lead unconditionally, and the other tribes attached themselves to it. That Israel does not merely mean Judah here, but that Judah, on the contrary, is the name given to the whole nation, is evident from chap. 10, where the return of Joseph and Ephraim is depicted. The latter cannot be regarded as excluded in this instance. Lastly, the change of name in ver. 10 sqq. shows that the Church is regarded there from a different point of view.—The predicates connected with the name of God serve at the outset to allay any doubts that might arise from the discrepancy between the promise and the actual circumstances, by pointing to the omnipotence of the author of the former. What is here implied is explicitly stated in chap. 8:6: “If it be marvellous in the eyes of the remnant of this people in these days, should it also be marvellous in mine eyes? saith the Lord of hosts.”<sup>41</sup> The participles  $\eta\eta\text{ } \eta$  and  $\eta\eta\text{ } \eta$  are not to be understood as referring exclusively to the past. In direct opposition to the mechanical view of the works of God, as standing when once created in just the same relation to him as a house to the builder, the upholding of these works is represented in the Scriptures as being, in a certain sense, a continuous creation. Every day God spreads out the heavens, every day he lays the foundations of the earth, which would wander from its orbit and fall into ruins if it were not upheld by his power. The last predicate, also, does not refer merely to the first creation of the spirit of man, but to the constant exertion of the power of God both to create and to sustain. The formation of the human spirit is brought forward here with peculiar prominence as one of the many works of the almighty power of God, because this is the ground of the unrestrained and constant influence which is exerted upon the spirits of men by him who “turns the hearts of kings as the waterbrooks.” Why should not the creator of the spirits of all men, the “God of the spirits of all flesh” (Num. 16:22, 27:16), be able to smite all the riders of the enemy with blindness, and fill the leaders of his people with holy boldness, as he is represented as doing in vers. 4 and 6?

Ver. 2. “Behold, I make Jerusalem a basin of reeling to all the nations round about, and even over Judah it will be in the siege against Jerusalem.”

$\eta\eta$  occurs indisputably in Ex. 12:22, and several other passages in the sense of “basin.” The reason why a basin is introduced here in the place of the *cup*, which we find in the earlier passage upon which this is based, has been plausibly explained by Schmieder thus:



“A basin, to which many may put their mouths so as to sip and drink at the same time.” לַעֲרָר has the same meaning as הִלְעָרָה in the earlier passage, “reeling,” “giddiness.” The giddiness is regarded here as a state in which the bodily strength is weakened. The point of comparison is the helplessness and misery of the condition. The cup of giddiness is frequently used as a symbol of the judgment of God, which places men in this condition. Thus, in Ps. 75:9, “For in the hand of the Lord there is a cup, and it foams with wine; it is full of mixture, and he pours out, and even the dregs thereof the wicked of the earth must swallow and drink.” The reference here is to the judgments which God prepares for the heathen world on account of their oppression of his people and his kingdom. See further Isa. 51:17, 22, 23. “Awake, awake, O Jerusalem, which hast drunk at the hand of the Lord the cup of his fury; thou hast drunk the dregs of the cup of giddiness, and wrung them out. Behold, I take out of thy hand the cup of giddiness, the dregs of the cup of my fury; thou shalt no more drink it again. And I will put it into the hand of them that afflict thee, which have said to thy soul, bow down,” etc. When Jerusalem, subsequent to the coming of the Good Shepherd, in other words, the Church of Christ, is represented here as being a cup of giddiness to all nations round about, that is, to the whole surrounding heathen world, this can only mean that their attacks upon Jerusalem will be followed by such judgments from the hand of God as will deprive them of all their strength. He who presents the cup of giddiness, as the earlier passages prove, can be no other than God himself, whose judgments begin indeed at the house of God, but never continue to press as a “burden” upon it. In the description given of the enemies there is a gradation. Here they are called “all nations round about;” in ver. 3, first “all nations,” and then, “all the nations of the earth.” We are introduced here to a state of things such as never existed under the Old Testament. *It was for the name of Christ that Israel was first hated of all nations.* Its earlier conflicts with the heathen world had all been with particular nations. The kingdom of God was first involved in a general conflict with the heathen world when it put forth world-wide claims, and, not content with defending its own existence, assumed the attitude of a conqueror. According to one of the explanations most generally adopted, the meaning of the second part is that Judah also will be constrained by the enemy, and take part in the siege of Jerusalem.<sup>42</sup> The supporters of this view are obliged to invent historical details, of which there is not only not the slightest indication in the text, but rather the very opposite. Again, nothing is gained by appealing to chap. 14:14; for when the verse is correctly rendered, there is no allusion whatever to any conflict between Judah and Jerusalem.<sup>43</sup> The true rendering is this: also over Judah it will come in the siege against Jerusalem. Luther’s translation is substantially correct: “It will also affect Judah, when Jerusalem is besieged.” The subject יהיה is to be obtained in part from אַשְׁמַנִּים, *burden*, in part also from the first clause. If Jerusalem is made a cup of giddiness, its own severe suffering is presupposed. We cannot supply רוּצֵם after יהיה. רוּצֵם can only apply to a fortress, not to a country (see Deut. 20:20). Hofmann supposes the country population to have taken refuge in the city. But this is precluded by what follows, where Judah is represented as acting independently of Jerusalem. Judah and Jerusalem are apparently contrasted here as the inferior and superior portions of the covenant nation;—a similar distinction is made in ver. 8, within Jerusalem itself, between the house of David and the rest of the inhabitants. The type of this distinction lay before the prophet in the relation in which Jerusalem, the civil and religious capital, stood to the rest of Judah, which had formerly looked up to it with wonder and admiration, and still continued to do so (see, for example, Ps. 122 and 87:2, “The Lord loveth the gates of Zion more than all the dwellings of Jacob”). Very little can be said in favour of the idea that this contrast, which we meet with in the first part as well (chap. 1:12, 2:16), is to be taken with strict literality, especially in the case of Zechariah, the character of whose prophecies is throughout

figurative and symbolical. The contrast serves merely to prepare the way for the announcement which follows, that the Lord will first of all deliver the weakest and most helpless portion of the covenant nation, in order that it may be all the more apparent that the rescue is his work.

Ver. 3. *“And it will come to pass the same day, I will make Jerusalem a burdensome stone for all nations: all who lift it will be torn in pieces, and all the heathen of the earth are gathered together against it.”*

The figure of a heavy stone, which causes sprains and dislocations to those who overrate their strength and try to lift it, is so lucid in itself<sup>44</sup> that there is no reason to suppose, as most commentators have done, that there is a direct allusion to a custom which Jerome says was very general in Palestine in his day, of lifting heavy stones as a trial of strength. Schmieder observes here with perfect accuracy, “Thus did the heathen of the Roman empire attempt to lift the ‘burdensome stone’ of the Christian Church by slaying the witnesses for Christ; but the heathenism of Rome bled to death of the wounds, which this ‘burdensome stone’ inflicted in return.” But when he adds, “It cannot yet be determined with certainty whether reference is made to the literal siege of a Christian Jerusalem, or whether the figure of a siege is merely the symbol of a hostile attack upon the heart of the Christian life,” we must beg leave to differ from him. If the fulfilment commences with the death of the Anointed One, Jerusalem can only stand for the centre of the Christian Church. And we are also led to this conclusion by the fact that in chap. 11 the whole of the holy land, and therefore of course the literal Jerusalem, is represented as given up to total desolation. A real conflict between the city of Jerusalem and all the nations of the earth is in itself a very improbable thing. We have evidently here a comprehensive view of that which appears in history in a long series of events, the victorious course of the militant Church through the many centuries of the world’s history, dating from the appearance of the Good Shepherd. But we have, lastly, a decisive proof that the prophecy does not relate to the literal Jerusalem, in the repetition of the same announcement in the book of Revelation, where we find, not Jerusalem, but simply the Christian Church, which overcomes first of all heathen Rome, then the ten heathen kings, and last of all that form of heathenism which is revived in Gog and Magog.—In the words, *“and there assemble themselves”* etc., the prophet again describes the danger in the strongest terms, in order that the deliverance may appear the more wonderful from the contrast, and also that those who believe may not be disheartened.

Ver. 4. *“In that day, saith the Lord, I will smite every horse with fear, and their riders with madness; and upon the house of Judah I will open my eyes, and I will smite every horse of the nations with blindness.”*

“He confirms what he has said a short time before, that although the whole world should conspire against the Church, yet there is strength enough in God either to thwart all their attacks from afar or to bring them to nought. And he mentions stupor, folly, and blindness in order that the faithful may learn that God can destroy or scatter his enemies by secret means. Although, therefore, he does not fight with material swords, or employ the common method of warfare, yet, says the prophet, he is provided with other means of prostrating his foes.” Horse and rider are characteristics of the might of the heathen; compare Ex. 15:1, and Ps. 20:8, “Some think of chariots, and some of horses; but we will think of the name of the Lord our God.” The figure alone is all that we find relating to ordinary warfare here. Chap. 9:11 sqq., where an actual war is referred to, has much more of a military character. The sword and the bow, arrows, trumpets, blood, etc., are all

mentioned there. The meaning of the expression, “smite the riders with madness,” is brought clearly before us in 2 Kings 6:18, where the Lord answers the prayer of Elisha by blinding his enemies, so that instead of taking him they rush into destruction. The *house* of Judah does not simply mean Judah itself, as it does in the foregoing and following verses where Judah is contrasted with Jerusalem, but appears to embrace the whole of the covenant nation.

Ver. 5. *“And the princes<sup>45</sup> of Judah say in their hearts, The inhabitants of Jerusalem are strength to me in the Lord of hosts, their God.”*

הַמְּצָנִים must be taken as a noun. Any other rendering is grammatically inadmissible, and fails to give an appropriate meaning. Vers. 6 and 7 throw light upon this passage. It is emphatically stated there that God will first of all deliver the weakest and most exposed portion of the covenant nation or Church, represented by the inhabitants of the provinces, as distinguished from the inhabitants of the capital, and will give them the most splendid victory over the common foe, that the former splendour of Jerusalem may not be so increased by the new distinction conferred upon it as to throw Judah completely into the shade. In the verse before us the way is prepared for this announcement by the statement that Judah does not entertain the most remote idea of any such good fortune and honour, but waits in calm humility and modesty, looking for deliverance solely from the capital, which is peculiarly favoured by God, and enjoys his especial protection. Its own confession of inferiority renders it all the more obvious that the glory which follows is a work of God, who is strong in the weak, and giveth grace to the humble. Schmieder justly observes that the princes of Judah are “a type of the leaders of those that believe, in every future age, whatever different names or titles they may bear in the course of centuries.” The use of לְ for לָנֹי may be explained on the supposition that the princes of Judah speak in the name of the whole nation, just as in chap. 7:3 the messengers of the people of the covenant inquire, “Shall I weep, as I have done?”

Ver. 6. *“In that day will I make the princes of Judah like a pan of fire in the midst of sticks, and like a torch of fire among sheaves; and they devour on the right hand and on the left all the nations round about: and Jerusalem sits still further in her place at Jerusalem.”*

Jerusalem is personified in the first place as a woman. Notwithstanding all the acquisitions of her enemies, who are desirous of overthrowing her, she still continues to sit where she has hitherto been sitting. In Isa. 47:1, an announcement of an opposite character is made respecting Babylon, the representative of the world, “Come down and sit in the dust, O virgin daughter of Babylon; sit on the ground without a throne, O daughter of the Chaldeans.”

Ver. 7. *“And the Lord will succour the tents of Judah first, that the splendour of the house of David and the splendour of the inhabitants of Jerusalem do not exalt itself over Judah.”*

The tents or huts<sup>46</sup> of Judah are contrasted with the splendid buildings of the capital, and probably indicate the defenceless condition of Judah, which made it absolutely dependent upon the assistance of God. There is a parallel passage in Ezek. 38:11. The clause “that the splendour, etc., do not exalt itself,” refers not to the help of God, which was to be afforded to Jerusalem quite as much as to Judah, and in fact through the medium of Judah, but to the expressionist, the false renderings of which it serves to preclude. It is not

without a sufficient reason that תִּפְאָרָתָהּ is not repeated before Judah. “The simple mention of the name of Judah shows that Judah possessed no splendour on which it could pride itself.”—Burckhardt. תִּפְאָרָתָהּ, not “the boast,” but the splendour and glory. The reference is simply to the possession of superior advantages, which, however, from the tendency of human nature might easily lead to self-exaltation not only over other men, but over God himself, and an excessive accumulation of which ought therefore to be guarded against. The prophet appears to have had in his mind such an abuse as Jerusalem had formerly made of its superiority to the provinces in this respect. The strong are rescued by the weak in order that the true equilibrium may be maintained, and, as *Jerome* says, “It may be made apparent that in either case the victory is the Lord’s.” The “house of David” is the royal family in the kingdom of God, which culminated in Christ, and is continued in the princes and potentates in the kingdom of God, who become partakers of his spirit. In Ps. 45:17, the kings of the Messianic kingdom are represented as the Messiah’s sons, and therefore as members of the house of David.

Ver. 8. “*In that day will the Lord defend the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and the stumbling among them in that day will be as David; and the house of David as God, as the angel of the Lord before them.*”

The article in הַנִּפְצָלִים (the stumbling one) divides the inhabitants of Jerusalem into two classes, the weak and the strong. The former are to take the place which was once occupied by the strongest man among the latter, viz. David their ancestor, the brave hero and king; the latter are to occupy a position which had no existence in the previous economy. This is the prophet’s method of expressing, by one particular example, the general idea that at that time the Lord would exalt his own people to a glory of which they had no conception before. The New Testament parallel is Luke 7:28, “For I say unto you, among those that are born of women there is not a greater prophet than John the Baptist; but he that is least in the kingdom of God is greater than he.” To the concluding words, “and the house of David,” etc., there is a parallel in Matt. 3:11, where John the Baptist says, “He that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear.” He is a weak man לַשָּׁכֵן (lit. stumbling, then weak generally, cf. 1 Sam. 2:4) in comparison with the Son of David, who comes after him. *Elohim*, by which many of the earlier expositors understood “angels” here, denotes divinity in general as contrasted with human nature (see the comm. on Ps. 8:5). On the other hand, the expression “*the angel of the Lord*” (not *an* angel as many render it), the revealer of God, to whom Zechariah frequently attributes both his names and his works, sets before us a distinct form within the sphere of duty. The expression “*before them*” also leads to the conclusion that *the* angel of the Lord is intended; for there is evidently an allusion to the march through the desert, in which not merely *an* angel, but *the* angel of the Lord led the way. (Compare vol. i. p. 118, and also the remarks on Mic. 2:13, vol. i. p. 433.) A hyperbole, such as we find in 2 Sam. 14:17, 20, cannot for a moment be thought of here, for we have the language of a prophet before us now. Moreover, the parallel passages, chap. 11, 12:10, and 13:7, which show that Zechariah expected the angel of the Lord to appear in the Messiah, are opposed to such a conclusion as this. The house of David is not referred to here in the same sense as in ver. 7, but primarily in this its culminating point. It would be strange if Zechariah, when depicting the glory of the house of David under the New Testament, should separate it entirely from him in whom the unanimous testimony of the prophets declared that it would reach its highest point. That Zechariah expected the Messiah to spring from the house of David, is evident from chap. 9:9, 10, 3:8, and 6:12, which refer, almost in so many words, to the earlier announcements of the descent of the

Messiah from the tribe of David. But the glory of Christ descends to his servants, the leaders of the Church; compare Gal. 4:14, “Ye received me as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus.” This can only be regarded, however, as the reflection of the glory which, strictly speaking, rests upon Christ alone. The true equality of the house of David with God, and, as it is here stated by way of climax, with the angel of the Lord, could only be effected by such an union of the human nature and the divine as was really accomplished in Christ. Humanity in itself could never be exalted to such a height as this. That it is not a mere resemblance which is spoken of here, but a literal equality, is evident from the expression, “as David” in the previous verse.

Ver. 9. “*And it shall come to pass in that day, that I will seek to destroy all the heathen, that come against Jerusalem.*”

Many render this “I will *seek out*, for the purpose of destroying,” But the words of chap. 6:7, in which the parallel is very striking, show that שָׁקַד with לְ must be understood as denoting an effort to attain to something. We have here the conclusion of the first part, in which the victory of Israel over the heathen world is predicted. The second part commences in ver. 10 with an announcement of the restoration of the children of the kingdom. Michaelis observes that “This prediction was evidently not fulfilled in the early part of the New Testament history; for not only had God at that time not destroyed the heathen, who came to destroy Jerusalem, but, on the contrary, by their instrumentality he destroyed Jerusalem itself, along with the Jewish state and Levitical worship.” But this remark is founded upon the erroneous idea that by Jerusalem in this passage we are to understand the literal city of Jerusalem; whereas, according to the previous chapter, this was already destroyed. The first fulfilment of this prophecy on a large scale was the destruction of Rome as the heathen mistress of the world (see Rev. 17:18). The limitation, “unless they repent,” is of course implied, and this is expressly stated in chap. 14, where the Messiah’s rule of justice and of peace is represented as embracing all the Gentiles to the ends of the earth (compare chap. 9:10).

Ver. 10. “*And I pour out my spirit upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitant of Jerusalem the spirit of grace and of supplication, and they look upon me, whom they have pierced; and they mourn for him, as the mourning for an only one, and they lament for him, as the lamentation for first-born.*”

This verse is connected with Joel 2:28. “And it shall come to pass afterwards, that I will *pour out* my spirit,” and the connection is sufficient in itself to show that we have a prophecy before us which relates to the Messianic era in its fullest extent, from the time of the atoning death of the Messiah onwards. The fulfilment of the primary prophecy took place on the day of Pentecost; and the events of that day had also a prophetic character, and constituted, as it were, a practical renewal of the predictions of Joel. By the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem we are to understand the members of the ancient covenant nation, those whom Peter addresses in Acts 3:25 as “sons of the prophets and of the covenant.” At first sight, it appears strange that in this passage, as well as in chap. 13:1, Judah should not be mentioned at all, but merely the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem. But this may be explained from the custom, which was prevalent among the earlier writers, of designating the whole nation by the name of its central-point or capital, Jerusalem or Zion. In the first part we frequently find Jerusalem only mentioned by name, although the prophet evidently had the whole nation in his mind. Compare, for example, chap. 3:2, “The Lord that hath chosen Jerusalem rebuke thee,” and chap. 8:8. In other passages, e.g. chap. 1:32, Jerusalem and the cities of Judah

are employed to denote the whole— $\pi\eta$  never means “*to entreat*” as Hofmann would render it. He appeals to Job 19:17; but the proper rendering of this verse is, “I mourn for the sons of my body,” in other words, “I mourn for the loss of my children.” Ewald’s rendering, “A spirit of *love* and of the wish for love,” is also merely an attempt to get rid of a difficulty,  $\pi\eta$  is never used for love to God, or even love to brethren, but love towards an inferior, that is *grace*. With reference to the genitive, Hitzig observes, “A spirit of grace and of supplication, of the latter inasmuch as it produces it, of the former inasmuch as the impartation of it is an act of divine grace;” but he also adds, “At the same time there appears to be something harsh and unparalleled in such a combination of two genitives with entirely opposite meanings. If the spirit of supplication is the spirit which produces supplication, the Spirit of grace must also be the Spirit which is the efficient cause of grace, or brings grace in its train. Compare the precisely similar combination in Isa. 11:1, “the spirit of wisdom, of power,” etc. From its connection with the supplication, again, the grace referred to here cannot be the grace of God objectively considered,<sup>47</sup> but grace regarded as an active principle working within. Wrath and mercy, which have their roots in God, produce a distinctive kind of life in the hearts of men. In Rom. 4:15, “because the law worketh wrath,” wrath is not exactly the consciousness of wrath, though it is evidently regarded as manifested in the heart of the sinner. With reference to the *grace*, there is a perfect parallel in Heb. 10:29, “and hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace,” in which there is an allusion to the passage before us. The “Spirit of grace” is the Spirit which produces a state of grace (compare also 2 Tim. 2:1, “Be strong in the grace, which is in Christ Jesus;” Acts 4:33; Rom. 12:6). The Spirit of grace, then, is the Spirit which brings grace near to the heart, and sets his seal upon it. In chap. 11:10, the staff “loveliness” is broken, as a sign that the Jews have no longer a gracious God, on account of their contempt of the Good Shepherd. Here, on the other hand, grace is once more communicated by the Spirit, and put within their hearts. There is something very striking in the combination of “grace” and the “supplication” (*gnade* and *gnadeflehen*). Even in the selection of two expressions derived from the same root, the writer shows that this supplication springs from a state of grace, “For thus will the Jews be entirely cured of their notion of their own merit, and the custom of *making prayers* (*preclarum*;” Burckhardt),— $\text{יָרַח־לִּי}$  with  $\text{אֶל}$  is not infrequently used, where either mental or physical perception is referred to, coupled with the idea of confidence in the object beheld; like  $\theta\epsilon\omega\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ , for example, in John 6:40. We find this in Num. 21:9, in connection with the brazen serpent, by looking upon which Israel was healed.<sup>48</sup> Here it is tacitly contrasted with the contempt and abhorrence with which Israel had previously turned its eyes away from the Messiah (compare Isa. 52:14). The expression “upon me” is very remarkable. According to ver. 1, the speaker is the Lord, the Creator of heaven and the earth. But it is evident from what follows that we are not to confine our thoughts exclusively to an invisible God, who is beyond the reach of suffering; for the same Jehovah presently represents himself as pierced by the Israelites, and afterwards lamented by them with bitter remorse. The enigma is solved by the Old Testament doctrine of the angel and revealer of the Most High God, to whom the prophet attributes even the most exalted names of God, on account of his participation in the divine nature, who is described in chap. 11 as undertaking the office of Shepherd over his people, and who had been recompensed by them with base ingratitude. The suffix in  $\text{עָלַי}$  is regarded by many commentators, who adhere to the Messianic interpretation, as used not in a personal, but in a neuter sense. Thus Gousset, Schultens (*Animadvv. Phil. in loc.*), and Dathe render it, “they mourn on account of it,” namely, on account of the crime committed in piercing him. But the reasons assigned are not sufficient. They adduce first of all the change in the persons,  $\text{אֶל}$  and  $\text{עָלַי}$ . But the change from the first person to the third is of such frequent

occurrence, especially in the prophets, that there is no necessity to bring forward specific examples (see Gesenius' *Lehrg.* p. 742). There was also a peculiar inducement to make the change in the present instance, inasmuch as the previous words, "him, whom they have pierced," formed a natural transition to the third person. And this transition, again, was the more appropriate, since it was important to give some intimation of the fact, that the same Being, whom the supreme God had identified with himself on account of his unity of nature, was yet *personally* distinct. (Compare chap. 13:7, "the man, that is my fellow.") This reason for the change has latterly been adopted by E. Meier (*Studien und Kritiken*, 42, p. 1039).—The authors mentioned inquire further, "Why should the believing Jews mourn for *him*, the slain Messiah, when, as has been stated, they regard him with confidence and hope as still alive? We reply: they mourn for the murdered one, not as though he were still in the power of death, but with the heartfelt consciousness that he was slain through their sins. But the proofs, which are decisive against this rendering, are the following:—When על follows the verb סָפַד, though it may denote the cause generally, it is universally connected with the person for whom lamentation is made. (Compare, for example, Jer. 34:5; 2 Sam. 11:26; and 1 Kings 13:30.) Again, in the verses which follow, persons alone are referred to as the object of lamentation: e.g. "for the only one," "for the first-born," "for king Josiah." Lastly, vers. 12-14 evidently depict the deep sorrow of the whole nation and of every individual for one who is dead.—עָלָיו, lit. *making bitter*, points back to the preceding verb "they mourn," as the use of the infinite sufficiently shows. Hence we must not supply "they shall weep," as most commentators have done on the strength of Isa. 22:4. There is all the less reason for doing this, since the appropriateness of the allusion to סָפַד is confirmed by Jer. 6:26. מְסַפְּדִים תִּמְרוּרִים and the Hiphil of רָמַר is used exclusively in the sense of making bitter, never of grieving. Mourning for an only son is also used in other passages as a sign of the deepest sorrow; compare Amos 8:10, "And I will make it as the mourning for an only son," and Jer. 6:26.—Of lamentation for the first-born, the type is to be found in Egypt; see Ex. 11:6, "And there shall be a great cry throughout all the land of Egypt, such as there was none like it, nor shall be like it any more."—The fulfilment of the prophecy in the verse before us commenced immediately after the crucifixion of Christ; see Luke 23:48, "And all the people that came together to that sight, beholding the things that were done, smote their breasts." (This is the primary signification of פָּסַד, which was originally used to denote a peculiar manner of giving expression to grief; see Isa. 32:12, *Super Ubera Plangunt*, Winer s.v.) The crowds, who but a short time before had cried out "Crucify him," now smite their breasts, overpowered by the proofs of the superhuman dignity of Jesus, and mourn for the deceased, and for their own sin. This was the commencement of a powerful movement, which brought large bodies of penitent Jews to the Christian Church. The first Christian Pentecost formed its central point. The point of Peter's address is contained in the words, "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ;" and the result is thus described in ver. 37, "When they heard, *they were pricked* in their heart." The theme of Peter's discourse is described as being this, "Ye have killed the Prince of life" (chap. 3:15); and the following is the result, "Many of them which heard the word believed; and the number of the men was about five thousand." The extent of the movement is also apparent from chap. 5:14, "And believers were the more added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women." There is the less reason to exclude these commencements of the fulfilment, since not only Luke 23:48 but also Heb. 10:29 points distinctly to this passage, and presupposes that the promise contained in it is already partially fulfilled. That the house of David was also affected by this movement has been convincingly proved by Schmieder from Acts 1:14, "These all continued with one accord in prayer and

supplication—(the *supplication* here, the grace in chap. 4:33)—with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and his brethren;” in connection with which it is important to observe that the guilt was national, and even those who had previously believed on Jesus felt that they were involved in it. The only passage in the New Testament in which this prophecy is actually quoted is John 19:37, “And again another Scripture saith, they shall look on him whom they pierced.” On the connection between this quotation and the prophecy itself, the following remarks are needful. (1.) The only point in which the citation differs from the original is in the change of the first person into the third. In Zechariah, the Messiah himself is represented as speaking; in the gospel, John speaks of him. There is no ground for inferring from this, as Bleek has done, that the apostle, who has not employed the Septuagint on this occasion, but translates direct from the Hebrew, had another reading before him, especially when we observe that Matthew does precisely the same thing in the case of Zech. 11:13, which is quoted by him in chap. 27:9. The desire to secure greater perspicuity is a sufficient explanation. If John had not read “upon me,” in the gospel, he could not have been so confident that the prophecy referred to Christ, as not this passage alone, but also Rev. 1:7, evidently prove that he was. (2.) Although Vitranga (*Obs.* ii. 9, p. 172) and Michaelis have taken great trouble to maintain the opposite, it is obvious that the words are quoted by John in immediate connection with the piercing by the lance, and not with reference to the crucifixion of Christ generally. In vers. 31-33, he relates that the legs of Christ were not broken like those of the others, and in ver. 34 mentions the piercing of his side. He then proceeds in ver. 36 to cite a passage from the Old Testament in explanation of the first fact, and in ver. 37 brings forward another in connection with the second. At the same time it by no means follows that John merely refers to the prophecy in connection with this particular circumstance, or that he regarded it as entirely restricted to this, but only that he looked upon this as actually a fulfilment of the prediction;—and with perfect justice, inasmuch as the piercing with a spear, in common with the entire crucifixion, is represented in Acts 2:23 as a work of the Jews, not indeed from a material, but from a spiritual point of view. That John is very far from restricting the prophecies to the particular circumstances in connection with which they are quoted by him, is obvious from chap. 18:9. The prophecy before us would evidently lose much of its meaning and importance if the verb *ἑώρακεν* were to be understood as relating simply to the one fact of the piercing with a spear. It is rather to be regarded as depicting the whole of the sufferings with which the death of the Messiah was attended. That the death itself is the essential point, and not the instrument employed or the manner of the death, is evident from chap. 13:7, where a sword is mentioned, whereas *ἑώρακεν* points rather to a spear. Lücke has very correctly observed, “At the time when John composed his Gospel, a considerable number had already been gathered out of the hostile Jewish world, of such as looked to the Crucified One for their salvation. In this sense the *ἑώρακεν* (they shall look) had been fulfilled.” In addition to this distinct quotation, there are two other passages in which there is evidently an intentional allusion to the one before us. The first is Matt. 24:30, “And then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.” The other is Rev. 1:7, “Behold he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him.” These passages contain a kind of sacred parody of the prophecy in Zechariah. They show that side by side with the salutary contrition, the godly sorrow, of which Zechariah speaks, there is another kind, viz. the Judas-contrition of despair; that by the side of the voluntary look, directed to the Crucified One, there is another, an involuntary look, which even unbelief cannot escape. The fearful meaning involved in this allusion will be learned by every one. It



shows, moreover, that the prophecy was referred to Christ, by both the Lord himself and his apostles.

## HISTORY OF THE INTERPRETATION

### I. AMONG THE JEWS

A valuable collection of materials has been made by Frischmuth and Salemann; by the former in his *Dissertatio de Messia Confixo* (*Theol. Phil.*, i. p. 1042 sqq.); by the latter in his *Jehovah Transfossus* (*ibid.*, p. 1054 sqq.). Even before the coming of Christ it was natural that the Jews should mistake the true meaning of the prophecy; for it not only pointed to a suffering and dying Messiah, like Isa. 53, but to a suffering and dying Messiah, connected with God by a mysterious unity of essence,—a mystery which could not be fully comprehended till the Son of God appeared in the flesh. Among the Jews after the time of Christ, the difficulty of interpreting the passage necessarily increased; for not only did they want the light of fulfilment, like those of an earlier age, but they were driven into a corner by Christian controversialists, who took it as the basis of their arguments. How little ground we have for expecting impartiality under these circumstances, is evident from the candid confession made by Abarbanel, that the chief object which he had in view in his exposition was to remove the stumbling-block laid by Christians in the way of his people, when they interpreted the prophecy as relating to the Crucified One. The history of the interpretation of this passage among the Jews is little more, therefore, than an account of the principal methods employed by them in the distortion of prophecy,—methods which led to such contradictory results as to furnish a powerful argument against their correctness.

1. Some sought to get rid of the difficulty by giving to קָרַךְ the figurative meaning “to pierce,” in other words, “to grieve.” According to the exposition, the verse depicts the contrition of the Jews on account of the sins committed by them against the Lord, This view was adopted by the translators of the Septuagint, who rendered the clause, ἐπιβλέψονται πρὸς με ἀνθ’ ὧν κατωργήσαντο. Jerome and many others suppose that the translators mistook קָרַךְ for קָרַךְ; and examples of similar transpositions are no doubt to be found. Lud. Cappellus and others suggest the probability of their having found קָרַךְ in their MSS.; but this is very unlikely, as there is nothing else to favour such a reading. Others, including Cocceius and Buxtorf, think that, as they did not know how to get over the difficulty, they substituted קָרַךְ for קָרַךְ by mere conjecture. We should not mention the fact that the blind prejudice shown by Vose (*De Translat. LXX. Interpret.*, p. 20 and 77) in favour of the Septuagint, has led him to maintain that ἀνθ’ ὧν κατωργήσαντο is a later corruption, were it not that Ewald has given expression to the same opinion (*Commentar. in Apoc.*, p. 93). The only explanation that can be given of this is the wish to get rid of an important argument for the genuineness of the book of Revelation, namely, the remarkable agreement between John 19:37 and Re 1:7 Rev. 1:7 in the rendering of the words quoted from this passage,—an agreement which cannot be set aside by merely referring to a similar coincidence in the use of the word ἐκκεντεῖν by Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, since in their case the one quoted from the other, and their agreement is entirely restricted to the use of the word ἐκκεντεῖν.—Very few have hit upon the true explanation, namely, that the translators read קָרַךְ, but thought the literal meaning of the verb unsuitable, and therefore understood it figuratively, “to pierce” in the sense of “to vex.” Lampe, among the earlier commentators, has adopted this explanation (*Comm. on John*, part 3, p. 633). The conjecture is changed into a certainty if we merely look at

the other examples of a similar mode of procedure on the part of the translators in the very same section. The most remarkable is chap. 13:3, where we find another instance of transposition in connection with the same verb קָרַךְ. In this case also the meaning *to pierce* seemed to them inappropriate, since they could not imagine that parents would be so cruel as to kill their own son; and probably also because, like many of the later commentators, they imagined that the same individual was alluded to in vers. 5 and 6. If so, he could not be regarded as killed. In this case they render the verb συμποδίζειν, to bind the feet together, whereas in every other instance they translate it ἀποκενεῖν, ἐκκεντεῖν, κατακεντεῖν, or τινρώσκειν.—We have another example in chap. 12:8. They were startled to find it stated there that the house of David should be as God. Hence they translated כִּאלֹהִים, ὡς οὐκός θεοῦ; whilst Jonathan, on the other hand, endeavoured to remove the ground of offence by giving to אֶלֹהִים the meaning of *prince*.—So much may perhaps he conceded to the supporters of the other hypotheses, that the translators were led to select the verb κατοργέομαι, to express the idea of contempt and wickedness, by the recollection of the word קָרַךְ, which they probably regarded as allied to קָרַךְ.

We have no hesitation in giving the same explanation of the Chaldee version, the words of which have been so often misinterpreted, and of which, so far as we are aware, the only correct explanation that has ever been given is that of Lampe (*ut supra*). The passage is rendered וְיָבֵעוּן מִן קִדְמֵי דִי אֶטְלְטְלוּ. The translation usually given of this is “orabunt coram me, quoniam translati fuerunt” (compare Lightfoot on John 19:37). The meaning of the paraphrast is supposed to have been, that the Jews would turn to the Lord, with bitter lamentation on account of their captivity. But the objection to this is, that nothing can be pointed out in the text which could give rise to such a translation. The difficulty, however, is removed if we understand לטלטא as meaning *to wander about* in a moral sense, to rove about so as to lose sight of the Lord; compare טַיִל, *vagatio, lusus*; טַיִל, *ambulator, otiosus spectator* (see Buxtorf *s.v.*).—This explanation has been given up by the modern Jews, who all agree in translating קָרַךְ literally. But it has found supporters in the Christian Church, and we will now inquire whether it is admissible. It must certainly constitute a grave objection, that in every other case קָרַךְ is used in a literal sense, never figuratively, and that we have an example in this very section in chap. 13:3, a passage which is the more important on account of the close relation in which it stands to the verse before us; they had wickedly pierced the Good Shepherd, but now they pierce the false prophet righteously. But the words which follow are a sufficient disproof of the figurative interpretation. If קָרַךְ is not used in a literal sense, how can the next clause speak of mourning for one who is dead?<sup>49</sup> how can it be compared to the mourning for the death of an only son, and the mourning for the death of King Josiah? The only resource left in this case is to take the word in its ordinary signification, and to look for the figure in the general statement. God is slain, as it were, by the sins of the Jews; and the remorse which they feel for their sins is figuratively represented as mourning for the dead. But let any one look through the whole of the Old Testament, and see whether he can find anything analogous to a figure so strange and derogatory to the dignity of God as this would be.—It is quite out of place to appeal to the fact that קָרַךְ, *to pierce*, is also used with reference to God; for it is not in its primary sense that it is so used, but with a figurative meaning *to insult*, and even in this sense it is not associated directly with Jehovah himself, but only with the *name* of God (Lev. 24:11). To these negative reasons for rejecting the explanation referred to, we have now to add—(1.) the positive grounds for referring the prediction to the Messiah and his death; viz. the evident identity of the person, slain and lamented here, with the Good Shepherd, whose faithful care was rewarded by the nation with base ingratitude (chap. 11), who is represented in chap. 13:7 as being slain, and

whose rejection on the part of the nation is the cause of their being visited by severe judgments, until at length the remnant is purified by affliction, turns to the Lord, and is received into favour again;—(2.) the parallel clause in chap. 13:7, “Awake, O sword against my shepherd,” which is sufficient in itself to overthrow the figurative interpretation of קָרַךְ; and (3.), as external evidence, the testimony of the New Testament.

2. There is another remarkable proof that the correct interpretation of the passage, as relating to a true Messiah, was not unknown to the earlier Jews. In the Jerusalem Talmud (fol. xii. 1 ed. Dessov.; compare the appendix on the suffering Messiah), it is the only one mentioned: “There are two opinions; one, that the mourning is for the Messiah, the other, that the mourning is for the crime.” This has frequently been understood as meaning, that by some the crime was regarded as the sole object of the prophecy in this verse. And it has been found impossible to understand how so strange an opinion could possibly have arisen. But this is not the case. Both views agreed in referring the prophecy to the Messiah. The difference, as we may see upon closer examination, and from a comparison of the corresponding passages in the Babylonian Talmud, had respect exclusively to the suffix in קָרַךְ. Some regarded it as relating to the person of the Pierced One, whilst others supposed it to be used as a neuter (as Schultens and Dathe also do), with the meaning, “on that account,” namely, on account of their sin, which had either directly, or what is more probable, indirectly occasioned the death of the Messiah. So much is certain. But we have no means of determining how these Rabbins interpreted the separate clauses of the verse, or how they got over the difficulty which must have presented itself to their minds in the words, “They look upon me, whom they have pierced;” whether they adopted the rendering which De Rossi, who has carefully examined the *Codex*, says that Symmachus has given in the *Codex Barberinus*, viz. *σὺν ᾧ ἐξεκέντησαν*, “They look upon me (the Lord) with him, whom they (either the Jews or the enemy) have pierced;” or whether they rendered it as many of the later Jews have done, “They look upon me (they turn to me as suppliants) *because* the enemy has pierced them.” It is impossible to decide this from the fact that the difference referred to there has respect not to the meaning of the whole passage, but to the object of grief. In any case, however, the passage is of great importance, inasmuch as it proves that the earlier Jews were not strangers to the doctrine of a dying Messiah, and that, in whatever way his death might occur, they associated it with the sin of the nation. In the course of time, however, this view was found to be inconvenient; and the attempt was made to get rid of the difficulty by adopting the fiction of two Messiahs, the son of David and the son of Joseph, to the latter of whom all the passages were applied which appeared to speak of a dying Messiah (compare the appendix on the suffering Messiah). This is the case with the passage before us in the Babylonian Talmud, where the question is raised again, whether the mourning relates to the Messiah or to the sin, and the former is pronounced indisputably the correct opinion, on the ground that the lamentation must have reference to the person described as pierced immediately before. (See the appendix.) Among the later Rabbins, this interpretation is adopted by Abenezra and Abarbanel; the latter of whom displays a marvellous vacillation, by giving his support elsewhere to the explanation proposed by Kimchi and Jarchi, to which we shall presently refer, although he so decidedly rejects it here. Lastly, it is also found in the *Jalkut Chadash* (fol. 24; quoted by Gläsener, *de Gemino Jud. Messia*, p. 57), “After Jonah has been pierced, that is, the Messiah Ben Joseph, David will come, that is, the Messiah Ben David.”

The supporters of this interpretation had now to solve the difficult problem: how is the expression, “whom they have pierced,” to be reconciled with the words “they will look

upon *me*”? Various methods were suggested, but all equally unsuccessful. (1.) They altered, without the least shame, the inconvenient  $\text{לְאֵלֵינוּ}$  into  $\text{לְאֵלֵי}$ . The text is quoted thus, without any further remark, in the Talmud, and also in *En Israel*, p. 117. And according to a remarkable passage in Rabanus Maurus, *contra Judaeos*, p. 13 (Wagenseil’s *Sota*, p. 68), it was to be found in his day (the 9th century) in the margin of many mss. “Where we, according to the faith of the Holy Scriptures, read in the person of God ‘and they shall look upon *me*, whom they have pierced;’ they (the Jews) although they dare not make any alteration in the text of the sacred volume, from their fear of the divine command, have written outside as a marginal note, ‘they shall look on *him*, whom they have pierced.’ And thus they teach their pupils to copy what they find in the text, but to read what they find in the margin; so that they hold, forsooth, that, in their folly, the Jews look to him whom Gog and Magog have pierced.” In the 13th century this reading had found its way into the text of several MSS., see *Raim. Martini* (p. 411; Leipzig), “Observe, that some of the Jews, being unable to endure such forcible testimony from the Holy Scriptures, falsify one letter in this passage, and read  $\text{לְאֵלֵי}$ , so that it may be understood as referring not to God, but to some one else.” Compare, on the other hand, p. 855, where the author appeals to the ancient MSS., in all of which the reading  $\text{לְאֵלֵי}$  found. The reading  $\text{לְאֵלֵי}$  is actually to be met with in 49 mss. in Kennicott, and 13 in De Rossi; it is also contained in the original text of many of the Rabbinical writings, though it has been to some extent rejected from the published editions (compare De Rossi on this passage). We need not enter into any elaborate proof of the correctness of the reading  $\text{לְאֵלֵי}$ . Grammatically it is the more difficult of the two; it is opposed to the favourite opinions of the Jews; it is found in all the ancient mss., the testimony of which is the more complete in this case, from the fact that the translations of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion have been handed down to us in a *Scholion* of the *Codex Barber.*; and it is found not only in the best manuscripts, but also in by far the largest number.<sup>50</sup> It is not so easy to decide the question whether the reading  $\text{לְאֵלֵי}$  is traceable to doctrinal considerations; that is, whether we have here an example of an attempt on the part of the Jews to falsify the text. Wagenseil has endeavoured to prove that we have (*Hackspan de Usu Libr. Rabbinic.*, p. 295); and De Rossi maintains the opposite. We are constrained to decide in favour of the former. It is true that there are not wanting other examples in which the Keri has attempted to restore grammatical correctness in cases where the first person is followed immediately by the third. But no one has ever ventured to bring these supposed emendations into the text. In this instance, in the Talmud, where we first meet with the reading  $\text{לְאֵלֵי}$ , its bearing upon the interests of the Jews is far too obvious, as is also the case with *Jalkut*, where the reading  $\text{לְאֵלֵי}$  is adopted, to render it possible to refer the passage to the Messiah Ben Joseph, “to him whom they have pierced,” a departure from the Talmud which clearly shows how little external ground there was for giving up the received version. If the emendation was occasioned solely by the grammatical irregularity, how was it that it did not occur to any one to read  $\text{לְאֵלֵי}$  instead of  $\text{לְאֵלֵינוּ}$ ?—De Rossi appeals to the fact, that not a single Jewish controversialist has brought forward the reading  $\text{לְאֵלֵי}$  to refute the Christian interpretation, as an argument against the supposition that there has been an intentional falsification of the text. But this fact may quite as legitimately be used as an argument on the opposite side. It bears testimony to a guilty conscience. If the reading  $\text{לְאֵלֵי}$  had been obtained by righteous means, they would never have hesitated to appeal to it. They used it timidly and modestly, more for their own satisfaction than as a weapon to direct against their foes; and when they found that, after all, it did not succeed, that the forgery could not be introduced into all the mss., and that attention was already being directed to the question, they gave up the reading altogether, and tried to find out some less objectionable way.—(2.) They gave a different rendering

to אֵת אֶפְסָר, viz. “They look to me (as suppliants), *because* they (the heathen) have pierced him (the son of Joseph);” a rendering the arbitrary character of which is so very obvious, that we can see no reason for examining it more minutely,—It is hardly worth while even to add, with reference to the antiquated notion of the Messiah Ben Joseph, that it is nothing but a foundling of modern Jews, which never met with general acceptance, as the remark of Kimchi, in opposition to its supposed application to the present passage, sufficiently proves, and which the more intelligent, such as Maimonides and Menasse Ben Israel, expressly or tacitly reject. It is of greater importance to lay emphasis upon a remark which affects, not merely this particular explanation, but the whole genus to which it belongs. The look directed to the Pierced One, the loud lamentation for his death, is represented here as a consequence of the outpouring of the Spirit of grace upon Israel, a sign of its genuine conversion, the fruits of which are described in chap. 13:1-6. But how could the lamentation for a leader, slain by the foe, be regarded as the result of conversion?

(3.) A still greater error was committed by those who, like Kimchi, Jarchi, and Menasse Ben Israel (Hulsius’ *Theol. Jud.*, p. 513), interpreted “the pierced one,” as meaning every one who had been slain in the war with Gog and Magog: “They will all lament for the death of one, as if the whole army had been slain.” Some of them adopt the false reading וילל, and others give to אֵת אֶפְסָר the inadmissible rendering “*because*” Kimchi, for example, explains it as equivalent to בְּעֵבֶר. The last reason adduced for rejecting the previous interpretation tells with considerable force against this one also. The supporters of it are unable to defend their assumption that there is a *change of subject* in דְּקָרָו, of which there is not the slightest indication in the text, and which is therefore unnatural, or to account for the absence of the suffix. This interpretation is to be especially accounted for, from the fear of conceding too much to the Christians, by referring the passage to the Messiah Ben Joseph; a fear for which there was all the more foundation, since it could not but be clearly perceived that it was useless to attempt to prove the reality of the fictitious Messiah Ben Joseph, and that, if the attempt was made and failed, so long as the passage was admitted to be generally Messianic, it would be impossible to evade the conclusion that it must refer to the Messiah Ben David. The extent to which this fear prevailed is evident from the fact that, in a Polish edition of Jarchi, the passage in which he speaks of the explanation, which refers the passage to the Messiah Ben Joseph as handed down by tradition and confirmed by the Talmud, has been omitted; compare Steph. le Moyne on Jeremiah 23:6.

## II. AMONG THE CHRISTIANS

In the Christian Church, as we should naturally expect, the reference to Christ has been generally maintained from time immemorial. It is superfluous therefore to mention the names of those who have supported it. Even J. D. Michaelis declares himself in its favour, although he adopts the ungrammatical rendering, “They will look upon me, *and* upon him, whom they have pierced.” “We shall notice only the exceptions, namely, those who reject the Messianic interpretation. But we shall be very brief, as the refutation will be found in what has already been written.

(1.) Calvin (in his commentary on the passage, and on John 19:37) followed to a certain extent in the footsteps of the translators of the Septuagint and Chaldee versions, though without in any way depending upon them. “Piercing,” he says, “is used here for continued irritation, and is as much as to say that the Jews with their obstinacy were equipped, as it were, for war, that they might fight against God and pierce him with their malice, or with

the weapons of their rebellion. . . . The meaning ... is this: when the Jews have provoked God in many ways with perfect impunity, they will at length become penitent, for they will begin to be alarmed by the judgment of God, although before this not one of them had thought of giving an account of his life.” At the same time, we must not overlook the essential difference between Calvin and both the Jewish and rationalistic expositors, who have adopted the same explanation. According to Calvin, the prophecy is to be understood in the first place figuratively, and referred to God; but under the superintending providence of God, it came to pass that it was literally fulfilled in Christ, who is associated with God by unity of nature, that is to say, the history of Christ formed a *visibile symbolum* of the substance of the prophecy. That he regarded the prophecy as connected with the fulfilment in Christ in a much more intimate manner than in the so-called “mystical sense” of Grotius, which, as Reuss has shown (*Opusc.* 1, p. 74 sqq.), is something purely imaginary, is obvious from all the rest of the exposition, in which he seems to lose sight of the figurative meaning altogether. By the earliest expositors this view of Calvin’s was universally opposed. Lampe complains very bitterly that Calvin’s private opinions should be charged upon the Reformed Church, and that a reproach should thus be cast upon it. With the exception of an unknown writer mentioned in Martini (*De Tribus Elohim*, c. 112), and Smalcius the Socinian, it did not receive support from any one but Grotius. From him it has been copied by several of the modern commentators, including Rosenmüller, Eichhorn, Theiner, and Maurer,

(2.) The reference to a Messiah Ben Joseph has so far found supporters among modern expositors, that many of them regard the prophecy as relating to the death of a distinguished Jewish general or martyr. Jahn (*Einkl.*, ii. 2, p. 671) supposes that Judas Maccabaeus is intended, and renders the clause thus, “They will look upon him (Jehovah), *on account of* him, whom they have pierced.” Bauer (*Schol.*, p. 310) conjectures that allusion is made to some Jewish commander who lost his life in the Maccabean war, though it is impossible to determine which. Bleek speaks of “one particular human martyr, who had been put to death a short time before, in the service of the true God.” In order to get rid of the reference to Jehovah, and therefore to the Messiah, to which he objects, on the ground that the prophet could not have expected any of his immediate readers and hearers to understand him in this sense,—overlooking the fact that the prophecy had been preceded by chap. 11 as well as Isa. 53,—he takes upon himself to read  $\text{לָאֵלֹהִים}$  the poetic form of  $\text{לְאֵלֹהִים}$ , and renders the clause “they look to him whom they have pierced.” But this is a desperate remedy.  $\text{לָאֵלֹהִים}$  only occurs four times in the whole of the Old Testament, viz. in the book of Job, in the highest style of poetry, and that immediately before a noun. Moreover,  $\text{לָאֵלֹהִים}$  is the construct state of a noun, and therefore cannot possibly be connected with the accusative  $\text{אֶת}$ . The result arrived at by Bleek—“it is uncertain to whom the prophet refers”—is surely purchased too dearly at such a price as this. Again, on Bleek’s hypothesis, it is impossible to explain the announcement in vers. 10-14, respecting the national mourning, or the statement made in chap. 13:1, as to the fountain opened for sin and for uncleanness, in consequence of their looking upon him who had been pierced; or again, the reference in vers. 2-6 to the sanctification resulting from the same look, not to mention the evident allusion to the healing effected by looking at the brazen serpent.—Ewald’s explanation is open to precisely the same objections. For *one* martyr, he substitutes *a plurality* of such as had fallen in the war with the heathen. His rendering is, “They look to him, whom men have pierced,” which he explains thus, “The intention is to show that no martyr falls in vain, but that he will one day be mourned for with universal love.” To render this explanation possible, “a spirit of love and the wish for love” is substituted for “the spirit of grace and

supplication;” but we have a sufficient proof that this is incorrect in the passage in Joel upon which this is based, and from which we learn that reference is made to something entirely different, namely, to religious regeneration. Again, Ewald is obliged to sacrifice the accredited reading לָא, and adopt וַיִּלֵּא in its stead. The third sacrifice that has to be made, is the assumption of a change of subject in וַיִּרְקַד, which is not only objectionable in itself, but is also disproved by the fact that it severs the connection with chap. 11 that it renders what follows incomprehensible, since the opening of a fountain for sin and uncleanness (chap. 13:1), and also the repentance (vers. 2-6) show that those who look are the same as those who had formerly pierced—(otherwise the repentance would be altogether visionary),—and lastly by the fact that there is no reference whatever to persons who had fallen in conflict with the heathen. But if we read וַיִּלֵּא, it would be presupposed that the pierced one had already been more particularly described. We could not in this case adopt the rendering, “they will look to one whom they have pierced,” but “to him” (definitely), especially as the relative is preceded by הָא. Ewald introduces the plurality on his own authority entirely; for both here and in the parallel passages (chap. 11 and 13:7) there is never more than one individual referred to as the object of persecution. Hofmann (*Schriftbeweis*, ii. 2, p. 562) has at length gone back again to one individual. He now renders the passage “my heroes look at him whom they (the heathen) have pierced.” “They mourn for a loss which they have suffered, not for a crime which they have committed.” The only peculiarity to be noticed here is the rendering of לָא, “my heroes,” to which two objections may be offered; first, that לָא never means hero (compare the remarks on Isa. 9:5), and, secondly, that טִיבָה is usually construed with לָא. But this false interpretation of לָא was compulsory; for if Jehovah was pierced, the author of the deed must have been Judah, whom we have already seen in chap. 11 in fierce conflict with the angel of the Lord. In the same manner was Hofmann also obliged to resort to a false rendering of הָא. If the spirit of grace must be poured out upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem before the *looking* takes place, they must also have been the sole authors of the piercing. With the spirit of *supplication*, again, Hofmann really does not know what to do. It is difficult to see for what they pray, if not for forgiveness of the sin indicated by the word וַיִּרְקַד. In answer to the supplications, they receive (in chap. 13:1) “a fountain opened for sin and uncleanness.”

(3.) The merit of having discovered a new exposition belongs to Vogel and Hitzig alone of all the expositors, who are at the same time neither Jewish nor Messianic. The former maintains that the prophet is not speaking of the Messiah, but of himself (on Capelli *Crit. Sacr.*, i. p. 140), According to Hitzig, the passage can be “simply” explained, on the ground that Jehovah is identified with, the prophets, the sender with the sent, “The murder of a prophet is regarded as an attack upon the person of Jehovah himself.” But Hitzig does not fail to perceive the difficulties connected with his explanation. “*This is the only passage*,” he says, “in the Old Testament in which a murderous attack upon Jehovah is simply deduced from a true idea; but *it may appear strange* that such a deduction could be made.” Jehovah slain! and a lamentation for the dead on his account! Such a representation is something more than strange, if it merely means that the prophets have been killed. One who wishes to introduce such startling ideas as these ought certainly to explain more clearly what he means. Besides, in chap. 11, to which, as even Hitzig admits, there must necessarily be an allusion intended here, there is nothing about the conflicts and sufferings of the prophet, but the angel of the Lord, who is associated with God by unity of essence, appears as the good shepherd, enters upon a conflict for life or death with the evil shepherds ver. 8, and receives from them a disgraceful recompense (ver. 12). Lamentation is made here for the guilt contracted by the inhabitants of

Jerusalem, through the events described in chap. 11— Lastly, the comparison with Josiah in chap. 13:7, of whom Hitzig, it is true, manages to dispose, contains a still more decisive proof that it is *a king* who has been slain.

How has everything been done here to get rid of the truth, and how ineffectual have all these efforts proved! The truth forces its way through all such errors, and is never without a witness.

Ver. 11. “*In that day the mourning in Jerusalem will be great, as the mourning of Hadadrimmon in the valley of Megiddo.*”

In this verse and the following the prophet does all he can to make the sorrow appear as great and as universal as possible. The mourning of Hadadrimmon is not mourning which actually occurred in Hadadrimmon; but those who took part in it, though really in Jerusalem, were in Hadadrimmon in spirit (see 2 Chron. 35:34), and therefore it was so far the scene of the mourning that the cause of it was to be found there,—it was there that the good king Josiah was slain. The following proofs may be adduced, that it is with the mourning for the death of this king that the lamentation for the pierced one is here compared. (1.) The lamentation to which the prophet refers must have been one of the most bitter that had ever occurred in their previous history. Now this can be proved to have been the lamentation for Josiah. According to 2 Chron. 35:25, Jeremiah composed a funeral dirge on the occasion of his death, and other odes were composed and sung by male and female singers. These odes were current in Israel as popular songs, and continued to be so till the chronicler’s own time. They were placed in a collection of elegiac odes, relating to the mournful calamities which befell the nation, commencing with the death of Josiah, and which speedily effected its ruin. In this we have a proof, not only of the bitterness of the lamentation, but also of the fact that it was preserved in lively remembrance in later ages, even in the period succeeding the captivity.—(2.) The lamented one must have been a *good* king; and the campaign’ becomes the more appropriate if he was one who died in a certain sense on account of the sins of the nation. Now both of these are fully realized in Josiah. He is described in 2 Kings 23:25 sqq. as the best of all the kings of Judah. Yet this did not suffice to turn the Lord from his purposes of destruction. He died a victim, not so much to his own imprudence in going to war with the powerful king of the Egyptians, as to the sin of his nation. If this had not called down the vengeance of God, he would either have preserved him from the imprudence itself, or have averted its consequences.—(3.) The comparison requires that the slain one should have been a *king of Judah*, and that the lamentation should have been in *Jerusalem*. The words “at Jerusalem” are evidently to be understood in the second clause as well as the first: “The mourning will be great in Jerusalem, as the mourning of Hadadrimmon was.” We find both of these in the case of Josiah. The king was brought to Jerusalem mortally wounded, and immediately after his arrival there the last spark of life was extinguished, and the lamentation commenced for him, the beloved one, with whom the throne of Judah appeared to have been carried to the grave (compare 2 Chron. 35:22).<sup>51</sup> —(4.) The places exactly coincide. We find in the Chronicles word for word the same expression as here, Josiah was pierced through “בְּקֶצֶת מְגִדּוֹ.” The only difference is, that in the passage before us the very spot is mentioned in which Josiah received his fatal wound.<sup>52</sup> Jerome bears express testimony to the fact that Hadadrimmon was situated in the valley of Megiddo or Jezreel.<sup>53</sup> Rimmon also occurs as the name of a city in chap. 14:10; and we frequently meet with it as the name of a place with some other word prefixed, *e.g.* *Ain Rimmon* (compare *Simmonis onom.* p. 347).



However, notwithstanding the cogency of these reasons, there have not been wanting some who dispute the reference to Josiah, or connect some other with it. The latter is the case in the Chaldee version, where the passage is paraphrased thus: "As the mourning for Ahab, the son of Omri, whom Hadadrimmon, the son of Tad-rimmon, slew at Kamath in Gilead, and as the mourning for Josiah, the son of Amon, whom Pharaoh Necho slew in the valley of Megiddo." Hadadrimmon is here regarded as the name of the Syrian king who slew Ahab, derived, according to a custom which undoubtedly prevailed among the Syrians and Babylonians, from *Rimmon*, the name of an idol. The mourning of Hadadrimmon is understood to mean the mourning caused by Hadadrimmon. But if this be correct, it must be all that is intended; for it is impossible to see how any second allusion can be reconciled with the words of the text, if Hadadrimmon is to be taken as a proper name. It really looks as if the Chaldee translator placed both in the text, merely because he was undecided which of the two he ought to choose, and not because he regarded them as equally admissible. But no proof can be needed that the passage does not relate exclusively to Ahab. Of all the tests which we have mentioned, there is only one that applied to him, viz. his death in the valley of Megiddo. Any general and bitter lamentation for this wicked king of the rebellious Israelites cannot for a moment be thought of. He was so universally hated that no one would wash his polluted blood from the chariot, and they were obliged to engage the services of disreputable persons for this dishonourable employment.—We shall pass over other opinions of a still more trivial character, and merely mention, in addition, the explanation proposed by Hitzig. He has set up two different hypotheses. In the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1830, 1. p. 29, he maintains that the allusion here made is to the death of the wicked Ahaziah (2 Kings 9:27), an allusion which even Melancthon defended in conjunction with that to the death of Josiah ("the comparison is taken from the death of the two kings, Ahaziah and Josiah, both of whom were slain near Megiddo"). On the other hand, in his commentary, Hitzig says that Hadadrimmon is the Syriac name for Adonis: "very strikingly(!)," he says, "is the sorrow for their God Jehovah compared to the lamentation for the god Adonis." Both hypotheses are intended to "neutralize" the reference to Josiah in favour of a preconceived opinion respecting the period when the second part was composed. Both of them, but especially the latter, show the utter absence of any sense of sacred propriety. In chap. 8:14, Ezekiel refers to the mourning for Adonis as an idolatrous abomination. The arguments brought forward to prove that Hadadrimmon was a name of Adonis, who is mentioned in the Scriptures under a different name, fall completely to the ground (compare Ezek. 8:14, etc.).—In conclusion, we simply call attention to the decisive manner in which this verse disproves the supposition that the previous verse refers to the supreme Deity, and establishes the reference to the Messiah. How perfectly absurd it would be to compare the mourning for the supreme Deity, to whom offence had been given, with the lamentation for King Josiah, who was slain! Yet how appropriate a type of the Messiah we have here! He was slain on account of the sins of his people: his reign was the closing manifestation of mercy on the part of the Lord; unspeakable misery followed immediately afterwards; the lamentation for his death rested upon the mingled feelings of love and of sorrow for their own sins, which had brought him to death.

Vers. 12-14. The reason why the prophet gives so elaborate a description of the mourning for the pierced one is twofold. His first design is to represent the mourning of the Israelites as true and not merely ceremonial, and their conversion as complete and deeply rooted in the heart. He effects this by continuing the figurative style with which he commenced, and describing every family as mourning apart, and in every family the men apart, and the women apart. This is intended to show that every family, and every

subdivision of every family, would mourn as if the loss were peculiar to themselves. His second design is to state, as emphatically as possible, that the mourning pervades the whole nation, that the conversion does not merely embrace a few of the “poorest of the flock, who followed the good shepherd,” as was the case when Christ appeared in his humiliation (chap. 11:11), but that it is a truly national affair. To effect this, he first of all mentions two of the leading lines; then, to show that the change will thoroughly pervade the whole, from one end to the other, he connects with these two of their principal families; and, finally, to give expression to the idea that the whole nation is affected, he adds to these “all the *rest* of the families.” Thus, like Paul in Rom. 11:26, he represents all Israel as saved, a work which commenced with the crucifixion, has been going on through every age of the Church, and will be fully completed in the last times.

Ver. 12. “*And the land mourns, family by family apart; the family of the house of David apart, and their wives apart; the family of the house of Nathan apart, and their wives apart;*”

Ver. 13. “*The family of the house of Levi apart, and their wives apart; the family of the Shimeite apart, and their wives apart;*”

Ver. 14. “*All the rest of the families, families by families apart, and their wives apart.*”

Commentators differ in their opinions as to the specification which is here given by the prophet of the various families which take part in the lamentation for the Messiah. At first sight there is something plausible in the explanation given by Jerome: “In *David* we have the royal tribe, *i.e.* Judah; in *Nathan*, the prophetic order; in *Levi*, the priests, for the priesthood sprang from him; in *Shimei*, the teachers, for the different orders of magistrates sprang from this tribe. The prophet does not mention the other tribes, which were not possessed of any peculiar privileges.” But on closer examination, his opinion is found to be quite untenable. The principal objection is, that the family of the Shimeite cannot possibly mean the tribe of the Simeon. In the first place, the patronymic of Simeon is not שִׁמְעוֹן, but Shimeoni (Josh. 21:4; 1 Chron. 27:16), in addition to which we find only the periphrastic expression שִׁמְעוֹן בְּנֵי שִׁמְעוֹן; and, secondly, if no tribes are mentioned here but those which possessed some peculiar privilege, the tribe of Simeon is quite out of place. So far was this tribe from having any peculiar privilege, that it did not even receive a separate province like all the rest of the tribes, with the exception of that of Levi, which was richly compensated for the want of it by a prerogative of a different kind.

That the “different orders of magistrates” were chosen from this tribe is a Jewish fiction, whose origin may be traced without any difficulty. The Jerusalem Targum paraphrases Gen. 49:7 thus: “I will divide the tribe of Simeon, that teachers of the law may be placed in the assembly of Jacob; and I will scatter the tribe of Levi” (for other Jewish quotations see Heidegger, *Hist. Patriarch*, ii. p. 484). In this passage, from Jacob’s blessing, we have the origin of the fable. The Rabbins, overlooking the fact that it was a sufficient blessing for a tribe to belong to the people of God and not to be cut off from the nation, and reading in Gen. 49:28, “Jacob blessed them,” came to the conclusion that a peculiar blessing must necessarily be awarded to every tribe in Jacob’s address. But the announcement made to Simeon did not appear to contain any such blessing. They did not allow this, however, to disconcert them; especially as the apparent curse on Levi, contained in the same verse, had been changed into a blessing. With regard to the special purport of the blessing on Simeon, they thought that it must be somewhat analogous to that on Levi, since the same announcement of dispersion in Jacob was made to both of

them. Hence they shared the vocation of teacher between the two tribes of Levi and Simeon. The later Jews placed the tribe of Simeon in a subordinate position. Jarchi, for example, was of opinion that none but clerks and schoolmasters were chosen from this tribe. We need hardly say that there is nothing whatever in history to indicate that this vocation was ever allotted to the Simeonites.

The key to a correct explanation may be easily obtained if we determine the precise position of the family of the Shimeite. We can do this with certainty from Num. 3:17 sqq. Levi had three sons, Gershon, Kohath, and Merari. Gershon had two sons, Libni and Shimei. In ver. 21 the family of the latter is called *הַשִּׁמְעִי*, the family of the Shimeite, just as in the passage before us. It is evident, therefore, that one particular family of the tribe of Levi, and that a subordinate one, is mentioned in connection with the whole tribe. If this be correct, then, it may be regarded as certain that by the family of Nathan we are not to understand the descendants of the prophet who lived in the time of David, still less the prophetic order; for the prophets did not spring from Nathan, and therefore could not be represented as his family. The family of Nathan must be a branch of that of David, just as the family of Shimei was a branch of that of Levi. It may be taken for granted, then, that the prophet alludes to the family of Nathan, a son of David, who is mentioned in 2 Sam. 5:14 and Luke 3:31, and that he introduces the name of Nathan for the same reason as that of Shimei, because he was merely the head of a subordinate branch of the family. We have thus the two leading families in the early theocracy, the *royal* and the *priestly*; and with these there are associated two minor subdivisions to show that the conversion would entirely pervade every family from the highest to the lowest of its members. The prominent position taken by women in the gospel history, from the daughters of Jerusalem in Luke 23:27 sqq. to the weeping Mary in John 20:16, answers to the peculiar emphasis laid upon the women *here*.

Chap. 13:1. "At that time there will be a fountain opened to the house of David, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and for uncleanness."

The penitential grief of Israel will not be in vain. In fact, it cannot be so; for it has been produced by the Lord himself, who has poured out the spirit of *supplication* upon his people. (Chap.12:10) A fountain is shut up as long as it is hidden in the rock, and *opened* when it breaks forth; see Isa. 41:18, etc., 35:6. That "the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem" are to be understood as denoting the whole nation is evident from chap.12:12, where the *land* is referred to. In the expression, "for sin and for uncleanness," there is an allusion to Num. 19:9 sqq., where we find the following passage with reference to the holy water, which contained the ashes of the red heifer that had been offered as a sin-offering, "and it shall be kept for the congregation of Israel for waters of *uncleanness* (טִּהוֹרָה) it is a *sin-offering*. . . . He that toucheth a corpse, and purifieth not himself, defileth the tabernacle of the Lord; and that soul shall be cut out off from Israel, because the water of *Niddah* was not sprinkled upon him, he shall be unclean, his uncleanness is yet upon him." Even under the Old Testament, Levitical uncleanness was regarded as a type of sin, and the outward purification as a symbol of the inward (see Ps. 51:19, and the remarks on Isa. 52:14, in vol. ii. p. 268). The water in this case must be healing water, if it is founded upon the atoning blood. The communication of forgiveness rests upon the atonement; compare 1 John 5:6, "This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ, not by water only, but by water and blood." The legal symbol leads to the same conclusion. The sprinkling, prescribed in Num. 19, could only be performed with water containing the ashes of the red heifer which had been sacrificed as a sin-

offering. A comparison of the passage in Isaiah, upon which this is based (Isa. 52:13 sqq.) leads to the same conclusion. Christ is there represented as the sacrifice for sins, and according to ver. 14, the sprinkling of many nations is rendered possible by his atoning death. This is also indicated in chap. 12:10, where the saving look at the pierced one is referred to. As we have an allusion in the passage before us to Num. 19, so have we, in the verse just mentioned, to Num. 21:9, "And it came to pass, that if a serpent had bitten any man, he *looked at* the brazen serpent and lived." Michaelis, therefore, is quite correct in saying, "Christ himself has been opened as a fountain." The blood, which forms the background of the water, has in fact been mentioned with sufficient distinctness in the context: viz, in the expression, "they pierced," and the funeral lamentation in chap. 12:10. Hence we have an intimation here of the fact, which is expressly stated in 1 John 1:7, "The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin." That the fountain for sin and uncleanness was opened to the inhabitants of Jerusalem immediately after the death of Christ, is evident from Acts 3:19, where Peter says to the Jews: "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out," and from Acts 5:30, where Peter and the apostles say in the presence of the Sanhedrim, "The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew, and hanged on a tree. Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel (chap. 12:10) and forgiveness of sins."

The consequence of the forgiveness of sins is a new life in righteousness and holiness, a removal, under the help of the Lord, of everything opposed to his will.

Ver. 2. "*And it shall come to pass in that day, saith Jehovah of hosts, that I cut off the names of the idols out of the land, and they shall no more be remembered; and also I cause the prophets and the unclean spirit to pass out of the land.*"

In order to express the idea of the removal of every form of ungodliness from the forgiven people, the prophet selects two specific examples, idolatry and false prophecy, which had been most rife in the earlier times, particularly in the days of Jeremiah, in whose prophecies Zechariah "lived and moved." We can draw no conclusion from this as to its prevalence in the prophet's own times, or in the future which he describes. The peculiar manifestation is merely an accident; the essence is ungodliness, which is always the same whether it assume the form of idolatry, of false prophecy, or of pharisaism. Such an assumption need cause the less difficulty here, on account of the many striking examples we have already had of descriptions of the future under the forms of the past or the present, which may differ in appearance, but are essentially the same. The expressions, "to cut off the names," and "that they be no more remembered," denote the most complete extermination; compare Hos. 2:19. With regard to the latter, Calvin has well observed, "His meaning is, that the hatred of superstition will be so great that the people will shudder even at the very name."—That we have no ground for inferring, as Eichhorn, Rückert, and others have done, that we have here an announcement of the cessation of the gifts of prophecy, but that it is rather the removal of *false* prophets which is here predicted, is evident from the fact that the prophets are classed with idols on the one hand, and with an unclean spirit on the other; from the expression, "I will cause to pass out of the land," which indicates a forcible extermination of something bad in itself and a pollution to the land; and from the further expansion given afterwards, where two different kinds of *false* prophets are mentioned, namely, those who speak in the name of the Lord, and those who combine false prophecy with idolatry. The *unclean spirit* presents a contrast to the spirit of grace, spoken of in chap. 12:10 as afterwards to be

poured out on the one hand, and to the fountain opened for the cleansing away of uncleanness, on the other. The special allusion to idolatry and false prophecy, particularly the latter, is evident from the connection. From the fact that a *spirit* of uncleanness is referred to, it follows that the false prophets, as well as the true, and possibly the worshippers of idols, as well as those of the true God, were under the dominion of a principle external to themselves, to whose power they had given themselves up by an act of free will. This is also apparent from 1 Kings 22, where, in accordance with the character of the vision, the spirit of prophecy is introduced in a personal form, and offers to deceive Ahab, by putting false prophecies into the mouths of the prophets of the calves. It follows from this that the false prophets, as well as the true, were subject to an influence from without,—a doctrine which is confirmed by the New Testament view of the kingdom of darkness and kingdom of light, as being both equally in possession of the minds of those who belong to them (compare, for example, the parable of the tares). In Luke 11:25, the “unclean spirit” (an expression taken from this passage) is a power existing apart from the individual, and is contrasted with the Holy Spirit (ver. 13). The same remark applies to the three unclean spirits in Rev. 16:13.<sup>54</sup>

Ver. 3. *“And it cometh to pass, if any still further prophesieth, his father and mother, that begat him, say to him, Thou shall not live, for thou hast spoken lies in the name of the Lord. And his father and mother, that begat him, pierce him through, when he prophesieth.”*

The prophet has here expressed in his own pictorial style the thought, that in that day love to God will be manifested with unbounded energy. If the pictorial character of the verse be overlooked, difficulties of various kinds immediately arise; though any one may see at once that they do not really exist. In Deut. 13:6-10, which formed the basis of the prophet’s drapery, a judicial procedure is alluded to, and the nearest relations merely commence the execution. קָרַךְ, in the passage before us, is supposed by many commentators to mean simply corporeal punishment, and not a mortal wound. But the opposite of this is evident, both from the words “thou shalt not live,” this being merely the execution of the sentence, and also from those passages in the law which the prophet had in his mind. In the latter it is not punishment in general, but capital punishment that is commanded. Compare Deut. 18:20, “But the prophet which shall presume to speak a word in my name, which I have not commanded him to speak, or that shall speak in the name of strange gods, even that prophet shall die;” see also chap. 13:6-11, and Michaelis, *Mosaisches Recht*. v. § 252. The severest punishment also is best suited to express the thought intended by the prophet. The cause which has led to this conclusion has been the erroneous assumption, that the false prophet mentioned here must be one of those whose actions are described in the following verse. There is an allusion in קָרַךְ to chap. 12:10, where the same verb is employed. (Compare the remarks on that passage.)—In the laws of Moses respecting the false prophets, two classes are mentioned, those who utter false prophecies in the name or by the authority of the true God, pretending to be his servants and messengers, and those who prophecy in the name of strange gods, and derive their inspiration from them. In the verse before us, the prophet introduces one of the former; in vers. 5 and 6, one of the latter.

Ver. 4. *“And it cometh to pass in that day, the prophets will desist, with shame, from their vision in their prophesying, and they will no more put on the hairy mantle to lie.”*

Upon the prophets themselves,—the deceivers. who are least open to good impressions,—the great revolution will have such an influence that they will give up their occupation

with shame. The *hairy garment* was the dress of the true prophets, and was imitated by the false ones, to impose upon the common people, in whose estimation the dress makes the man (compare Isa. 20:2; 2 Kings 1:8; Rev. 11:3). According to the general idea, the prophets wore this kind of clothing as ascetics; and Vitringa (on Isaiah) has very strenuously defended this view. But as the hairy garment is on other occasions always peculiar to mourners, as the prophets themselves not infrequently order it to be worn as a sign of sorrow for sin and for the judgments of God, which are either threatened or have already fallen, it is a more natural conclusion that in their own case also it had the same meaning, that it was a *sermo propheticus realis*, a symbol of the prophet's grief for the sins of his nation, and the consequent judgments of God; and this supposition is confirmed by the fact, that we have no indication that any of the prophets of the Old Testament led a strictly ascetic life. The expression "*to lie*" may either mean that they dress in this way to give themselves out as true prophets and the better to impose upon the people, or that they did it to gain credence to their lying prophecies. The former is the more probable on account of the following verse, where the false prophets, who have hitherto pretended to be true, are described as candidly confessing that they are no prophets at all. Strange to say, it has been maintained by Ewald and even by Schmieder, that the prophet foretells the overthrow of the whole existing order of prophets, and that, in fact, the words of vers. 2-4 betray the author's opinion, that the prophets, as a whole, were false. (Hitzig). This is just as rash as the conclusion to which some have come, that the rejection of sacrifice is announced in Isa. 1 and 64. In every one of the three verses we have a distinct sign, which serves to mark the prophet as a false one; in ver. 2, the association of the unclean spirit along with the notice of the prophet; in ver. 3, his speaking lies; and in ver. 4, his deceiving. If the prophet had disputed the claims of the prophets, he would by so doing have denied his own existence. It is evident, however, from chap. 7:3, 7, and 12, that he held the true prophets in very great esteem. This is also apparent from the fact that his announcements universally rest upon the predictions of the earlier prophets. A future revival of prophecy is expressly predicted by Malachi, the last of the old line, in chap. 3:1.

Ver. 5. "*And he saith, I am no prophet^ I am a husbandman. For a man has sold me from my youth.*"

The false prophets were, for the most part, of humble rank. The leading motives by which they were actuated were idleness, which made them dislike to work for their living, and ambition, which led them to push themselves into the more respectable order of teachers of the people. This is evident from many passages; among others, from Isa. 9:13, 14, where the honourable man is described as the head of the nation, the false prophet, on the contrary, as the tail, the representative of the common people.—At the time referred to, however, better principles will so thoroughly have gained the upper hand, that they will prefer to pass for what they are, even though they may be nothing more than common husbandmen, rather than for what they once wished to be considered. The prophet depicts a scene between a man, who has formerly been a false prophet, and some one who asks him what he is. At first he is ashamed to answer, and tries to hide the fact that he has been a false prophet; but a second question forces from him the humiliating acknowledgment (ver. 6). This dramatic character of the whole account is a sufficient explanation of the double use of קאמר (in this verse and ver. 6), without any further or more precise description of the persons speaking. In a drama the persons are known from their speeches and actions,—הקנני has been rendered in very different ways. But this would never have been the case if the translators had kept to the ordinary sense of the Hiphil. קנה

means to acquire, possess: *Hiphil*, to cause to acquire or possess, then, to give anything into a persons possession. The words “from my youth” are intended to avert the suspicion that the husbandman of to-day was formerly a prophet. If he were not an independent farmer, but a farm-labourer in another man’s service, he would apparently have been prevented by outward circumstances from ever acting as a prophet, however much he might have desired it. Undoubtedly, if he wanted entirely to escape suspicion, he might have adopted some better method than beginning with the declaration, “I am no prophet.” But his fear lest he should be discovered so completely overcame him, that he spoke without reflection, and by his very denial put the inquirer upon the true scent.

Ver. 6. “*And that man saith to him: What are the wounds then between thy hands? He saith: They have been inflicted upon me in the house of my lovers.*”

In the opinion of many commentators the late false prophet still continues his lying. Others suppose that he confesses his shame, and states that the wounds have certainly been inflicted upon him by his parents on account of his prophesying, and as he now sees from true affection. The latter is Jerome’s explanation. But neither of these interpretations can be sustained. In both of them *מַצְרִיבִים* is taken in a good sense, whereas, from the nature of the Piel as an intensive form, it is always used to denote impure and sinful love, either carnal or spiritual, and especially that of idols. It occurs in this sense not less than fourteen times; first of all in Hosea; then in Jeremiah and Ezekiel; and these are the only books in which it is found. It is evident that it must have the same meaning here. To the objection adduced by Hitzig, “one single man could not call the idols his lovers.” we reply that there is nothing more objectionable in this than in the fact that Isaiah calls the Lord his beloved or bridegroom in chap. 5:1, or that Solomon should be called Jedediah (compare my commentary on Solomon’s Song). To the further objection that “the prophets are represented in the previous verse as prophesying in the name of Jehovah, although they prophesy falsely, and not as idolaters, it is a sufficient reply that the first kind are noticed there, the second here. Moreover, in the period which Zechariah had more particularly in his mind, the line of demarcation between the two was not clearly defined. Hence we subscribe to the opinions of those who believe that reference is made here to the wounds commonly inflicted in connection with idolatrous worship.<sup>55</sup> We shall content ourselves at present with proving that this custom also prevailed in connection with the forms of idolatrous worship which existed among the Hebrews. The strongest proof is afforded by 1 Kings 18:28, where the priests and prophets of Baal are said to have “cried aloud, and cut themselves after their manner with knives and lancets, till the blood gushed out upon them.” But a proof may also be found in Jer. 16:6 and 41:5, from which we learn that the heathen custom which prevailed among the surrounding nations, particularly the Philistines and Moabites, of inflicting wounds upon themselves when any death had occurred, or any great calamity had befallen the land (see chap. 47:5 and 48:37), had been adopted by the Hebrews. This custom was not a mere sign of grief, but was intimately related to idolatrous worship, and the wounds inflicted in connection with that worship. This is obvious from Deut. 14:1. The Israelites are there forbidden to wound themselves on occasions of mourning, on the express ground that they are the nation of God, which is not to be defiled by idolatrous practices. The connection becomes still more apparent when we look more closely into the origin and meaning of the custom of wounding as one of the rites of idolatry. We find the best explanation of this in a passage of Apuleius: “*Infit vaticinatione clamosa, conficto mendacio, semet ipsum incessere atque criminari, quasi contra fas sanctae religionis designasset aliquid, et insuper justas poenas noxii facinoris ipse suis manibus exposcere. Arrepto denique flagro, quod semiviris illis*

proprium gestamen est, . . . indidem sese multimodis commulcat ictibus, mira contra plagarum dolores praesumptione munitus. Cerneret prosectu gladiatorum ictuque flagrorum solum spurcitie sanguinis effeminati madescere.” According to this passage, and another which Calmet has quoted from *Clemens Alexandrinus*, the custom of inflicting wounds originated in a vague consciousness of guilt and of the necessity for expiation which manifested itself in such various ways in the ceremonies of idolatrous worship. The worshippers punished their own bodies without mercy, that they might thereby render a species of satisfaction, and secure the favour of the offended deities. Now this consciousness of guilt was excited in a peculiar manner by the death of friends, not merely because their loss was regarded as a punishment, but also because death in general, which comes so near to us in the death of those we love, affects even the rudest minds in such a manner as to excite a suspicion of what it really is, namely, the wages of the sin of the human race. And this is also the case with public calamities, inasmuch as they are commonly regarded as judgments from an angry God, or from angry gods. But we are not left without proofs that this custom of wounding was intimately associated with the rites performed by idolatrous prophets. We find it expressly mentioned in this connection in the passage quoted from the books of Kings (compare ver. 29), whilst the whole narrative furnishes evidence of the intimate association between idolatry and false prophecy. The priests of Baal were also his prophets. There is a very remarkable passage, however, in *Tibullus* (l.1, eleg. 1, ver. 43 sqq.), relating to the worship of Cybele:

Ipsa bipenne suos cseclit violenta lacertos,  
 Sanguineque effuso spargit inepta deum,  
 Atque laius prsefixa veru stat saucia pectus,  
 Et canit eventus, quos dea magna movet.

This close connection may be traced to the consciousness that satisfaction must first be rendered to the Deity for sin before any man can be worthy to receive him into himself, and engage in his service. The doubt which has been raised, whether מַכּוֹת could be applied to these wounds and the scars that they caused, is not deserving of any consideration. Apuleius renders it by *plagoe*, which exactly corresponds. Seneca, as quoted by Augustine (*de civ. dei*, 6. 10), says, “se ipsi in templis contrucident, *vulneribus* suis ac sanguine supplicant.” A plausible objection might be founded upon the expression, “I have been wounded;” for in nearly all the accounts which we possess relating to this custom, self-inflicted wounds alone are mentioned. But it is evident, at least from the statements of modern travellers (see Olearius, p. 332), that there are cases in which the worshippers inflict wounds upon one another; and the assertion, “I have been wounded,” does not preclude the infliction of wounds upon oneself. The late prophet may have intentionally selected the passive, because he was only the instrument, the real authors were the lovers. The probability of this last assumption is increased by the selection of the word מַיְבִהָאֵם, to denote the idols, a choice which can hardly have been accidental. The expression “my lovers” is evidently employed on account of the contrast which it presents to the announcement, “I have been wounded.” The folly of this species of idolatrous worship is described by Seneca (*ut supra*) in much the same manner: “ut sic dii placentur, quemadmodum ne homines quidem saeviunt teterrimi et in fabulas traditae crudelitatis. Tyranni laceraverunt aliquorum membra, neminem sua lacerare jusserunt. In regiae libidinis voluptatem castrati sunt quidam; sed nemo sibi, ne vir esset, jubente domino manus intulit.” The connection between this verse and the preceding one is as follows. The late prophet, when asked about his circumstances, tries first of all to avert suspicion that he has ever left his humble occupation. But when the interrogator calls his



attention to the suspicious scars upon his body, he acknowledges with the deepest shame his former folly, and shows that he regards it in this light, by the manner in which his confession is made, "*Between thy hands*" may be most simply explained as meaning on the hands themselves and round about them. "*Between*" is employed instead of "on" to show that we are not to imagine that the wounds were confined to the hands; it merely describes the situation in general terms, showing, however, that they were chiefly about the hands, and also that we are not to think at all of such remote parts as the head and shoulders. The reason why the hands are singled out is not that they were uncovered, and that the wounds were more readily seen on that account. It is evident from the expression, "on all hands there are cuttings," which occurs in Jer. 48:37, in connection with a description of the mourning of the Moabites, that it was a common custom to wound the hands. In the passages relating to this subject, in both classical authors and the Fathers, the greatest stress is generally laid upon the arms, which are certainly included here. Seneca, for example, says "*lacertos secat,*" and Apuleius, "*sua quisque brachia dissecant.*"

### CHAPTER 13:7-9

The Lord's shepherd, who is closely connected with the Lord himself, is to be taken away from his flock, the covenant nation, by a violent death. The flock, deprived of its shepherd, will then be exposed to sufferings of every kind and eventually scattered. But the Lord will not withdraw his hand from it for ever. Two-thirds, indeed, must perish. But to the last third, after it has passed through the purifying fire of affliction, the mercy of God will be gloriously displayed.

This prophecy forms a brief repetition, and at the same time an explanation of that contained in chap. 11 and 12:1-13:6.

Ver. 7. "*Awake, O sword, upon my shepherd and upon a man, my fellow, saith the Lord of Sabaoth; smite the shepherd and the flock, is scattered, and I bring back my hand over the little ones.*"

There can be no doubt that by the Lord's shepherd mentioned here we are to understand the same shepherd who is represented as associated with him by a mysterious unity of nature; who is described in chap. 11 as undertaking the office of shepherd over the miserable nation, and making a last attempt to preserve it; whose fidelity in his office is rewarded by it with such base ingratitude,<sup>56</sup> and who is eventually put to death (chap. 12:10). The rejection of this shepherd is represented in chap. 11 as followed by precisely the same consequences as his death in the verses before us, namely, the destruction of the greater portion of the nation (compare ver. 8 with chap. 11:6, 9, 15-17); and even in chap. 12:10, his death is indirectly referred to as the cause of all the sufferings which befall the nation. This is amply sufficient to demonstrate the fallacy of every exposition which seeks for any other shepherd than the Messiah; whether "the ideal pseudo-Messiah, Ben Joseph," as most of the Jewish commentators suppose;<sup>57</sup> or "some hostile general," who is called the Lord's shepherd *ironically*, as Jarchi imagines; or "the foolish shepherd" spoken of in chap. 11:15-17, as Grotius maintains in his commentary on Matt. 26:31; or "Judas Maccabeus," as not only Jahn but Grotius also affirms in his commentary on this passage (for, as is generally the case where mere conjectures are indulged in, he is not consistent with himself); or "an ideal general, who is to fall in conflict with the foe," as Köster, Bertholdt, and Eichhorn say; or "a native monarch, who is to be punished for his sins," which is the notion entertained by Hitzig and Bleek, and

which Maurer and Ewald have carried out still further by fixing upon the individual intended,—the former fancying Jehoiakim, the latter the wicked Pekah; or lastly, “the whole body of rulers, spiritual and temporal, including Christ,” which is the interpretation given by Calvin and Drusius.—All these explanations are at variance, not only with the authority of Christ, but also, and most decidedly, with the expression which immediately follows “upon a man my fellow.” It is true, this would not be the case if עֲמִית could be applied to an associate of any description, as many have asserted. The shepherd is said to be called the associate of the Lord, because he is also the shepherd of his people. But this assertion cannot be sustained. עֲמִית is one of those words which are peculiar to the Pentateuch, having subsequently become entirely obsolete. It is used eleven times in the Pentateuch, and is not met with anywhere else. From this it is obvious that Zechariah did not take it from the living language of his own day, but, like אֶלֹהֶיךָ in chap. 12:5, from the Pentateuch, and, therefore, that we must adhere strictly to the meaning which we find it bearing there. It occurs in the laws relating to injuries done to near relations, and is always used with peculiar emphasis, to show how great a crime it is to injure one who is related both bodily and spiritually by a common descent. It is used interchangeably as being equivalent to *brother*; a word which is invariably employed in the laws of Moses with reference to a common physical and spiritual descent. We will quote the eleven passages in which it occurs. Lev. 19:11, “Ye shall not lie or defraud בְּעַמִּיתוֹ” (compare Eph. 4:25). Ver. 15, “Thou shalt judge עֲמִיתְךָ righteously.” Ver. 17, “Thou shalt not hate thy *brother* in thy heart; thou shalt rebuke עֲמִיתְךָ” Lev. 18:20, “Thou shalt not lie with אִשְׁתַּ עֲמִיתְךָ.” Lev. 24:19, “If a man inflict a bodily injury בְּעַמִּיתוֹ, as he hath done so shall it be done to him,” Lev. 25:15, “If thou buyest anything of רֵתִימֶעַל, or sellest anything רֵתִימֶעַל, ye shall not injure any one his brother.” And so again in vers. 16 and 17, “And ye shall not injure any one רֵתִימֶעַל; and thou shalt fear thy God.” Lev. 6:2, “If a soul sin, and commit a trespass *against the Lord*, and lie unto רֵתִימֶעַל in anything entrusted to him (repudiate a trust)— or oppress רֵתִימֶעַל.”<sup>58</sup> It is obvious that in all these passages עֲמִית is used in a very different sense from our word *nächste* (lit. the next or nearest one; Angl. *neighbour*), which has been weakened by use and robbed of its original meaning by sin, until it has come at length to denote generally a stranger. It clearly indicates the closest relationship that can possibly exist among men, not one which can be entered into at pleasure, but into which every man is born, which continues to exist even against his will, and becomes the just occasion and ground of punishment if he violate its obligations. From this it is evident, however, that, when the same term is applied to the relation in which a certain individual stands to God, the individual referred to cannot be a mere man, but must be the same person who has already been referred to in chap. 11 and 12 as connected with the Lord by a mysterious unity of essence. The neighbour or fellow of the Lord is no other than he who says in John 10:30, “I and the Father are one,” and who is described in John 1:18 as “the only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father,” whose connection with the Father is the closest that can possibly be conceived.

In the use of רֵתִימֶעַל in this passage, there seems to be a special reference intended to the circumstances under which it invariably occurs in the Pentateuch, namely, in laws relating to injuries inflicted upon a “neighbour.” The prophet, by employing this word, gives prominence to the apparent discrepancy between the command of the Lord “Sword, awake over my shepherd,” and the precepts of his own law, according to which no one was to injure his *ammith* (neighbour). He calls attention in this way to the grandeur of that object, for the attainment of which the Lord could even disregard a relation, whose type among men he had commanded to be kept holy. Humanly speaking, he points out how much is involved in such a command, how much it must cost the Lord (compare the

expression in Rom. 8:32, “*who spared not his own son*”). נָקַר, which is added, stands in a certain contrast to עֲמִיתֵי. He, whose is the sword to smite, must combine the human nature with the divine. נָקַר is not infrequently used to denote man, as contrasted “with God, *e.g.* Job 16:21. The subordinate idea of strength, which the word often has, like our word *man*, is not to be sought for here, as it has been by many. The personification of the sword, and the address delivered to it, is perfectly analogous to the prophecy of Jeremiah against Philistia in chap. 47:6, where the prophet is affected by feelings of pity for the fate of those against whom he has prophesied, and exclaims, “O thou sword of the Lord, how long will it be ere thou be quiet? put up thyself into thy scabbard, rest and be still! How couldst thou be quiet, seeing the Lord hath given it a command, seeing that he hath sent it against Ashkelon and the sea-shore?” This command also proves that the Lord himself is the first cause of the death of his shepherd, the human agent being merely his instruments, as Christ says to Pilate, “Thou wouldest have no power against me if it were not given thee from above” (John 19:11). The expression “awake” shows that, in accordance with the personification, we are to regard the sword as hitherto at rest. Until now the shepherd’s *hour* had not yet come. The fact that a *sword* is commanded to smite the Lord’s shepherd, merely announces the death which awaits him, and has no reference to the precise manner of his death, any more than the *piercing* mentioned in chap. 12:10, which indicates not a cut but a stab. The sword, as being the weapon usually wielded by the judge and the warrior, is not infrequently used to denote any instrument by which a wound or death is inflicted, in cases where the point in question is not the instrument itself but the wounding or slaying. The most striking example is 2 Sam. 12:9, “Thou hast slain him, O Uriah, by the *sword* of the children of Ammon;” or, according to 2 Sam. 11:24, he had been pierced by the *arrows* of the Ammonites. In 2 Sam. 11:25, when David had received information from Joab that many of his men had been slain by the *arrows* shot by the foe, he sent back this message, “Let not this thing be evil to thee, for the *sword* devoureth now here, now there.” The same general use of the word sword is met with in Ex. 5:21, “Ye have made our savour to be abhorred in the eyes of Pharaoh and his servants, putting a sword into their hands to slay us.” Compare also Ps. 22:21 and Matt. 26:52, “All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.” What murderer could deny the applicability of these words, which are a repetition of the general sentence pronounced in Gen. 9:6, to his own case, on the ground that he had not slain his neighbour with a sword, but with some other kind of weapon? The same idiom was current among the Romans, who called the right of the magistrate to inflict capital punishments, the *jus gladii*. There are many commentators who suppose that the words, “smite the shepherd,” are not addressed to the sword. Thus Michaelis says, “smite, whoever thou mayest be that smitest.” But the fact of הָרַב being feminine furnishes no support to such an explanation, when we consider the personification adopted here; compare, for example, Gen. 4:7, where sin which is personified as a wild beast, is construed as a masculine.

*Smite the shepherd, and the sheep will be scattered.* If the shepherd be dead in either a spiritual or a corporeal sense, the flock is generally scattered. Compare 1 Kings 22:17, where the prophet Micah, when predicting the death of Ahab, addresses both Jehoshaphat and Ahab thus: “I saw all Israel scattered upon the hills, as sheep that have not a shepherd; and the Lord said, These have no shepherd, let them return every man to his house in peace.” (“Judas also was killed, and the remnant fled,” 1 Macc. 9:18.) A misunderstanding of the New Testament quotations of this passage has led many commentators to interpret the term *flock* in too limited a sense, and to restrict to a part what really applies to the whole. Thus, for example, in the *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, the

flock is represented as referring exclusively to the disciples, and the passage is supposed to have been completely fulfilled when he was taken prisoner and they all “forsook him and fled.” Ambrosius discovers the fulfilment in the dispersion of the apostles into every land, and in their proclamation of the gospel of Christ (Sermon ii. on Ps. 118). According to Jerome, the flock embraces “*omnem in Christo multitudinem credentium*,” and Michaelis explains it in a similar manner as denoting “the apostles and other believing Jews.” But the flock must include *all* the sheep, which *the* shepherd had to feed. Now, according to chap. 11, these embraced not merely the believers, but the *whole* Jewish nation; compare especially the notes on ver. 7. “The poor of the flock, *who wait upon the shepherd*,” are described in ver. 11 as only a portion of this flock. Hence the entire nation is represented here under the image of sheep without a shepherd, after the death of the Messiah. In what way and for what length of time they were deprived of the shepherd, and plunged into misery in consequence, would depend upon the differences in their spiritual condition, and the consequent differences in the treatment they received from the Lord. The bereavement suffered by the apostles and other believers was only temporary; the Lord soon took them under his protection again.

The phrase, “*to bring back the hand upon a person*,” in other words, to act upon him again, is indefinite in its nature, and whether it is used in a good or bad sense, the context must decide. In the present instance many suppose that the expression is used in a bad sense, and in this they have been preceded by the Chaldee and Septuagint, and by the Greek commentators who are guided by these versions. The next verse also appears to favour this conclusion, for reference is there made to a severe judgment impending over the scattered flock. But this merely carries out what has already been said of the *dispersion* of the flock, upon the greater portion of which it is destructive in its effects. Then follows, at the end of ver. 8 and in ver. 9, an expansion of the words, “I bring back my hand.” Moreover, the very phrase itself, “I will bring *back*” contains a proof that it is used in a good sense, for it evidently expresses a contrast to the act of *dispersion*, which is recorded immediately before. The expression “*the little ones*” again, also leads to the same conclusion; for it evidently indicates the compassion of the Lord for the miserable condition of the poor sheep; just as in chap. 11:7, the shepherd undertakes to feed the flock, on account of their being most wretched sheep. (Compare Isa. 1:25 sqq.; where Vitringa has clearly proved that the same words, “I will bring back my hand over thee,” are used in a *good* sense, and refer to the mercy which is manifested by the Lord to his people in its purification; whereas so long as this was delayed, he appeared to have forsaken it.) There is evidently a contrast between Zion in ver. 25, and the enemies of God in ver. 24; and the same contrast is introduced in vers. 27 and 28.—הַצְּעִירִים are the *little ones* in a figurative sense, the wretched ones, those who are called the most miserable sheep in chap. 11:7. In Jer. 14:3, the synonymous term צְעִיר is opposed to אֲדִיר, “their nobles send their little ones for water.” In Jer. 48:4, צְעִיר is also used to denote wretchedness of condition; compare again Ps. 119:141, “I am small and despised.” In the form of the word, מִרְעָצ is simply the participle of רָעַצ, to be small; and in the only other passages in which it occurs, viz. Jer. 30:19 and Job 14:21, it is inferiority of condition that is referred to. Hitzig understands by the little ones, “the poor and pious in the nation, who suffer wrong, but do not inflict it;” but the fact that there is no antithesis in this case, as there is in Ezek. 34:16, 20, is a sufficient objection to such an interpretation. And again, “the *little ones*” in chap. 11:7 are not one particular portion of the flock, but the whole. If מִרְעָצ is a participle, the reference to the flock is the more obvious; “over those who are little” being equivalent to “over them, on account of their degradation.” The bringing back of the hand of the Lord upon the little ones, which is promised here, was

experienced first by the apostles and such of the Jews as already believed on Christ.— We will take another look at the New Testament quotations of this passage. The principal one is Matt. 26:31, 32, “Then saith Jesus unto them, all ye shall be offended because of me this night, for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad. But (δὲ), after I am risen again I will go before you into Galilee” (compare Mark 14:27). This quotation is taken from the original Hebrew, not from the Septuagint. The figurative mode of representation, the address to the sword which the Seventy have retained, is resolved by the Lord into plain terms, “I will smite.” The concluding words as the δὲ sufficiently shows, are consolatory in their nature, containing an announcement that, after a brief suspension of his office of shepherd, the Lord will resume it again so far as the apostles and the rest of the believers are concerned. Hence they contain a particular application of the words in Zechariah, “I bring back my hand over them.” It is also obvious from this that the words are interpreted by the Lord in good sense, and that he did not understand the *little* sheep as meaning *shepherds*, as the Chaldee paraphrast and all the Greek expositors have erroneously supposed (see Aquila, ἐπὶ τοῦς ποιμένας βραχεῖς; Symmachus and the Septuagint, μικροὺς; Theodoret, νεωτέρπους). We have already seen, however, that the special application of Zechariah’s announcement respecting the dispersion of the flock to the apostles and first believers. in whom a commencement was made of the saving operations of the Lord on behalf of his church, which was given over to judgment, does not preclude a more comprehensive meaning or a wider application. The great importance attached by the Lord to this passage is apparent from the fact that he had already made use of the words to announce to the disciples the fate which awaited them; though he does not expressly introduce them as a quotation, as he does on the present occasion, on account of their having failed to comprehend the allusion before. In John 16:32, he says, “Behold the hour cometh, yea, is now come, that ye shall be scattered, every man to his own, and shall leave me alone.”

Ver. 8. “*And it cometh to pass, in all the land, saith the Lord, two parts therein are cut off and die, and the third remains therein.*”

The article in רָחֵקָה points to the land with which the prophet had been occupied throughout, and over the inhabitants of which the Lord had undertaken the office of shepherd (compare chap. 7:5, 12:12). The expression שְׁנֵי־פִי is taken from Deut. 21:17, as it is also in 2 Kings 2:9. It means, literally, “a mouth of two,” that is, “a mouthful,” a “mouth-portion,” of two, and is founded upon the custom of placing a double portion of food, or more, before such as it was desired to honour. (See Gen. 43:34, and Rosenmüller’s *Alt. u. Neu. Morgenland*, i. p. 207). In the passage referred to in Deuteronomy it is used in a secondary sense to denote that portion of the inheritance which fell to the share of the first-born, namely, a double portion. The word פִּי is not used anywhere else, in this derivative sense, for a share or “portion” in general; and there can be no doubt that, when Elisha, as the firstborn of Elijah in a spiritual sense, asked for a double portion of his spiritual inheritance, he borrowed the expression from the Pentateuch, and that our prophet has done the same. The whole of the Jewish nation is represented here as an inheritance left by the shepherd, who has been put to death, and this inheritance is divided into three parts, *two* of which are given up to death, as maintaining the right of the first-born, whilst life receives the *third*;—a division similar to that which was made by David after the overthrow of the Moabites, “And David smote the Moabites, and measured them with the measuring line, making them lie down; and he measured two parts to put to death, and one part to keep alive.” That the double portion

allotted to death was just two-thirds, is intimated afterwards in the fact that “the third” still remained. If we compare Ezek. 5:2 with ver. 12, “A third part of thee shall die with the pestilence, and with famine shall they be consumed in the midst of thee; and a third part shall fall by the sword round about thee, and I will scatter a third part into all the winds, and I will draw out a sword after them,” it seems natural to suppose that the double portion of death was to be divided into those who died a violent death by the sword, and those who died by famine and pestilence. But it is decisive against this, that *וַיָּנֶחַ*, to disperse, is also used in connection with a violent death; compare vol. ii. p. 453; Gen. 7:21; Josh. 22:20. At the same time, the similarity between Zechariah and Ezekiel—the (the division of the whole nation into three parts, two-thirds to be destroyed, and one third to be preserved)—is too striking for it to be regarded as merely accidental.<sup>59</sup> Moreover, it is not merely external, but has a deeper foundation. The prophet takes up the whole of Ezekiel’s prophecy contained in chap. 5, and announces a second fulfilment, just as we have already proved that he has done with a similar prediction of Jeremiah (compare the remarks on chap. 11:13). Ezekiel had already threatened the people that the Lord would divide them on account of their sins. This threat had been fulfilled, and the people were still suffering the consequences of the judgment, when the prophet announced that the Lord would make a fresh division on account of their fresh rebellion. The substance of the two prophecies is to be found in that striking and comprehensive picture at the close of Isa. 6, in which Isaiah had depicted the fate of the covenant nation some centuries before. In chap. 6:11, 12, he announces the utter desolation of the land and the dispersion of its inhabitants into distant countries;—(the Babylonian catastrophe).—This portion of the prophecy is still further expanded in Ezek. 5.—He then adds, “but yet in it shall be a tenth, and it is made desolate again.” Under the latter we can only understand the fresh overthrow of the national independence by the Romans. And it is this second destruction to which Zechariah here refers. The further predictions of Isaiah respecting the holy seed, which is to be preserved when the whole nation is overthrown, and is to attain to salvation, are in perfect harmony with the concluding words of the passage before us and with ver. 9 (compare vol. ii. p. 5).

Ver. 9. “*And I bring the third part into the fire, and refine them as silver is refined, and try them as gold is tried: he shall call upon my name, and I will hear him: I say, It is my people; and he saith, Jehovah is my God.*”

The third part is the true Israel which continues to exist in the Christian Church (cf. chap. 12:1), the only people of God on earth, the only one which can call the Lord its God. The fire represents the tribulations which necessarily attend the first introduction of the kingdom of God, the severe conflicts in which the true Israel has to engage, first with the two-thirds, but after that, and to a still greater extent, with the heathen (compare chap. 12:1-9 and chap. 14). In 1 Pet. 1:6, 7 the apostle wrote, after the fire had already broken out, “Wherein ye greatly rejoice, though now for a season, if need be, ye are in heaviness through manifold temptations, that the trial of your faith, being much more precious than of gold that perishes, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise, and honour, and glory.” This passage might serve as a commentary upon the one before us. C. B. Michaelis and others, who suppose that the sufferings of the Jewish nation during the whole period of its dispersion are here referred to, have quite mistaken the meaning. *In this case unbelieving Judaism would be regarded as the legitimate and sole continuation of Israel.* Moreover, refining presupposes the existence of a precious metal; the *assaying* of gold proves that it is really gold. *Both of them, wherever they are spoken of, have reference solely to such as are still in a state of grace.* There is almost a

verbal agreement between this passage and ver. 10 of the 66th Psalm, of which David is the author, “For thou, O God, hast proved us; thou hast tried us as silver is tried.” But this earlier passage, upon which ours is based, refers to Israel as still enjoying the grace of God. In the Berleburger Bible there occurs the following note on the Psalm referred to: “By many a furnace of affliction thou hast tested the worth and constancy of our faith, hope, and patience, as metals are tested by fire.” קָרָא בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה has two meanings: “to shout out the name of the Lord with love,” *i.e.* to praise him (1 Chron. 16:8 and Isa. 44:5); and “to call upon the name of the Lord with love.” In either case the ׀ denotes the object in which the affections of the person, engaged in shouting or calling, repose; and the strict meaning is to shout out, or address, being satisfied with the name of the Lord, that is, absorbed with love in his manifested glory. The phrase, therefore, is not perfectly equivalent to אֵל יְהוָה קָרָא or אֵל יְהוָה קָרָא. It can never be used, as the latter can, in connection with persons who address the Lord in a hypocritical manner, or outwardly and superficially alone. Hence it is used with perfect appropriateness in Isa. 64:7, as a parallel to “taking hold of the Lord.” In Joel 3:5, it is represented as the sole condition of salvation.

## CHAPTER 14

All the nations of the earth are collected together by the Lord against his holy city. The city is taken, and the greater part of its inhabitants are either slain by the sword or led into captivity (vers. 1, 2). The Lord, however, now miraculously interposes on behalf of his own people, who have still been preserved, and the judgment is suddenly transferred from the congregation of the Lord to its enemies. The Lord appears in majesty upon the Mount of Olives, and whilst an earthquake announces his coming to judgment, and fills all with dismay, the Mount of Olives is split in two, by which means the valley of Jehoshaphat is extended, and a safe and easy way is opened for the escape of the people of the Lord. The Lord then appears with all his saints to establish his kingdom on the earth (vers. 3-5). At first thick darkness prevails; but at length, when it is least expected, the day of salvation dawns upon the elect (vers. 6, 7). A stream of living water then issues forth from Jerusalem, and spreads fertility and life over all the land (ver. 8). The theocracy, which has hitherto been restricted to one single country, now embraces the whole earth (ver. 9). That Jerusalem alone may be exalted, all the mountains throughout the entire land are levelled, the city rises in splendour from her ruins, to rejoice for ever in the mercy of God, and is henceforth secure from every change (vers. 10, 11). When the enemies, who attacked Jerusalem, have been chastised by the judgment of God (vers. 12-15), the remnant will turn unto the Lord, and will come to Jerusalem every year, to celebrate the feast of tabernacles (ver. 16). Any who fail to perform this duty will be visited by severe punishments (vers. 17-19). The distinction between sacred and profane will then cease for ever, and also the intermingling of the righteous and the wicked (vers. 20, 21).

Commentators are for the most part of opinion that this prophecy is merely a repetition and expansion of chap. 12:1-9; and many powerful arguments may be adduced in support of this conclusion. A fact of importance presents itself at the very outset, namely, that there is no fixed boundary line which separates it from the passage referred to. Now, on account of the great similarity in the subject-matter of the two prophecies, such a division would be all the more necessary if they referred to different events. Moreover, another thing which may be appealed to, as rendering the latter improbable, is the fact that, so far as the emblematical portion is concerned, the prophecy contained in chap. 6:1-8 corresponds to these two prophecies combined, which certainly renders the conclusion a

very natural one, that we have here a resumption of chap. 12:1-9, the attack of the heathen power upon the kingdom of God, and the glorious victory attained by Zion. Those who would separate this prophecy from chap. 12:1-9, imagine that, like Rev. 22:7-10, it refers to the *last* conflict between heathenism and the church, at the close of the millennium, and to the glorification of the kingdom of God, which immediately ensues. But ver. 8 is decisive against this. The living waters which issue from Jerusalem cannot be sought on the other side of the thousand years, as the connection between this passage and Ezek. 47:1-12 clearly shows (see vol. iii. p. 65). And in addition to this, there is no prophecy in the New Testament which relates exclusively to the last stages of the Church's history. Such a step in advance as this was not accorded to the Revelation. The prophecy in Ezek. 38 and 39, to which appeal has been made, bears throughout an ideal and comprehensive character, and cannot be limited to one particular event at the end of time. Gog and Magog represent the future enemies of the kingdom of God generally (compare my commentary on the book of Revelation, vol. ii, p. 304). The reasons assigned for separating this passage from chap. 12:1-9 do not appear capable of being sustained. It is said that in chap. 12 the successful resistance offered by Judah through the miraculous assistance of God, is apparently represented as preventing the capture of the city by the army of the nations, whereas in the passage before us the coming of a day is announced, in which the army of the nations of the world will take Jerusalem. But this difference is not of any importance, unless by Jerusalem we understand the actual, city. If Jerusalem means the Church, the boundary line between taking and not taking becomes a vanishing one. Moreover, even here the capture is only partial; according to ver. 2 only half the inhabitants are carried away, the remainder of the people are *not* cut off from the city. When it is affirmed that "there is not the slightest trace in chap. 12 of the splendid prospects which are here presented to the people of the Lord," the fact is overlooked that it is not a mere recapitulation of chap. 12 that we have before us, but, as a matter of course, an expansion and continuation also. In chap. 12 we find nothing but the victory over the nations; here, on the other hand, we have the glorification of Jerusalem (ver. 10), the healing waters which issue from Jerusalem (ver. 8), the reception of the heathen into the kingdom of God, the dominion of the Lord over the whole earth, and so forth. The result at which we arrive, therefore, is that the prophecy does not relate exclusively to the termination of the Church's history, but to the whole of the Messianic era from its commencement till its close.

Ver. 1. "*Behold, a day cometh to the Lord, and thy spoil is divided in the midst of thee.*"

The day cometh *to the Lord*, not only because he brings it to pass, but also, and more especially, because it is the day on which he is glorified. Every other day has come rather to men; this belongs to the Lord alone. In the same way is the day of the overthrow of Gog represented in Ezek. 39:3 as "the day that I shall be glorified, saith the Lord God." Again, in Isa. 2:12, a day is said to come to the Lord above everything high and exalted; and according to ver. 17, "the Lord alone is exalted in that day." The glorification of the Lord is the result of the overthrow of the heathen. The defeat of the nation of God, which is not mentioned till afterwards, comes into consideration only so far as it is the necessary *condition* of this overthrow. No doubt the sufferings of the people of God presuppose their sinfulness, and therefore serve to glorify God, whose omnipotence and righteousness are displayed in their punishment (compare 1 Pet. 4:16, 17). But it is not in this light that it is referred to, either in this passage or in chap. 12:1-9.—*Thy spoil*; the prophet addresses Jerusalem, the seat of the kingdom of God in his day, since it was under the image of this city that the kingdom was present to his inward view. The impossibility of



adhering strictly to the letter of this announcement is apparent from its figurative character throughout, which no one can deny, and especially from the fact that all the nations of the earth could not possibly gather together to attack the city of Jerusalem, or come every year to celebrate the feast of tabernacles after their defeat. According to ver. 2, the spoil of Jerusalem must be the spoil which is taken from it (compare Isa. 33:4). The passive side is presented here, the active in ver. 14.

Ver. 2. “*And I gather all the Gentiles to Jerusalem to war; and the city is taken, and the houses rifled, and the women ravished; and half of the city goeth forth into captivity, and the residue of the people is not cut off from the city.*”

The assembling of the heathen against Jerusalem, which is here ascribed to God, is traced to Satan in Rev. 20:8. But if even evil is subservient to God, and becomes one of the means by which his plans are carried out; if Satan, who is introduced on that account in Job among the angels of God, is still his servant, though an unwilling one, just as Asshur is called the rod of fury in his hand, and Nebuchadnezzar his servant; if he cannot touch a hair of the heads of the members of the Church of God, the constant object of his attacks, without permission from God (compare chap. 3); it is evident that the discrepancy is only in appearance. There is a parallel in Ezek. 39:2 sqq. where the Lord is represented as bringing Gog from the farthest north to the mountains of Israel, that he may destroy him there. The expression “the houses are rifled, the women ravished,” is taken from Isa. 13:16. When that which properly belongs to Babylon reaches Zion, the divine reaction cannot long be delayed. In the declaration, “*and the remnant of the nation is not cut off from the city,*” a contrast is evidently intended to the former judgment on Jerusalem, which the Chaldeans had been the instruments employed in executing. In that case the advantages enjoyed by those who were left behind, on the occasion of the first transportation, over those who were carried away into captivity, was only an apparent one; a respite was all that was granted them. *Now* the advantages will be solid and lasting. Even in the expression which he employs, the prophet points to the passages relating to the former exile. Thus in Jer. 39:16-18 we find, “For thus saith the Lord to the king that sitteth upon the throne of David, and to all the people that dwell in this city, to your brethren, that have not *gone forth with you as captives*, behold I send upon them the sword and hunger and pestilence, and scatter them into all the kingdoms of the earth;” and again in 2 Kings 25:11, “and the *remnant of the nation*, that was left *in the city*, Nebuzaradan led into captivity.” This contrast, which presupposes that no *curse* rests upon Jerusalem, but that it is under the protection of the mercy of God, is entirely set aside by many of the Church fathers, who imagine that the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans is alluded to here (*e.g.* Theodoret and Jerome). What follows shows still more clearly that it is with the true Church of God, and not with the base sediment, that we have here to do.

Ver. 3. “*And the Lord goeth forth, and fighteth against those heathen as in his day of conflict, and the day of the battle.*”

The connection between this verse and the preceding one may be explained by referring to Isa. 26:20, 21: “Rise up, my people, enter thy chambers and shut thy doors behind thee. Wait but a little while, until the indignation be overpast. For behold, the Lord cometh out of his place to punish the wickedness of the inhabitants of the earth against him.” מִלְחָמָה, with מִן of the person, always means to fight *against* any one (compare the remarks on ver. 14). The rendering adopted in the Septuagint, καὶ ἐξελύσεται κύριος καὶ

παρατάξεται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐκεῖνοις, tended to confirm Theodoret and Cyril in their mistaken idea that the prophecy referred to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. The former observes, παρατάξεται δὲ, οὐκ Ἰουδαίων ὑπερμαχῶν, ἀλλὰ κατ' ἐκείνων στρατηγῶν.—” *As the day of his conflict*” is equivalent to “as in his day of conflict,” and to this is appended, “in the day of the battle,” we may explain this as meaning, either “as he is accustomed to do,” or “as he has done.” Those who adopt the former explanation refer the words to all the conflicts in which the Lord has engaged on behalf of his people (compare, for example, Josh. 10:10; Judg. 4:15-23; 1 Sam. 7:10). Others, again, are of opinion that there is a special reference to the Lord’s conflict with the Egyptians. Thus Jerome, who follows the Chaldee, says, “He now goes forth and makes war, as in the day of battle when he overwhelmed Pharaoh in the Red Sea, and fought for the people of Israel.” The latter interpretation is to be preferred. The judgment of the Lord upon the Egyptians is expressly called a conflict, a battle, in Ex. 14:14 and 15:3 sqq.; and the deliverance from Egypt towers so high above all the rest that it is spoken of as *the* deliverance *par excellence*; whilst subsequent ones are compared to it to indicate their greatness, without any farther description to single them out from the mass of the rest (compare Isa. 11:11, “Then will the Lord stretch out his hand *the second time*”). The only means referred to here as those which the Lord employs in his conflict, are an earthquake and putrefaction which destroys the foe. Ezekiel is more minute in his description (see chap. 38).

Ver. 4. “*And his feet stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east; and the Mount of Olives is split in two from east to west, a valley very great, and the half of the mountain removes towards the north, and the half towards the south.*”

The reason why the Lord is represented here as standing upon the Mount of Olives is explained in the clause which follows, “which is before Jerusalem on the east.” Regarded as a mere geographical notice, these words would have been quite superfluous, so far as the contemporaries of the prophet were concerned, who had the Mount of Olives constantly before their eyes. The situation of the mountain is evidently mentioned to show that it was this which induced the Lord to select it as his standing-place. The Mount of Olives stood before and above Jerusalem. It afforded the most uninterrupted view of the whole city. From this mountain, therefore, the Lord directs the attack upon the enemies in the city, and adopts the necessary measures to save his own people. He at whose presence the mountains flow away, prepares for them a way of escape, that they may not be involved in the judgment inflicted upon the ungodly heathen. That the division of the mountain is to be regarded as effected by an earthquake is apparently implied in ver. 5. An earthquake is also mentioned in Isa. 29:6, as one of the punishments with which the Lord will visit the enemies of Zion, “Thou shalt be visited of the Lord of hosts with thunder, and with earthquake, and with great noise, with storm and tempest, and the flame of devouring fire.” But the passage which the prophet appears to have most distinctly before his mind is Ezek. 38:19, 20: “In that day there shall be a great earthquake in the land of Israel. And the fishes of the sea, and the fowls of the heaven, and the beasts of the field, and all creeping things that creep upon the earth, and all men that are upon the earth tremble before me, and the mountains are destroyed, and the hills fall, and every wall will fall to the ground.” (On the earthquake as a symbol of the omnipotence of God to destroy, see the remarks on Hag. 2:6, and my commentary on the book of Revelation, vol. i. p. 275.) The earthquake which threatens destruction to the foe is the signal to the believers to fly, for they are afraid of being destroyed by the judgment of God along with the

heathen, in the midst of whom they are living. In like manner the prophet had “previously urged the members of the covenant nation who still tarried in Babylon to fly with all speed, that they might not be exposed to the judgments which were about to fall upon her (chap. 2:6, 7). Jeremiah also had done the same thing in chap. 51:6, “Flee out of the midst of Babylon, and deliver every man his soul, that ye be not cut off for her iniquity; for it is the time of vengeance for the Lord; he renders to her the recompense.”—Now, whilst the wish for flight is thus excited in the minds of the believers, the Lord opens a way for it by means of the same earthquake which brings destruction to the foe. In a case like this, where there was real danger in delay to any one desirous of escaping from Jerusalem by means of a rapid flight, the Mount of Olives, which terminated the valley of Jehoshaphat, and which David when he fled was obliged to climb (2 Sam. 15:30), presented an obstacle of no little importance. But this was removed when the Lord divided the mountain. The flying multitude of believers poured through the extended valley of Jehoshaphat, and as soon as they were beyond the range of the divine judgments, the latter poured down with violence and without cessation upon the enemies of God, as they had formerly done upon Sodom when Lot reached Zoar. It is very obvious that the whole account is figurative, and that the fundamental idea, the rescue of believers and the destruction of their enemies, is clothed in drapery borrowed from the local circumstances of Jerusalem.—With reference to the manner in which the mountain is divided, several of the commentators, particularly Theodoret and Cyril, who were led astray by the false rendering of the Septuagint, and also Jerome, have fallen into considerable errors. They erroneously imagine that a *fourfold* division takes place. But the prophet merely speaks of a simple division of the mountain, in which, according to his description, the mountain is divided in two; and, almost in the same manner as when the Jordan was divided, the one half moves towards the north, the other half towards the south, thus opening a broad valley from east to west, from Jerusalem to the Jordan.—מְהַצֵּי is correctly explained by Marck as follows: “Not on this side, or that side, or merely at the extremity, nor into more parts than two, but in the middle, into two equal parts.” The words “towards the east and towards the west” do not show the direction in which the two halves fall back, but the direction of the split; the mountain is divided across, not lengthways. The מן in מְהַצֵּי has been overlooked, and it is this which has furnished occasion to the false interpretation. Lastly, the direction in which the two halves move away is also mentioned; not towards the west, for in this case the miracle would have afforded no assistance to the believers, but towards the north and south.

Ver. 5. “*And ye flee into my mountain-valley; for the mountain-valley will reach to Azal, as ye fled from the earthquake in the days of Uzziah, the king of Judah: and the Lord my God cometh, all the saints with thee.*”

The word “*for*” may be explained on the ground that no one would think of flying into the valley if it did not reach to the other side of the Mount of Olives. The mountain-valley is either the valley newly made or the whole of the valley of Jehoshaphat, with the continuation just added to it. The Lord calls it *his* mountain-valley, because, as we learn from ver. 4, it was by him that the valley had been opened. ירה יג is an accusative after a verb of motion. Luther, who is followed by Schmieder, has deviated entirely from the rules of the language, and renders it “*before the valley*” supposing the flight to be an expression of the fear resulting from amazement. *The mountain-valley of the Lord*; the valley of Jehoshaphat, not merely the valley between the two halves of the Mount of Olives, which comes into consideration here solely as a continuation, of the valley of Jehoshaphat. לֶאֱזָל is regarded as a proper name by all the early commentators, with the

exception of Symmachus and Jerome, who render it *proximus*. Cyril observes: κόμη δὲ αὕτη πρὸς ἔσχαταις, ὡς λόγος, τοῦ ὄρους κειμένη. But nearly all of those who take it to be a proper name perceived that it must be used here with some regard to its actual signification, and not merely as a geographical term. This is obvious from the character of the whole account. They differ widely, however, in their explanations of its meaning. This could not have occurred to the same extent if closer attention had been paid to Mic. 1:11. We have there a description in which several proper names are introduced with an immediate reference in every case to their appellative signification. The prophet is describing the progress of the judgment of God from city to city until it reaches Jerusalem, and says, “The lamentation of Beth-Haezel will take away from you her *standing-still* (will not afford you an interruption to the lamentation, as the etymology of the name of the city might lead you to imagine). *For* Maroth (which is farther off) will experience pain; for evil cometh down from the Lord upon Jerusalem.” According to this passage, Beth-Haezal must have been a city near Jerusalem, and must mean “the house of standing still,” a meaning which may be easily obtained from the ordinary signification of בָּצֵר, to lay aside; whereas the explanation suggested by Gesenius (*Theo. s.v. תר*), “house of the fixed root,” derives no support from the usages of the language, since even יָצֵר, noble, does not mean “rooted,” as he supposes, but “set apart,” as the proper name Azaliah sufficiently shows. Now if we look at *the form* of the proper name in the passage before us, it is evident that בָּצֵר in pause בָּצֵר, can only mean “standing still,” “ceasing.” The valley, therefore, is to extend as far as a place which will actually afford to the fugitives what its name promises, the cessation of danger; because, when once they have reached it, they are beyond the range of the judicial punishments of God. Whether this place was the same as that mentioned by Micah, is a question that cannot be answered in the negative, for the *Beth* in proper names is frequently omitted (compare Gesenius, *Theo.* p. 193); and changes of the same kind as Ezel and Azel are also by no means rare. At the same time, it cannot be answered with certainty in the affirmative, from the fact that the situation of the place is not clearly pointed out in either case, except that, according to Zechariah’s description, it must have stood to the east of Jerusalem beyond the Mount of Olives. *And ye flee*; namely, for fear of being swallowed up, along with the enemies of God, by the earth which opens at the time of the earthquake. Compare Num. 16:34, “And all Israel that were round about them fled; for they said, Lest the earth swallow up us also.” Hofmann says, “They flee not from the judgment which falls upon the enemy, but from the enemies themselves.” But ver. 3 precludes such a notion as this. Their enemies are no longer active, but passive. Moreover, in this case the comparison, which requires that it should be from the earthquake that they flee, would be inappropriate. The earthquake in the time of Uzziah is not mentioned in the historical books, but only in Amos 1:1. The manner in which the prophet alludes to it, the expression “in *the days*” as well as the additional words, “*of the King of Judah*,” by which he guards against the supposition that Uzziah was a king of Israel, all show that the prophet lived at a period very far removed from the event to which he refers.—*And the Lord cometh, my God, all the saints with thee. He cometh* to execute a decisive judgment upon the world, and to glorify his kingdom. The coming alluded to in ver. 3 is not to be compared with this, and was merely a provisional one. The expression *my God*, may be explained on the supposition that, when the prophet saw the Lord draw near with the most glorious manifestations of his grace, he was seized with lively joy at the thought that this God was *his* God. The suffix in בָּרַךְ refers to the Lord, whom the prophet beholds by the eye of his mind, as it were, already present, and to whom, being no longer content to speak in the third person, he addresses himself with triumphant emotions, and with ecstatic joy at the thought that the long desired and absent One has at length arrived. By the *saints* many

commentators understand angels; others, like Vitrina (on Rev. 15:3), “both holy angels and holy men.” In favour of the former we may adduce Deut. 33:2, “he comes from the holy myriads,” *i.e.* the angels; and as still more conclusive, ver. 3, “all his saints are in thy hand,” they are engaged in thy service, they are subservient to thy salvation, O Israel; again, Matt. 25:31, “When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him;” Mark 8:38, “When he cometh in the glory of his Father, with the holy angels;” and lastly, Rev. 19:14 (compare the commentary on this passage).

Ver. 6. “*And it cometh to pass in that day. it will not be light, the precious will become mean.*”

The prophet here depicts the transition from the darkness which accompanies the judgment upon the enemies of the kingdom of God and the birth-pangs of the new world, to the light which bursts upon this new world (ver. 7), as at the first creation, when darkness covered the face of the deep, and afterwards it became light.—In the second clause the Kethib is to be pointed יִקְפְּאוֹן, as the future of קָפָא. The marginal reading is וְיִקְפְּאוֹן. The latter is explained by the majority of commentators, after the example of the Septuagint (καὶ ψυχρὸς καὶ πάγος), as meaning “cold and frost;” “there will be no light (but there will be) cold and frost.” They either assume that יִקְרוֹת is exactly synonymous with קָרוֹת (*frigora, cold*), and appeal to Prov. 17: 27, where the marginal reading יִקְר רִיחַ is substituted in precisely the same sense for וְיִקְר רִיחַ, the reading in the text; or they maintain that for יִקְרוֹת we ought to read וְיִקְרוֹת. But the rendering throughout has everything against it. It is extremely improbable that a word of such frequent occurrence as יִקְר should be introduced here all at once with a totally new meaning. The marginal reading in Prov. 17:27 proves nothing more and nothing less than any Jewish conjecture can prove. The alteration of יִקְרוֹת into וְיִקְרוֹת is an arbitrary procedure, so long as there is any possibility of explaining the reading in the text. The supposed noun וְיִקְפְּאוֹן is never met with. Even assuming the existence of such a noun, the meaning suggested for which other words actually exist in the language would not be established. The construction, too, is a harsh one, *viz.* the addition of יִקְרֵה without a negative. But what is still more important is the fact, that there is not a word about cold and frost in any of the parallel passages in the prophetic books. Moreover they are altogether unsuitable here, for in the whole passage light and darkness alone are referred to (compare ver. 7); and therefore the second clause should contain a description of darkness as well as the first. And what external authority can be produced in support of a rendering which is exposed to so many difficulties? As good as none at all. The marginal reading is never anything more than a mere conjecture, even in cases where, at first sight, it seems to commend itself. The obscurity of this passage necessarily presented a great temptation to venture upon such a conjecture, as the praise awarded by commentators to the marginal reading clearly shows. Again, the difference in gender between the noun and the verb, in the reading in the text, appeared to justify it. How, then, can the marginal reading have any further value in our eyes than a Jewish conjecture, the origin of which is probably to be found in the attempt of the Septuagint translators to guess at the meaning of a passage which they could not understand? We will now turn to the different renderings which have been given of the reading in the text. C. B. Michaelis explains it thus, “for *the lights (claritates)* if any exist in turn, *will be made dense (condensabuntur)*, and will now change into thick darkness.” But this rendering must be rejected for the simple reason that קָרוֹת is taken in a sense which it cannot be proved to bear. יִקְר never means anything but precious, glorious, not even shining (as some have attempted without effect to prove from Job 31:26), much less *claritates*. Hence קָרוֹת cannot have any other meaning than *res pretiosae, valuables*.

There is a far better foundation for the explanation given by the acute-minded De Dieu, “The glorious thing will be dissolved, the creation will be changed into chaos.”<sup>60</sup> But it is exposed to this objection, that the idea which the passage is supposed to contain is not found in any of the parallel passages of the Old Testament, a fact which is of peculiar importance in the case of Zechariah. In their descriptions of the judgments of God, they frequently speak of the darkening of the sun, moon, and stars, but never of a darkness which arises from all created things being converted into a new chaos. And the former thought is so prominent in them all that we should be greatly surprised if we did not find it here. Compare the remarks on Joel 2:31, “The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood;” on Ezek. 32:7, “I will cover the heaven, and make the stars thereof dark; I will cover the sun with a cloud, and the moon shall not give her light;” and ver. 8, “All the bright lights of heaven will I make dark over thee, and set darkness upon thy land;” also Isa. 13:10 and Amos 8:9. In harmony with these passages we render קְרוֹתָּ precious things, and regard it as a term applied to the shining heavenly bodies. We have the greater right to do this from the fact that, in Job 31:26, the moon is represented as walking preciously, or magnificently (יִקָּרֵה לַיָּרֵךְ). The whole clause we translate thus, “*res pretiosae viles evident*,” the heavenly bodies will lose their most splendid ornament, namely, the light.<sup>61</sup> With this explanation we get rid of the difficulty arising from the apparent difference in the gender, for sun, moon, and stars are masculine.

Ver. 7. “*And there will be a day it will be known to the Lord, not day, and not night; and at evening-time it will get light?*”

We have already found the expression *a day* used to denote, comparatively speaking, the shortest period of time, in chap. 3:9; and also *a month* in chap. 11:8, used for a comparatively short period. Cocceius has correctly explained the words before us thus, “*unus dies, tempus non longum.*” The allusion is to the transient character of the visitations of God. The words of Ps. 30:5 are applicable to the Church, “weeping may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning.” Moreover this day is *known to the Lord*; it is under his supervision and direction. It does not come unexpectedly, or interfere with his plans; but is subservient to his counsels of mercy for the Church. *Not day, etc.; i.e.* “which is not.” Many commentators suppose that a *commingling* of day and night is intended, a transition state of dim twilight; but there are no parallel passages containing any such idea. We have rather to think of a day which is not day at all, in consequence of the lights of heaven having lost their brightness. “The usual order is miraculously inverted, the day is turned into night, and the day comes in the evening.” (Schmieder.) The expression, “at evening-time it gets light,” may be explained from the antithesis in Amos 8:9, “And it shall come to pass in that day, saith the Lord God, that I will cause the sun to go down at noon, and I will bring darkness upon the land in clear day.” Just as in this case, it becomes dark at the time when we should expect and actually possess the brightest light; so in the passage before us, it gets light at the time, when, according to the natural course of things, the dark night is apparently about to commence. It is the exalted privilege of the Church, that with her at evening-time it always becomes light.

Ver. 8. “*And it cometh to pass on this day, living waters will issue forth from Jerusalem; half of them to the eastern sea, and half of them to the western sea: in summer and in winter shall it be.*”

The eastern and western seas, that is, the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean, are given here as the limits of the course of the living waters. There is a difference between this and Ezek. 47, where the sea itself is healed by the waters. By selecting these two points, the

prophet intimates that the water will flow through the whole of the promised land, which is bounded on the east by the Dead Sea, and on the west by the Mediterranean. For what purpose, may be gathered from Joel 3:18: "And it shall come to pass in that day, that the mountains shall drop down new wine, and the hills shall flow with milk, and all the rivers of Judah shall flow with waters, and a fountain shall come forth of the house of the Lord, and shall water the valley of Acacias."<sup>[1]</sup> Whatever conclusion may be formed with reference to the more precise meaning of "the valley of Acacias," one thing is certain, that it is a dry and barren locality; the intention of the waters, therefore, viz. to fertilize the land, which is barren for want of water, and to furnish a refreshing draught to the thirsty of every age,—an intimation of which has already been given in the foregoing announcement of plenty in the place of dearth, fertility instead of barrenness,—is hereby confirmed. The figurative character of the whole representation is placed beyond all doubt by this one fact, that natural water could not possibly flow in two opposite directions. Water, whether coming from the clouds, or contained in springs, brooks, and rivers, is constantly employed as a figurative representation of the blessings of God in their whole compass and fulness, by which the dry and thirsty desert of human need is refreshed. To be forsaken of God, and deprived of his mercies and blessings, is represented as drought. Compare, for example, Isa. 41:17, "When the poor and needy seek water, and there is none, and their tongue faileth for thirst, I the Lord will hear them, I the God of Israel will not forsake them;" Isa. 30:25, "And there shall be upon every high mountain, and upon every high hill, streams of water in the day of the great slaughter, when the towers fall;" Ezek. 34:26, "And I will make them and the places round about my hill a blessing; and I will cause the shower to come down in his season;" Isa. 43:20, 48:21, 49:10, 58:11. (See also the remarks on Ezek. 47:1 at vol. iii. p. 65, and my commentary on Rev. 22:1.) The water, the type of blessing and salvation, issues forth from *Jerusalem*. Under the image of the central point of the kingdom of God under the Old Testament, the place which the Lord made glorious by his typical presence in the temple, there is here exhibited to the prophet the Church of the New Testament, from which blessings go forth to the world, and which may be the more appropriately called by the name Jerusalem, since it originated there and is its legitimate continuation. According to Joel and Ezekiel the water issues from the temple. In Rev. 22:1, it is described as "proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb." If Jerusalem, then, stands for its antitype, the whole compass of the land of Judea, over which the water from the fountain flows, must denote that which bears the same relation to the spiritual Jerusalem as the latter bore to the typical, namely, the whole of the New Testament kingdom of God, which is destined, according to ver. 9 and the constant declaration of all the rest of the prophets, to overspread the whole earth. The entire earth, therefore, is to be watered by the stream of divine blessings proceeding from the Church (Ps. 36:9). The concluding words, "in summer and in winter shall it be," indicate the constancy of the divine blessings, as contrasted with the uncertain character of all human possessions. The winter is mentioned as the time when even the rest of the streams yield water in abundance. In Job 6:16-18, the patriarch compares his friends to streams, which swell in winter and have an abundance of water, but are dried up in summer when the water is most needed, and in consequence bitterly disappoint the traveller, who has built his hopes upon them. In Isa. 58:11, the prophet represents the mercy of God, and those who are in possession of it, under the figure of a spring of water, whose waters *do not, lie*.

Ver. 9. "*And the Lord will be king over all the land; in that day the Lord will be one, and his name one.*"

This is almost always rendered “over all the earth.” There can be no doubt that in substance this rendering is correct, and that reference is made here to the fact that the dominion of the Lord “will extend over all the families of the earth, in contradistinction to its previous restriction to one single nation (chap. 9:9, 10; Ps. 72:8-11; Ps. 2; Dan. 2:35, etc.). But, notwithstanding this, we agree with Rückert in preferring the rendering “over all the land.” In ver. 8 the prophet depicts the new kingdom of God under the image of the former one. In ver. 10 the same mode of representation is adopted; and it is certainly hardly likely that קַלְהָאָרֶץ is used here in a different sense from that in which it occurs so immediately afterwards. Marck has justly observed, “It is not the kingdom of nature and ordinary providence which is spoken of here, but the special kingdom of grace—such as God formerly possessed in Israel.” The Lord is naturally the king of the whole human race; but this relation was disturbed by the fall, which formed the commencement of a series of attempts at rebellion, ending in the renunciation of obedience on the part of nearly all his subjects, who chose to themselves other lords and kings in heaven and on earth according to their hearts’ desires. The Lord, to whom it would have been an easy thing to annihilate all his rebellious subjects by one word of his omnipotence, was prompted by his love to seek, rather, their voluntary return to obedience. And because the whole race was not ripe for this, he commenced by restoring the natural relation between himself and one single people. The execution of his entire plan, to which the special theocracy had merely been subservient, commenced with the first coming of Christ. Its final consummation will coincide with his return in glory, when all his opponents will either have been subdued by grace so as to become his servants instead of his foes, or have been exterminated by his punishments from the midst of his kingdom, which will then embrace the entire earth. The words of Ps. 22:27, 28 are peculiarly worthy of notice in connection with this announcement: “All the ends of the earth shall remember, and turn unto the Lord; and all the families of the heathen shall worship before thee. *For* the kingdom is the Lord’s, and he ruleth among the heathen.” That all the heathen will one day submit to the Lord, arises from the fact that he is their rightful and natural king, and that their present attitude towards him is an unnatural one, and therefore cannot last.—The Lord will be only one, and his name only one; the gross system of Polytheism will come to an end; and also that more refined Polytheism which looks upon all forms of worship as merely so many different modes, all equally legitimate, in which the one divine Being is worshipped (see the remarks on Hos. 2:18, vol. i. p. 260).

It is possible that the peculiar circumstances of the time may have induced the prophet to lay stress upon the fact, that in that day the name of the Lord will be *but one*. The edicts of the Persian kings, which are recorded in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, render it very probable that the Persians, who were strongly inclined to religious eclecticism, were ready to acknowledge their own god and the God of Israel as one and the same deity, differing only in name and in the mode of manifestation. Nothing further would be gained by this, however, for they naturally meant that every nation was to abide by its own name, and adhere to the mode in which it had received this manifestation, the latter being, in fact, inseparable from the name.

Ver. 10. “*All the land will change as the plain from Geba to Himmon, south of Jerusalem; and she is high, and sits in her place, from Benjamin’s gate unto the place of the first gate, unto the corner-gate, and from the tower of Hananeel unto the king’s wine-presses.*”



The subject of this verse is twofold, *first*, the exaltation of Jerusalem, which is effected by the change of all the rest of the land into a plain; and, *secondly*, the restoration of the city to its former grandeur after its destruction, in consequence of being taken by the enemy (ver. 2), but still more, perhaps, in consequence of the earthquake (ver. 5) and the other judgments inflicted upon the enemy within her walls. We will first of all examine certain points connected with the former of these. “To change *as*,” is the same as “to change so as to become like.” כָּל־הָאָרֶץ, not the entire district round Jerusalem, but the whole land. This is evident from the only expression which could afford any support to the more limited interpretation, namely, the words “from Geba to Rimmon.” For these are the two extreme points in the land of Judea, the one towards the north, the other towards the south; and the prophet employs them to denote its entire extent, just as in ver. 8 he makes use of the eastern and western boundary. Rimmon, which is described as situated to the south of Jerusalem, to distinguish it from the rock of Rimmon, was at the extreme south of the tribe of Judah, and, like Beersheba, was a city of the Simeonites on the borders of Edom. (Josh. 15:32, 19:7) That Geba was situated at the northern extremity, is evident from the fact that, in 2 Kings 23:8, the expression “from Geba to Beersheba” is employed to denote the whole extent of the kingdom of Judah.—הָעֲרָבָה is regarded by many commentators as an appellative noun, and rendered “a plain.” But they have failed to observe that this does not make good sense, since the land which is to be changed into a plain cannot be compared to a plain, and also that the article stands in the way of such a rendering. It is true that, so far as the article itself is concerned, it might be used generally, but in Hebrew *Arabah* with the article always denotes the largest and most celebrated of all the plains of Judea, the plain of the Jordan, called by Josephus μέγα πεδίον. Compare Ritter, xv. p. 481. “Ghor, like Aulon, *i.e.* the plain, is the name given to the large valley, including its plains, extending from the Lebanon, or the Lake of Gennesaret, to the farther side of the Dead Sea.”—The meaning therefore is this: all the mountains of Judea, with the exception of the mountain of Jerusalem itself, are to be changed into plains, so that the whole land will resemble the extensive plain which has hitherto formed but one portion of it. The reason of this change is indicated in the words “and Jerusalem will be exalted.” (רָם for רום is only met with in this passage; but two derivatives of the former occur, viz. הָרָם and הַמְּוֹרָר). The whole land is depressed, that Jerusalem alone may appear elevated.—Let us pass on now to an examination of the meaning of this symbolical representation. As in ver. 8, so in this passage also, Jerusalem represents the central point of the kingdom of God under the New Testament; Judea, the same kingdom in its widest extent, regarded as embracing the whole earth. What other meaning then can the passage well have than this, “the Lord alone shall be exalted in that day;” “his rest shall be glorious” (Isa. 11:10); his dominion, as king over all the earth, shall be the only one; all the outward glory of the earth, which exalts itself above him, shall be annihilated? The same thought is expressed in Isa. 2:2; Mic. 4:1 (see vol. i. p. 441), and Ezek. 40:2 (see vol. iii. p. 60)—though under a somewhat different figure, which proves that the literal interpretation given by Jewish and Judaizing commentators is untenable. In this case everything else is levelled; in Micah and Ezekiel, on the other hand, the temple mountain is represented as rising. The temple mountain is placed upon the top of all the mountains of the earth. There is a third figure employed in Dan. 2:35. The stone, which is the symbol of the Messianic kingdom, breaks in pieces the colossal image, the representative of the kingdoms of the world as contrasted with the kingdom of God, and becomes a great mountain, which fills the whole earth. The natural situation of Jerusalem forms the starting-point here. On this Robinson says, “Upon the broad and elevated promontory, within the fork of these two valleys (Jehosha-phat and Hinnom), lies the holy city. *All around are higher hills.*” This external position of Jerusalem was

also regarded by the writer of the 125th Psalm (ver. 2) with the eye of a theologian. But whilst, in his view, the mountains round about Jerusalem were symbols of the protection of God, to Zechariah the comparative height of Jerusalem is a symbol of the depressed condition of the kingdom of God under the Old Testament.

The meaning of the symbolical representation has been entirely mistaken by many expositors, who imagine that the Arabah is introduced in connection with the *watering*. Thus Hitzig writes, "The valley of the Jordan, so luxuriant in its vegetation, was rendered so by the extent to which it was irrigated (Gen. 13:10). The author has already promised the same to the poorly watered district (ver. 8), a promise which implied the highest degree of fertility." But this interpretation, in which the expression "she is high" is entirely overlooked, and the connection between this passage and Mic. 4:1, and Ezek. 40:2 severed, is at variance with the natural constitution of the Arabah. The words of Gen. 13:10 relate exclusively to that portion of it which was destroyed by the fearful catastrophe that befell the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah. Josephus says, in his *Wars of the Jews* (4. 8. 2), "The large plain, μέγα πεδίον, through which the Jordan flows, is very parched in summer." According to Monro (v. Raumer, p. 51), the lower portion especially presents "the aspect of extreme desolation." The Arabah is anything but a garden of God. "The heat is concentrated by the rocky mountains, which keep off the cooling breezes of the west wind." (v. Raumer, p. 51).—The exaltation of Jerusalem, which is a consequence of Jehovah being king over all the earth (ver. 9), is attended by *its complete recovery from its ruins*. Whilst the former part of the verse, the exaltation, points back to Mic. 4:1 and Ezek. 40:2, the latter recalls Jer. 31:38, "The city is built to the Lord from the tower of Hananeel to the corner-gate," where the restoration of the kingdom of God is set forth under the image of a restoration of Jerusalem.

The point at which the description of the boundaries commences is Benjamin's gate. This gate is unquestionably the one which is called elsewhere the Ephraim gate. The Benjamin gate led to the land of Benjamin (Jer. 37:12, 13). It was on the north side of the city therefore. But the Ephraim gate is represented in 2 Sam. 13:23 as turned towards Ephraim; and the road to Ephraim lay through Benjamin. The first *terminus ad quem* is "*the place of the first gate*." There is no other passage in which the gate is called by this name. It is no doubt the same as we meet with elsewhere under the name of שַׁעַר הַיְשָׁנָה. This is evident first of all from the name itself. שַׁעַר הַיְשָׁנָה means "the gate of the old one" (fem.), not "the old gate." Now Hitzig and Krafft (*Topogr.* p. 149), follow Gousset in the opinion that "the gate of the old one" is equivalent to "the gate of the old pool," which is mentioned in Isa. 22:11. But such an ellipsis is harsh and unexampled. On the other hand, there is hardly any ellipsis at all if we adopt the explanation given by others, "the gate of the old town." For as cities are personified as women, there was really no necessity for any addition. We meet with Jeshanah on two other occasions as names of cities (see Reland, p. 861). The name "old town" was probably applied to that portion of Jerusalem which was already in existence in the time of the Jebusites, to distinguish it from the later enlargements made by David and his successors—just as at a subsequent period another portion which had been recently erected was called Bezetha, κατὴν πόλιν, by Josephus, in contrast with the whole of the earlier city. Now the name of the gate in the passage before us is in perfect harmony with this. שַׁעַר הַרְאִשׁוֹן cannot mean anything but the first gate, not as Hitzig and Ewald suppose, "the former gate," or "the gate that was;" for such a meaning as this could only exist in cases where a contrast was intended to some new gate. Now, just as the old town was the first town, so was its gate the first gate when compared with all the rest of the gates in the more recent portion of Jerusalem. Our conclusion is

favoured *secondly* by the situation. As the *first* gate is represented here as the first *terminus ad quem*, reckoning from the Benjamin's gate, so do we find the old gate mentioned immediately after the Ephraim gate in Neh. 12:39, where the gates are named in their geographical order. We must look for the first gate on the east, and not on the west of the Benjamin gate. For the corner gate is mentioned directly afterwards as the *terminus ad quem* to the west of the Benjamin's gate, and it is evident from the little distance between the two gates, namely, 400 cubits (2 Kings 14:3), that "the first gate" cannot have stood between them. The position of the gate in the old town corresponds exactly to this. It was the next gate to the Ephraim gate towards the east, probably at the north-eastern extremity (compare Faber, *Archäologie*, p. 332). שַׁעַר הַפְּנִימִי does not denote the *terminus ad quem* from the first gate, but, as we have already observed, a new *terminus ad quem* towards the west of the Benjamin's gate. That the corner gate was not situated on the eastern, but on the western side, is very evident from Jer. 31:38, where the tower of Hananeel, which stood on the eastern side, is mentioned along with the corner gate to designate the whole extent of the city. The tower of Hananeel was on the eastern side of the city, near the sheep-gate (Neh. 3:1, 12:37, 39). From this tower the prophet draws a new line—for מִן must be supplied before מִגְדָּל from the previous clause—which he continues as far as the king's wine-presses, most likely on the southern side of the city, where the royal gardens are said to have been (Neh. 3:15; compare Faber, p. 335). According to this, the limits of the city are given towards the four points of the compass. The prophet mentions just those buildings which were left standing when the city was destroyed by the Chaldeans, and not a single one which was not in existence in the time of Zechariah,—*i.e.* subsequent to the destruction and previous to the restoration of the walls by Nehemiah,—a fact which can only be explained on the supposition that the second portion of the book was actually written by Zechariah himself. Two gates are first given as *termini*, the Benjamin's gate and the corner gate; for the third, "the first gate," is expressly shown to have been no longer in existence by the words "unto the place" that is, the spot on which it formerly stood. Now both of these are omitted in the account of the rebuilding in Neh. 3; and, if we compare chap. 12:39, the only explanation that can be given of this omission is that they did not require to be rebuilt, but probably needed only some trifling repairs. On the other hand, the old gate, which is represented in this passage as destroyed, is mentioned in the list of those that were rebuilt. The tower of Hananeel is referred to in Neh. 3:1 as still in existence. In the case of the royal wine-cellars, we can hardly imagine any demolition to have taken place. In fact this was scarcely possible; for, even to the present day in Eastern countries, cellars are hewn out of the rocks wherever the nature of the soil admits of it (see Chardin in *Harmar*, part iii. p. 117; compare also Isa. 5:2, and Matt. 21:33). This being the manner in which the royal cellars were constructed, it is not improbable that they are still in a state of preservation among the excavations in the rock which exist in great abundance, especially in the neighbourhood of the fountain of Siloah. We can even bring forward a direct testimony to the fact that the royal cellars are still in existence. As we have already observed, there can be no doubt that they were in the royal gardens, and in Neh. 3:15 these are expressly stated to have been preserved when the destruction of the city by the Chaldeans took place.

We will now inquire into the prophet's meaning. What are we to understand by the restoration of Jerusalem, which is the figure he here employs? It is evident from the general character of the prophecy that we are not to abide by the letter. This is especially obvious from vers. 8 and 9, where Judah is employed to represent the whole earth, as well as from the first part of the verse before us, where the relation in which Jerusalem stands

to the rest of Judea is used as a figurative representation of the relation in which the central point of the future kingdom of God stands to its circumference, which embraces the whole earth. The restoration of Jerusalem predicted here is closely connected with the conquest described in vers. 1 and 2, and with the destruction referred to in ver. 5, as the result of the divine judgments inflicted upon the enemy within its walls. The meaning is, that the kingdom of God will rise again in its ancient splendour after the Lord has exterminated every trace of the misery which it has had to endure. The prophet adheres to the same mode of representation which he adopted before, when he described the calamities endured under the figure of a conquest of the city. He depicts the future glory under the image of a restoration of the city to its *ancient* limits, and to make the figure more complete introduces special notices of particular points in the city boundaries.

Ver. 11. *“And they dwell in her: and there shall be no more curse; and Jerusalem sits secure.”*

*Dwelling* forms the antithesis to going out, whether as captives or as fugitives (ver. 2 and ver. 5). The expression, “there shall be no more curse,” shows that the Church of God is to consist of such as are righteous and holy. On the idea implied in the curse, see the remarks on Mal. 3:24. It denotes a judgment similar to the one described in chap. 11, which involves a complete suspension of the state of grace. There are degrees in the execution of the curse; the last and most fearful is announced in Rev. 22:3.

Ver. 12. *“And this will be the plague wherewith the Lord will smite all the nations that have fought against Jerusalem: His flesh shall consume away while he stands upon his feet, and his eyes shall consume away in their sockets, and his tongue shall consume away in his mouth.”*

The prophet, having first depicted the judgment on the house of God, had contented himself with a slight indication of the destruction which the Lord was about to bring upon the enemies of his house, who were the instruments and at the same time the objects also of his punitive justice (vers. 3-5). From this he had proceeded at once to the subject which was most attractive to his heart, viz. the blessings to be bestowed in the mercy of God upon the purified Church. He now interrupts his description of the latter, to give a fuller account of the punishment to be inflicted on the foe. In harmony with the general character of the symbolical representations of prophecy, in which everything is presented to the eye and thus assumes a material form, and also with an evident allusion to earlier judgments,—such, for example, as the destruction of the Assyrians,—the punishment is represented here as purely corporeal, just as the act performed by the enemy had previously been depicted as a literal invasion of Jerusalem. The essential part of the prophecy is the punishment alone; all that the prophet states, with reference to the mode, is merely drapery. Another form of representation might have been chosen instead; as we may see, for example, from Isa. 66:24, where the enemies of the kingdom of God are figuratively described as living corpses, lying outside the gates of the dwelling place of the saints, viz. Jerusalem; the eternal food of worms and fire.—The infinitive *קָמַן* gives prominence to the simple action for the purpose of directing attention to its fearful character. The Hiphil shows that the Lord himself is to be regarded as the agent. The words, “and he stands upon his feet,” lay emphasis upon the terrible character of the judgment. They will be living corpses. Corruption of this kind in the case of a living body is more fearful than death. Examples of this species of corruption are to be found in antiquity, viz. in the Roman state, and also in modern times, in the Turkish empire. The *tongue* is mentioned, because it had spoken with insolence and arrogance of God and his

people (Ps. 12:4; Isa. 37); *the eye*, because it had seen the nakedness of the city of God; the whole body, because it had proceeded against Jerusalem.

Ver. 13. “*And it cometh to pass in that day, great will be the confusion of the Lord among them; and they seize every man the hand of his neighbour, and his hand riseth up over the hand of his neighbour.*”

There is an illusion here to examples, in the early history of the people of God, of panics caused by the Lord among the enemy, and of confusion leading to mutual destruction; see Deut. 7:23; Judg. 7:22; and 1 Sam. 14:20 (“and behold every man’s sword was against his neighbour, a very great *confusion*”), but especially to the history of Jehosaphat in 2 Chron. 20:23: “And the children of Ammon and Moab rose up against the inhabitants of Mount Seir to destroy them, and when they had made an end of the inhabitants of Seir, they helped to destroy one another.” Discord in the enemy’s own camp is one of the principal means employed by God for the assistance of his Church. By the expression, “seizing the hand,” we are to understand a hostile grasp, as the context and the parallel passages clearly show. But the hostility is indicated still more fully in the words, “his hand riseth up over the hand of his neighbour.” Every one endeavours to get hold of his neighbour’s hand, that he may disarm him in this way; and when this is accomplished he falls upon him, attacking first of all the hand itself, since a man deprived of this may afterwards be put to death without difficulty or danger.

Ver. 14. “*And Judah also will fight at Jerusalem; and the riches of all the heathen round about will be gathered together, gold, and silver, and apparel, in great abundance.*”

According to a very ancient and widely circulated rendering, the first clause means, “and Judah also will make war against Jerusalem.” The Chaldee and Jerome both adopt it. But the rendering, “Judah will fight in Jerusalem,” is at least as old (see Septuagint: παρατάξεται ἐν Ἱερουσαλημ). It cannot be pleaded in defence of the former that כ after חלה always points out the object of attack. As *fighting* is not infrequently spoken of, without the object of attack being mentioned at all (compare ver. 3), it may be regarded as certain that כ may also be used in a local sense. It is so in Isa. 30:32, where the feminine suffix in חה, “in the holy land,” is not to be referred to Assyria, and where we are not to read חה as the Masoretes have done.—On the other hand, the following *objections* may be offered to this rendering; *first*, a contrast between Judah and Jerusalem would be something so unparalleled that it would certainly have been more clearly expressed (of hostilities between Judah and Jerusalem there is not the slightest trace either here or in chap. 12); *secondly*, such an announcement would be quite out of place here in the midst of a description of the defeat of the enemy;”<sup>[1]</sup> and, *thirdly*, in the primary passage in the Chronicles, Judah is not introduced as an ally of the heathen, but comes up after they have destroyed one another. In ver. 27, Judah and Jerusalem are spoken of as one.—We may either assume, then, that Judah represents the whole nation,—in which case the attack of Judah would be assigned as a second cause of the overthrow of the enemy, along with the confusion produced by the Lord,—or that the whole nation is represented by Judah together with the inhabitants of Jerusalem. In the latter case, the contest in Jerusalem would be referred to solely in relation to the participation in the booty. The latter view is certainly favoured by chap. 12:2, “and *also* over Judah,” as well as by the general distinction made there between Judah and Jerusalem,

Ver. 15. “*And so will be the plague of the horses, of the mules, of the camels, and of the asses, and of all cattle which will be in these camps as this plague?*”

We have here an amplification of the crime and the punishment. They have rendered themselves so guilty that even their possessions are defiled and fall under the divine ban. The description given here is based upon the same idea as that which lies at the foundation of the Mosaic laws with reference to the ban. When a whole city had committed the crime of idolatry, not only the inhabitants, but the animals also, were to be put to death; in which case the same law, affecting the relation between the irrational and rational portions of the creation, was repeated on a small scale, as that which had caused the creature to be “subject to vanity not willingly,” on account of the sin of man. We have also an analogous example in the case of Achan, whose oxen, asses, and sheep were burned along with himself and his children. (Josh. 7:24)

Ver. 16. *“And it cometh to pass, every one that is left of all the heathen which come against Jerusalem, shall go up from year to year, to worship the King Jehovah of Sabaoth, and to keep the feast of tabernacles.”*

That the approach of the nations to Jerusalem out of all the countries of the earth is to be understood as a figurative representation, founded upon the manner in which the fear of God and connection with his kingdom manifested themselves under the Old Testament, and that the prophet employs this as a type of the higher form in which they would be manifested in the Messianic times (similarly to chap. 8:22, 23; Mic. 4:1; and Isa. 2:3), is evident both from the nature of the case,<sup>62</sup> and also from the general character of the whole prophecy (see the remarks on vers. 8-10). The only question that suggests itself is, why should the prophet have selected particularly the feast of tabernacles? That this is not done without a definite purpose is evident from the fact that otherwise it would be impossible to understand his reason for not retaining the festal periods mentioned in Isa. 66:23, to which he very closely adheres in other respects, even adopting the terms employed, and in which it is stated that “it will come to pass from new moon to new moon, and from Sabbath to Sabbath, all flesh will come and worship before me, saith the Lord.” In this case the festivals of most frequent occurrence are mentioned for the purpose of pointing out the zeal of the new citizens of the kingdom of God in the worship of their Lord. Under the Old Testament only one nation assembled at Jerusalem at the three annual festivals; now “all flesh” congregates there every Sabbath and every new moon. This parallel passage also serves to present in a more glaring light the absurdity of a literal interpretation.—Commentators differ in opinion as to the reason which induced the prophet to select the feast of tabernacles. Theodoret, Grotius, and others adhere to the most material ground possible, namely, that the autumn is the best time of the year for travelling. The true reason, on the other hand, has certainly not been assigned by those who suppose that the feast of tabernacles is specially mentioned because it was regarded by the Jews as peculiarly holy. This was not the case; the passover was the chief festival, and the proof of this is to be found in the fact that, in reality, it was at this festival alone that all Israel assembled at the place of the sanctuary. The actual reason has been given by Dachs, C. B. Michaelis, and others, who trace it to the essential characteristics of the feast of tabernacles. According to Lev. 23:33, it was a feast of thanksgiving for the gracious protection afforded by the Lord to His people during the pilgrimage through the desert, which had been the sole cause of their being purified instead of destroyed by the dangers to which they were exposed, and attaining to the possession of the land of Canaan. But these wanderings of the Israelites were a type (1 Cor. 10:11), not only of similar dealings on the part of God with the same people in later periods of the Old Testament economy,—especially in the time of the Babylonian captivity, at the termination of which, when God had delivered them out of the “wilderness of the

nations” (Ezek. 20:34-38), the feast of tabernacles was celebrated with peculiar earnestness (Ezra 3:1 sqq. and Ps. 107), Zechariah himself taking part in it,—but also of His dealings with the people of the new covenant. By the latter the feast of tabernacles will be celebrated, “when at the close of their tedious wanderings through the horrible desert of this world, they shall see an approach to their inheritance, and an entrance into Canaan fully laid open before them.” (Dachs.) It will not be kept outwardly, but spiritually, like the Sabbath in Heb. 4:9, and the passover in 1 Cor. 5:7, 8. In the feast of tabernacles, just as in the other two great festivals, not only were the blessings of God in history commemorated, but also the blessings of God in nature. It was a feast of thanksgiving for the completion of the harvest. It is possible that the prophet may also have this view of the festival in his mind, and may regard the feast of tabernacles as a feast of thanksgiving for the rich gifts of mercy bestowed upon the new citizens of the kingdom of God. A New Testament feast of tabernacles is also met with in the book of Revelation (see my commentary on chap. 7:9); but it is one which is to be celebrated in heaven by those who have ended their dangerous pilgrimage of suffering and temptation through the desert of life, and have safely reached the heavenly Canaan, the place of their repose.—The expression “all that is left,” etc., calls to mind a point of agreement between the type and the antitype. Just as it was not all that came out of Egypt who entered Canaan and celebrated the feast of tabernacles, but on the contrary the greater portion had been destroyed by the judgments of God during the march through the wilderness; so the heathen, who formerly marched against Jerusalem, will not all go thither in gratitude and love, but only the remnant which has been spared by the mercy of God, after the obstinate despisers of his name have been destroyed by the judgments depicted before.

Ver. 17. *“And it cometh to pass, whoso will not come up of the families of the earth unto Jerusalem to worship the King Jehovah of Sabaoth, upon them there will be no rain.”*

The rain is a particular example employed to denote generally the blessing of God, which is withdrawn from the wicked despisers. The thought that the Lord will not then leave the heathen to themselves as he does now, but will require of them the fulfilment of their duties towards him, is expressed by the prophet thus: all who do not join the procession to Jerusalem will be visited with one of the punishments denounced in the law against those who transgress it, and one which was frequently carried out in history, for example in the case of Ahab, namely the want of rain.

Ver. 18. *“And if the family of Egypt go not up, and come not, there will not (be) upon them (any rain; but) there will be (upon them) the plague, wherewith the Lord will smite all the nations which shall not go up to keep the feast of tabernacles.”*

The strange notion that the prophet must necessarily pay strict attention to the natural characteristics of Egypt, which is not indebted for its fertility to the rain, but to the Nile, seeing that the former falls but sparingly anywhere, and not at all in upper Egypt,—though of course the water of the river must come originally from the rain even if it falls beyond the limits of Egypt,—has led many commentators to adopt the most forced interpretations. The  $\text{לֹא יִרְדּוּ עָלֵיהֶם}$  must be taken in the same sense in this verse as in the preceding one, and therefore  $\text{יִהְיֶה הַפֶּגֶעַה}$  must be supplied; and the plague can be no other than the withdrawal of rain. Egypt, which is mentioned here by way of example, had also been assured by Isaiah of a full participation at some future period in the blessings and privileges of the people of God (see vol. ii. p. 143). But this is also directly associated with accountability for the abuse of these blessings.

Ver. 19. “*This will be the sin of Egypt, and the sin of all the nations which shall not go up to keep the feast of tabernacles.*”

*This*; namely, that no rain falls upon them. *The sin* cannot directly signify the *punishment* of sin, but is looked at here in the light of its consequences, which, according to the scriptural view, are to be regarded as an appendage of the sin; compare Lam. 4:6; Gen. 4:13; and 1 Sam. 28:10. The inseparable character of the connection between sin and punishment is apparent from Num. 32:23, “your sin, which *findeth* you.”

Ver. 20. “*In this day there will stand upon the bells of the horses ‘holy to the Lord,’ and the pots in the house of the Lord will be as the sacrificial bowls before the altar.*”

Commentators are all agreed as to the rendering to be given to the first clause, except that many of them give a different rendering to *הַלְלֵיךָ*, some rendering it *bridles*, as the Septuagint and Vulgate have done, and others, like Luther, *trappings* or *armour*. It is also generally acknowledged that the prophet alludes to the sacred plate on the diadem of the high priest, upon which was engraved, like the engraving of a signet, “Holy to the Lord” (Ex. 28:36). There are many things which are represented in the Old Testament as holy to the Lord, but this was the only case in which such an inscription was borne, and the only one therefore in which the analogy was perfect; since it is not merely stated here that the bells of the horses will be holy to the Lord, but that *on* the bells of the horses, that is engraven upon them, there will be “Holy to the Lord.”<sup>63</sup> But, notwithstanding this agreement, there are no small differences in the explanations which have been given. The Jewish commentators have gone farthest away from the truth (e.g. the Jew whom Jerome questioned, Jarchi, Kimchi, and Abenezra). They were kept from the correct interpretation by the fact that it would involve the abrogation of the entire ceremonial law, and understood the words as denoting the consecration of the bells to purposes of religious worship, and their employment in the manufacture of sacred vessels. The untenable character of this interpretation is sufficiently evident from the fact, that Grotius, whose superficial tendencies lead him to adopt it in the main, insensibly substitutes for the bells the whole trappings of the horse, from a feeling, no doubt, that the bells of the horses were too contemptible a gift for the Lord. But it will be still more obvious if we compare the second clause with ver. 21, where there is no reference, such as we should expect according to this explanation, to gifts consecrated to the Lord, but to the cessation of the distinction between sacred and profane. And, lastly, by this exposition the reference to the plate on the forehead of the high priest, which is evidently a deeply significant one, is changed into quite a common allusion.—There is greater plausibility in the explanation given by Marck, particularly with the embellishments added by Pels.<sup>64</sup> Having adduced several examples of the custom prevalent among idolatrous nations of marking persons and things with the image or name of an idol (3 Macc. 2:21; Acts 28:11), he proves from passages quoted from ancient authors, that among the Persians the horses were sacred to the sun; and conjectures, chiefly on the strength of the assertion made by Cratius (iii. 3) to the effect that there were figures of gods on the chariot of Jupiter (Ormuzd), that it was a customary thing with the Persians to write the name of their deity on the bells of their horses, and in this way to indicate that they were sacred to the god. He then proceeds to show that, in the time of the prophet, the cavalry was the strength and pride of the Persians. In his opinion the meaning is, that the glorious day would hereafter arrive when the idolatrous nations and everything belonging to them, which had hitherto been dedicated to their idols, Lord, but to something to be effected *by* Him. And this is confirmed by the allusion to the golden plate on the forehead of the high priest, which was



not a merely human invention, a sign that the priest had consecrated himself to God; but, on the contrary, was the symbol of the holiness imparted by God to the high priest as the representative of his people. This may be clearly seen from Ex. 28:38 (“And it shall be upon Aaron’s forehead, that Aaron may bear the iniquity of the holy things, which the children of Israel shall hallow; and it shall be always upon his forehead, that they may be accepted before the Lord”), where it is represented as containing in itself the objective holiness, imparted by God, by which every imperfection in the subjective holiness was removed, and in consequence of which the people were all regarded and treated by the Lord as holy so long as this relation lasted, notwithstanding the imperfections by which their holy services were all defiled. The meaning therefore is this: in that day the Lord will adorn the high priest with the symbol of holiness, which has hitherto been borne by the high priest alone. We have thus an important truth in a priestly garb (see also chap. 9:15, where the priestly character of the prophet peeps out again). The distinction between sacred and profane originated with the fall. To abolish this distinction, and re-establish the sole supremacy of holiness, was one of the ultimate designs of the divine economy of salvation; whilst, on the other hand, the prince of this world endeavoured to exterminate altogether the other of the two, namely, everything holy. In order to secure his purpose more perfectly at last, the Lord allowed the two to exist for a long period side by side, that the points of contrast might be more and more conspicuous. He set apart for himself a holy nation in comparison with which all other nations were profane; and to this nation he gave a law, in which the distinction between sacred and profane was universally maintained in things small as well as great. He was satisfied for a time that only a certain outwardly defined territory should be kept sacred as his own; since, otherwise, if the two opposing principles were mixed up together, the evil would completely swallow up the good. With the first coming of Christ, the ultimate purpose of God drew nearer to its realization. The *outward* distinction between sacred and profane fell into the background, because a much stronger support and aid were communicated to the former by the spirit of Christ. Nevertheless, the two antagonistic elements still continue, and even in the believer the good does not attain to complete and sole supremacy in this present life. The day will come, however, when the Lord will be all in all, and when every distinction between the holy and the unholy, every corrupt admixture of the two, and all differences of degree in the holy itself, will come to an end (see vol. ii. p. 447 sqq.). Just as the first clause announces the change of everything profane into a holy thing, so does the second clause announce the abolition of the different degrees of holiness. Under the Old Testament the bowls before the altar,—that is, the basins into which the blood of the animals slain in sacrifice was received, and from which it was sprinkled upon the altar and poured out at the foot of the altar,—were reckoned among the holiest of the vessels; for of all the vessels in use these were the most directly appropriated to the holiest service of God. On the other hand, the pots, namely, those in which the meat of the sacrifices was boiled, were reckoned among the lowest in point of holiness. We can have no doubt that it is to them that the prophet alludes (see ver. 21), and they were subservient to human purposes. Even in this instance the Jewish commentators *were compelled* by their notion of the perpetual duration of the ceremonial law (for a refutation of which either this passage or Mal. 1:11 is amply sufficient) to resort to a forced interpretation in order to get rid of the correct but unpalatable meaning. The same thought, the cessation of all difference in the degrees of holiness, is expressed by Ezekiel in chap. 43:12, though he employs a different figure. The whole mountain, he says, upon which the new temple stands, is to be most holy.

Ver. 21. "And every pot in Jerusalem and Judah will be holy to Jehovah of Sabaoth; and all they that sacrifice come and take of them and boil therein; and in that day there will be no Canaanite more in the house of the Lord of Sabaoth."

Just as the pots in the temple will be quite as holy as the sacrificial bowls, so will all the pots in Jerusalem and Judah which have hitherto been simply clean, not holy, be just as holy as the pots in the temple. In the closing words, which express the same idea as the preceding verse, that in the new economy the profane will become holy, many understand כְּבַיִת to mean *dealer*.<sup>65</sup> But by far the majority follow the Septuagint, and render it Canaanite; and in the main this rendering is greatly to be preferred. When the prophet says, that at that time there will *no longer* be a Canaanite in the house of the Lord, it necessarily follows that in his day there were Canaanites in the house of the Lord. But this shows that we are not to understand the word as literally denoting a Canaanite by birth, for even the Gibeonites, to whom many commentators, including Hofmann, suppose that the words refer, were not to be found in the temple itself, from which all foreigners were most scrupulously excluded. Moreover, it can hardly be imagined that the Gibeonites, who had been received for centuries without any exception into the nation of God, should be simply represented as Canaanites; and it is still more inconceivable that they should be regarded as unclean. On the contrary, we have an example here of an idiom, which is by no means infrequently met with, in which the ungodly members of the congregation itself are either described as heathen or uncircumcised, or else directly called Canaanites or by the name of some other heathen nation, for the purpose of ridiculing their arrogant pretensions in consequence of their outward connection with the congregation. Circumcision had the force of a covenant-seal, only when accompanied by the spiritual condition of which it was a visible sign; where this was not the case, circumcision was reckoned uncircumcision. Just as the Pentateuch speaks of a circumcision of the heart, which was rendered obligatory by the outward circumcision of the Israelites (Deut. 10:16, 30:6), so does Jeremiah speak of the ungodly Israelites as uncircumcised in heart. Thus, in chap. 4:4, he says, "circumcise yourselves to the Lord, and take away the foreskins of your hearts, ye men of Judah and inhabitants of Jerusalem;" and in chap. 9:26, "for all the heathen are uncircumcised, and all the house of Israel are uncircumcised in heart." Ezekiel goes a step further. In chap. 44:9, he represents the ungodly priests and Levites, not merely as uncircumcised in heart, but also as uncircumcised in flesh and sons of the stranger. That the uncircumcised and the sons of the stranger mentioned here are not actual heathen, as many commentators have strangely enough supposed, but ungodly Levites, is evident, among other reasons, *first*, from the fact that priestly actions are attributed to the persons alluded to, particularly the offering of sacrifices (compare ver. 7 with ver. 15): *secondly*, from כִּי עִי in ver. 10, which these commentators (*e.g.* Rosenmüller) erroneously render "also," "however," (*aber*), instead of *but* (*sondern*); and, *lastly*, from vers. 15 and 16, where the announcement of the reward to be conferred upon the *pious* is opposed to the threat of punishment to be inflicted upon the *ungodly* priests and Levites. Of the transfer of the name of some one idolatrous nation, which had distinguished itself by the depth of its moral degradation, to the ungodly Israelites, the following examples may be adduced. Isaiah, in chap. 1:10, addresses the princes of Israel without reserve as "princes of Sodom," and the people as the "people of Gomorrah." In Ezek. 16:3, we find these words, "Thus saith the Lord to Jerusalem; thine origin and thy descent is from the land of the Canaanite; thy father is the Amorite, and thy mother a Hittite." The meaning of the passage before us, therefore, cannot be doubtful. It is a parallel to such passages as Isa. 4:3, "He that is left in Zion and he that remaineth in Jerusalem shall be called holy;" and chap. 60:21, "thy people also shall be all righteous"

(compare the history of Susannah, ver. 48).—At the same time, it cannot be denied that the rendering *dealer* is to a certain extent correct. The fact that Canaanite also means dealer, shows that the profanity of the disposition which characterized this nation was especially apparent in the predominance of material interests. In Zeph. 1:11, where the overthrow of the covenant nation is announced in the words “all the people of Canaan are destroyed,” the Chaldee has very correctly paraphrased the passage thus, “totus populus cujus opera similia sunt operibus Cananaeorum,” and it would be wrong to render it, “the merchant people,”<sup>66</sup> as v. Cöln and Maurer have done. At the same time, it is evident from the parallel clause, “all they that are laden with silver are cut of” (Jonathan, “*divites opibus*”), that the reference is not merely to the Canaanites generally, but particularly to their unholy love of gain. In Hos.12:7, the fallen covenant nation is spoken of in these terms, “Canaan, in his hand is the balance of deceit, he loves to act unjustly.” “The Phoenicians,” observes C. B. Michaelis (*in loc.*), as Grotius and others observe, were φιλοχρήματα τε καὶ τρῶκται, avaricious and cheats.” In Ezek. 17:4, it is certainly wrong to render Canaan “merchant.” Babylon was a second Canaan (see Hävernack *in loc.*), but in the next clause “city of merchants” is introduced as a parallel to the land of Canaan, to show that the Babylonians are not called Canaanites on account of their carnal disposition in general, but on account of their carnal devotedness to trade. That this has been an hereditary failing with the Jewish people experience teaches even to the present day; and therefore it is very appropriate that the prophet should conclude his prophecy with an allusion to the extermination of this evil in the days of salvation, seeing that the loss of national independence, which causes personal interests to be thrown into greater prominence, would make the evil stronger than ever. If, then, the Canaanites represent the essential character of the world, from the most material point of view, this places in a new light the purification of the temple in John 2:13-22. In its general features the latter rests upon Malachi. But in the fact that the Lord drives out the *traders* from the temple as a symbol of the reformation predicted by the prophet,—that his zeal for a reform manifests itself on the *traders* in particular,—there is an allusion to the passage before us, in combination with that of Malachi. In the purification of the temple this passage is, as it were, placed upon the stage before our eyes; compare especially ver. 14, “and found in the temple those that sold oxen, and sheep, and doves, and the changers of money sitting;” and ver. 16, “make not my Father’s house an house of merchandise.”—There were degrees in the fulfilment of this announcement; see the remarks on Isa. 4:3. By the blood and Spirit of Christ, the material spirit received a heavy blow, and in every age of the Church there is a powerful reaction. The ultimate fulfilment is that described in Rev. 21:27, and 22:15.

## MALACHI

THE question as to the period at which the prophet wrote has been set at rest by Vitringa (de Mal. proph. in the *Ols.* vol. ii.). The reasons adduced by him in support of his conclusion, that the book was composed under Nehemiah, about the time of his second arrival in Canaan, subsequent to the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes, hardly leave any further room for doubt. The principal reason which he assigns is the following: in Malachi, and in the 13th chapter of Nehemiah, which is occupied with the period succeeding his return, the same offences are referred to as common at the time, and described in nearly the same words. Compare, for example, chap. 2:8 with Neh. 13:30, where the sin of the nation, especially of the priests, in marrying heathen wives, is referred to; and chap. 3:10 with Neh. 13:10-12, in which allusion is made to the neglect of the people to bring the tithes. Of the objections offered by Hitzig, Reinke, and others, to

this conclusion, the only one which has any plausibility, is that the governor, mentioned in chap. 1:8, does not appear to be an Israelite, and certainly not to be Nehemiah, who had refused to take even such presents as were justly due to him (see Neh. 5:14, 15). But this passage merely treats of forced contributions and extortions. Such a position as that of Nehemiah can hardly be conceived of in an Eastern country without presents. And an absolute refusal to receive them would have been a manifestation of unfeeling harshness. The only point about which there can be any doubt is whether the public appearance of Malachi occurred shortly before, or shortly after, or precisely at the period of the reform movement which took place on the occasion of Nehemiah's second arrival. The last is the most probable supposition. It cannot be right to fix upon an *earlier* period, since the strength of the abuses that had arisen is represented in Nehemiah as not in the least diminished,—a fact which presupposes that God had left the nation to itself for some time,—and also because a governor over the civil affairs is mentioned in chap. 1:8, as existing at the time in the midst of the nation. A *later* period cannot be thought of from the very nature of the case; and, according to Nehemiah's own account, the steps taken by him to effect a reformation cannot be supposed to have been altogether without effect. Hence it is probable that the contemporaneous labours of Malachi and Nehemiah bore the same relation to each other as those of Haggai and Zechariah on the one hand, and Joshua and Zerubbabel on the other. The outward efforts of Nehemiah to bring about a reform were accompanied by the more spiritual efforts of Malachi. Nehemiah cast forth all the household stuff of Tobiah out of the chamber (ver. 8); "if ye do so again," he threatens the Sabbath-breakers in ver. 21, "I will lay hands on you." He smites the men who have taken foreign wives, and plucks off their hair (ver. 25). Malachi, on the other hand, merely smites with the word of God. He points expressly to the judgment of God, the beginning of which was already to be seen in the midst of the nation, and which would continue to increase in distinctness and strength, in proportion as the germ of destruction, which already existed, became more and more developed. A similar parallel in the progress of inward and outward reform is to be met with on various occasions in the history of Israel; for example, that of Isaiah and Hezekiah, and again that of Jeremiah and Josiah. There is not a single example of a purely outward reform.

Vitringa's views, with regard to the name of the prophet, viz. that Malachi was an ideal name and not the prophet's own name, have met with far less favour than those with respect to the date at which he wrote. And yet the reasons that may be adduced in support of this opinion are by no means weak, though Vitringa himself did not perceive them all. In the *first* place, we cannot but be struck at the outset with the fact, that the superscription contains no further information as to the prophet himself, not even the name of his father or his birth-place. There are only two other instances of this,—both of them in the case of minor prophets,—Obadiah and Habakkuk; though, of course, these two parallel cases are sufficient to prevent our inferring anything with certainty from this fact alone. *Secondly*, we cannot fail to be struck with another circumstance, namely, that doubts were entertained at a very early period, as to the historical personality of Malachi. It is very certain that the translators of the Septuagint regarded the name as merely an official one. They render the words מְלָאכִי מִלְּפָנֶיךָ, ἐν χειρὶ ἀγγέλου αὐτοῦ. This is also the case with the Chaldee translator, who appends to the name Malachi the words "*qui alias Ezra scriba vocatur.*" Jerome, who expresses the same opinion, has certainly followed the Jewish tradition. From these testimonies so much at least may be inferred with perfect certainty, that tradition knew nothing of a historical person named Malachi. And this absence of any traditional account is the more striking, in proportion to the lateness of the period at which the prophet lived. But we may even go further with some degree of

certainty. How came it to pass that it was only in the case of Malachi, and not in that of other prophets, the circumstances of whose lives were just as little known, that such conjectures were ever expressed? This certainly appears to point to the conclusion that tradition was not merely silent with regard to the existence of any prophet named Malachi, but expressly denied that any prophet of that name really did exist. *Thirdly*, the name itself furnishes the strongest argument. This would not be the case if it were compounded of מְלָאָךְ and יְהוָה, as Vitringa, Caspari (on Mic. p. 28), and others assume. Cases of a similar kind, in which the name and the vocation correspond, are frequently to be met with in the Scriptures; and in many instances the influence of God in producing this result is unmistakeable. Again, the name would prove nothing if the rendering *angelicus*, suggested by Gesenius and Winer, were admissible. But the rules of the language will not allow of either of these explanations. The first is untenable, because not a single reliable example can be adduced of such an abbreviation of the word יְהוָה.<sup>67</sup> Moreover, הוֹדֵי יְהוָה could not mean *a* messenger, but *the* messenger of the Lord, and therefore, although the whole of the priesthood might be so designated, the expression could not be properly applied to a single individual. The second is inadmissible, because the words in ׀—, when derived from ordinary nouns, are only used to denote descent or occupation. But a still stronger reason is, that מְלָאָךְ is not a proper name peculiar to the angels, from which such an adjective as *angelical* could be derived; and this is particularly apparent in the case of our prophet, seeing that he only uses the word once in connection with a heavenly messenger, and twice of an earthly messenger sent by God. But how could any one think of rendering מְלָאָךְ in the superscription differently from מְלָאָךְ in chap. 3:1? We have here a sufficient disproof not only of both the derivations mentioned, but also of the untenable opinion that the name signifies “messenger,” “one sent.” That the two are connected, whatever the nature of the connection may be, must be at once apparent to every one. Now in chap. 3:1, the rendering “my messenger” is not exposed to any difficulty. But if the same meaning be adopted in the heading, it would be difficult to find any analogy to such a proper name, except the perfectly isolated name Hephzibah in 2 Kings 21:1 (compare Isa. 62:4). And where should we find another example of a proper name, the form of which can only be explained on the supposition that it was given by God himself? The actual state of the case would be a very different one if Malachi were regarded as a name which the prophet adopted for this particular prophecy. He would then expect every one to gather the meaning from the word itself, as found in chap. 3:1. We might imagine it preceded by some such introductory words as these. Burden of the word of the Lord through “my messenger.” If the name be regarded as dependent upon the passage referred to, the more precise explanation given will necessarily differ according to the different modes in which this passage is explained. If we understand by “my messenger” John the Baptist in his historical character, Cocceius<sup>68</sup> is right, and the name must be interpreted as meaning, “he who has prophesied of the messenger of the Lord,” or “he of whose prophecy ‘my messenger’ forms the sum and substance.” If we understand the expression “my messenger” as used ideally, so that it is simply because the idea was most perfectly realized in him, that John comes principally into consideration whilst the labours of the prophet himself are also represented as included in the idea, then the meaning of the name is, “he whom the Lord himself has called his messenger.” In this case he directs attention to the extreme responsibility incurred by those who refuse to listen to his message. He says exactly the same thing as Haggai expresses in the words, “then spake Haggai, the Lord’s messenger, in the Lord’s message unto the people” (chap. 1:13). The latter supposition is evidently the more natural of the two; and no other furnishes any kind of analogy to other proper names. In this way, too, the name of the prophet himself serves to confirm the second explanation of

chap. 3:1, of the correctness of which we shall by and by bring forward still further proofs. Caspari's objection, that there is no other instance of an ideal name of this description, may be met by a reference to Agar in Prov. 30:1, and to Lemuel in Prov. 31:1. But it is very questionable whether, even in the case of the other prophets, the names are to be all regarded as those which they received at their birth, whether, on the contrary, many of them do not resemble the name Peter. The sacred character of the names is so unmistakeable, and the agreement between the name of the prophet and the peculiar character of his prophecy is frequently so striking (for example, in the case of Jeremiah), that this assumption is a very natural one. If the name be really an ideal one, it might be argued, in support of the opinion, that Ezra is hidden under Malachi, that the priestly calling of Malachi is rendered probable by the excessive interest which he manifests in the priestly order, and also that the books of Ezra and the Chronicles favour the conclusion that Ezra took part anonymously in the completion of the canon. If it be correct to attribute to Ezra—the only man of God who is mentioned in the Scriptures along with Nehemiah, as living at that time—the last four anonymous Psalms, which certainly belong to the period in which he lived, the works of Ezra would then form the conclusion of all three departments of sacred literature, and from his entire position this is by no means improbable.

The heading of the book of Malachi, “burden<sup>69</sup> of the word of the Lord to Israel,” is a sufficient indication of the character of the book as containing one single prophetic address, the tenor of which is threatening and punitive, not comforting or promising. In the prophecy itself, this unity is manifest in the expressions employed. The charges are constantly followed by an inquiry on the part of those who are punished, on what ground the punishment is inflicted, and this again by a fuller explanation on the part of the prophet (compare, for example, chap. 1:6, 7, 2:14, 17, 3:7, 8, 13). Eichhorn and De Wette pretend that this uniformity of style is a sign of exhaustion. But if we look attentively at the plan of the prophecy, if we observe how with all that is apparently fragmentary it forms a closely connected whole, and how the expressions throughout are utterances of the very sentiment against which the prophet is contending, it will assume a totally different aspect. To regard punishments in the manner indicated here is the peculiar characteristic of this state of mind, this Pelagian blindness, which knows neither itself nor God. And the unchangeable character of such a disposition could not be exhibited in a more striking manner than by the adoption throughout of precisely the same mode of expression. The self-righteous man is thus brought distinctly before the mind. But if we look merely at the contents of the book, his portrait presents itself on every hand. The captivity formed an important turning-point in the thoughts and feelings of the Israelites. Even before that event, ungodliness manifested itself in two different forms, open infidelity, which either ridiculed all religion or gave itself up to idolatry, and a dead reliance upon justification by works, a hope of meriting the favour of God by a tattered and imperfect outward righteousness, in spite of corruptions and enmity to God within. The latter disposition is depicted and opposed in the 50th Psalm and the 1st chapter of Isaiah; but it is still more vigorously resisted in the second part, especially in chap. 58. Previous to the captivity, the former was by far the more prevalent of the two forms of religion. The captivity itself made a deep impression upon the nation. At first a better state of feeling prevailed among those who returned. Haggai and Zechariah found more occasion to comfort troubled minds than to reprove the hardened and terrify them by severe threatenings. But it soon became apparent that with the mass of the people the professed repentance was only hypocritical, and that corruption was still burning under the ashes ready to burst into flames again in due time. Even Zechariah found occasion to

announce a new and destructive judgment upon Judea, as soon as the wickedness which existed in the germ in his own day should have struck its roots and put forth branches (compare chap. 5 and 11). The growth of these germs made rapid progress between his day and that of Malachi. It was only upon the form in which irreligion manifested itself that the captivity continued to exert a powerful influence. The second of the two forms referred to now attained to sole supremacy. The people still shrank back from the open profession of irreligion. It was not till a much later period that Sadduceeism arose by a powerful movement from without; and even after this, Phariseeism retained its influence unquestioned over the great mass of the nation. In its leading features the latter was fully developed in the time of Malachi. To perceive this we need only consider the prominence of the priestly order, the utter absence of any deep-rooted convictions of sin and righteousness, the striving after an outward fulfilment of the law, the thirst for judgments upon the heathen, who were regarded as the sole objects of the judicial punishment of God, and the murmuring against God, which Calvin has so strikingly described as a distinguishing characteristic of hypocrisy. "Thus," he says, "are hypocrites accustomed when God does not appear immediately with his aid, not only to express their disapprobation indirectly, but even to break out into open blasphemies. They fancy that God is under obligations to them, and therefore proceed with the less hesitation, yea, with all the greater arrogance, to exalt themselves against him. On the other hand, it is a proof of true piety when we patiently submit to the judgments of God, and as Jeremiah admonishes us by his own example, bear his anger, because we know that we have sinned (chap. 8:14). Hypocrites are not conscious of any guilt, since they do not examine themselves, but rather make excuses and stupify their consciences, and therefore imagine that God is doing them an injury, unless he comes at once to their help."

The manifestation of this wickedness, though not its existence, was promoted by the dealings of God with the nation. The prophets before the exile had promised an infinite supply of blessings to such as should return. But the actual circumstances appeared to stand out in glaring contrast with these promises. There was no Messiah; the people of God were servants in their own land (Neh. 9:36, 37); they were governed by heathens; and there was everywhere poverty and distress. Even to the truly pious this state of things was the cause of many temptations; but their doubts, which they overcame by faith, did not affect the righteousness of God. On the contrary, the circumstances in which they were placed seemed rather to furnish proofs of his righteousness, though they led them to despair of his grace, which they thought they had forfeited by the greatness of their sins. Compare, for example, the prayer in Nehemiah, chap. 9, which has been described as a parallel to the grievances referred to in Malachi—a comparison which is quite unwarrantable, since the fact is altogether overlooked that, although the former contains bitter complaints, they relate not to God, but to the people's own sins. In ver. 31 we read, "Nevertheless, for thy great mercies thou didst not *utterly* consume them, nor forsake them; for thou art a gracious and merciful God;" and in ver. 33, "Howbeit thou art just in all that is brought upon us; for thou hast done right, but we have done wickedly." The merely outwardly pious, on the contrary, could not fail to murmur against God and charge him with unfaithfulness. For according to their views of the relation in which they stood to God, they had really suffered wrong. Since they could not perceive that the cause of the very imperfect fulfilment of the promises was to be found in themselves, they necessarily formed wrong conceptions of God. A *theodicee*, with regard to sufferings, is only possible from the scriptural view of human sinfulness.

We will now give a sketch of the work from beginning to end, for the purpose of showing that the state of mind against which the prophet contends is the same throughout, although manifested in different forms.

The first section embraces chap. 1:2-5. "I have loved you, saith the Lord;" these are the prophet's opening words, in which he points to the love of God as the foundation of the complaint which follows. "Wherein hast thou loved us?" is the reply of the hypocrites, who thus display their character at the very outset. Mistaken notions as to the mercies of God, and ingratitude for those mercies, are distinguishing characteristics of hypocrisy. Even the greatest of all are regarded by hypocrites as a merited recompense; and the smallest in which the humble believer rejoices as proofs of undeserved compassion are treated by them as a kind of offence. As a proof of the love of God, the prophet appeals to the fact that the Lord has brought Israel back into its own land, whereas the home of the kindred nation of Edom, which the Lord hates, is still lying waste. This commencement of mercy was a pledge of its continuance, if only they did not by their own sins place obstacles in the way.

A second section extends from chap. 1:6-2:9. The question with regard to their guilt, in not reciprocating affection, is directed first of all to the priests. The principal reason for this was, that in the time of Malachi the priests constituted the heart of the entire life of the nation; compare chap. 2:3, where the whole nation is addressed in them. The result in this case is a very mournful one. Instead of humbling themselves, and suffering themselves to be stirred up to renewed zeal in the service of the Lord, by the sufferings inflicted upon the nation at large, and upon their own order in particular, to which the service of the Lord afforded but a scanty means of subsistence, they do the very opposite, and in their pharisaic blindness look for the causes not in themselves, but in God. In the blindness which is inseparable from their self-righteousness, they imagine that, since God does not give them what is due, he cannot make any great claims upon them. Not only do they come very far short therefore of the fulfilment of the higher duties of their office, which the prophet expressly enforces upon them at the close, namely, to live in the fear of God, to be the mediators between God and the nation, and to bring back many from iniquity, they are no longer fit to discharge even inferior duties. The worst sacrifices, in their opinion, are good enough for the Lord. Even when they offer these, they think that they are rendering another important service to the Lord. They fancy that he cannot do without the temple and its sacrifices. The prophet shows that the outward circumstances of the priestly order are merely the reflection of its moral condition, and that the breakers of the covenant are brought into affliction now by the very same means by which in former times those who observed the covenant were made partakers of life, prosperity, and peace. And he threatens with still greater punishment in the name of the Lord. Those who have profaned him must be themselves profaned. In opposition to the delusive notion that the Lord stands in need of the temple and its service, he points to the future, when the Lord will form for himself a new and inconceivably large church from the midst of the heathen, which will serve him with true sincerity, and when *pure* sacrifices will be offered instead of those which are offered now and which are *impure* in his sight, because they are offered without faith, without love, and without fear. Compare the important passage in chap. 1:11, "For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, my name is great among the heathen, and in every place incense is offered to my name, and a pure offering; for my name is great among the heathen, saith Jehovah of hosts." In the expression, "my name is great among the heathen," there is an allusion to ver. 6, "ye priests, who despise my name." The name of God springs out of his acts, and



therefore the announcement that the name of the Lord will become great among the heathen points to manifestations of a glorious description on the part of God. The words “in every place,” form a contrast to the temple mentioned in the previous verse. The wish which is there expressed that some one would shut the temple, seeing that it is no longer a house of God, contains at the same time a prophecy. The pure gifts of those among whom the name of God is great, are contrasted with the impure gifts of the despisers of God, in which he will not accept (ver. 6), because he has no pleasure in the givers. What a wondrous insight into futurity, in the case of the prophet whose prophecies form the top-stone of the Old Testament! To any one who had correctly interpreted them, there could be nothing surprising in the words, “The kingdom of God is taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.” The only thing that could cause him surprise must have been the long-suffering of God, which suffered the barren tree to stand for so many years. This passage is necessary to complete the following threat of the judgment which is to fall upon Israel. It shows that the kingdom of God does not perish when the Lord comes and smites the land with a curse (chap. 3:24), but that this apparent death is the pathway to true life. We have here the Old Testament foundation of the words spoken by the Lord in John 4:21 sqq., and Matt. 8:11. In the latter of the two passages (“many shall come from the east and from the west, and shall sit down,” etc.), even the expressions point back to this passage.

Hitzig, Maurer, and Ewald have endeavoured to rob this section of its prophetic character, and maintain that it relates to circumstances which existed in the time of the prophet himself. But the simple fact that there were no such circumstances in existence in the prophet’s days is a sufficient proof that the present is merely ideal, and that he is actually treating of a future which he anticipates by faith. At that time the name of the Lord was *not* great among the heathen “from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same” (a standing phrase for “over the whole earth”), and incense and a pure offering were *not* offered to his name “in every place.”<sup>70</sup> Moreover, the intimate connection between this prophecy and other Messianic announcements (*e.g.* Zeph. 2:11, “and men shall worship him, every one from his place, even all the isles of the heathen;” Isa. 11:10; and Zech. 9:10) is too obvious to be overlooked, and it is only by suppressing the exegetical evidence altogether that the passage can be severed from this connection.—Reinke (Die Weissagung Mal. 1:11 in the *Beiträge zur Erklärung des A.T.*, vol. ii.) agrees with us in our Messianic interpretation, but understands the passage as referring to “the bloodless sacrifice of the New Testament, the holy sacrifice of the mass.” He takes a false position, however, especially as he has given a spiritual interpretation to the incense connected with the pure offering. This he supposes to relate to prayer (p. 503); and at the same time he even observes, “That Malachi could not refer to literal incense is evident from the fact, that the offering and burning of incense could only take place in the holy temple,” a rule which was quite as applicable to the meat-offering. The use of the terms relating to sacrifice in a spiritual sense is very common in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament; in fact it could not be otherwise on account of the transparent character and symbolical meaning of the sacrifices of the Old Testament. Compare, for example, Ps. 50:23, 51:19; Hos. 14:3; Isa. 66:20 (where the presentation of a spiritual meat-offering on the part of the heathen is especially mentioned, just as in the passage before us); Rom. 12:1; Heb. 13:15; and 1 Pet. 2:5. Incense and meat-offering, the intimate connection of which is attested by Lev. 2:15 (compare also Isa. 1:13), are both employed in a spiritual sense to denote prayer<sup>71</sup> and good works. In this connection the emphasis is evidently laid, not upon the outward form, but upon the spirit of the sacrifice. The spiritless meat-offerings of the Jews, the Lord had just before declared that he would not accept. The

outward sacrifice was intimately and inseparably connected with the *national sanctuary* under the Old Testament (*vid.* Lev. 17:3-9 and Deut. 12); and therefore the expression, “in everyplace,” coupled with the allusion to the closing of the temple in ver. 10, and with the threat of the *ban* in chap. 3:24, lead to the conclusion that it is not to incense and meat-offering in the ordinary sense that the prophet here refers. The abolition of the Old Testament form of worship had been expressly announced even by the earlier prophets (compare Jer. 3:16 and Dan. 9:27). It is the more apparent that there can be no reference here to the “bloodless sacrifice of the New Testament,” since the resemblance on which Reinke lays stress, namely, “that they are both composed of fine and pure wheaten flour with a mixture of wine,” is a purely material one, and there is no essential connection between the two. The meat-offering, the food to be offered to the Lord by his people, was a symbolical representation of good works (see the *Dissertation on the Pentateuch*, vol. ii. p. 530; and “*The Lord’s Day*,” p. 24, translation). But, according to the doctrine of the Catholics, the “holy sacrifice of the mass” has a very different meaning.

The third section embraces chap. 2:10-16. At first sight it appears as if the prophet is reproving one particular crime, which has an immediate connection with the corrupt state of mind to which all the rest is directed, namely, severity and unfaithfulness towards women. But the appearance vanishes on closer examination. The prophet traces this crime to its original cause, to the darkening of the religious consciousness, which must always take place where the punishment of sin is inflicted, whilst the confession of sin is wanting; he who does not murmur against this sin will necessarily murmur against God (Lam. 3:39). This is evident from ver. 10, which determines the genus to which the particular crime belongs. “Have we not all one father? Hath not one God created us? Why then is brother faithless towards brother, to profane the covenant of our fathers?” The Israelites are children of God, spiritual brethren. Hence every violation of the duties arising out of their fraternal relationship, such as the unfaithfulness of which the men have been guilty towards their Israelitish wives, is at the same time a sin against God and a profanation of his covenant. “He who loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how shall he love God whom he hath not seen?” Whoever abolishes the distinction between an Israelitish and a heathen woman, shows by that very fact that he must, first of all, have ceased to recognise the distinction between the God of Israel and the idols of the heathen. This is expressly declared in the opening clause of the following verse, “Judah hath dealt treacherously.” Unfaithfulness in connection with their earthly marriage is represented here as the symptom and consequence of unfaithfulness in connection with their heavenly marriage. And the latter, viz. the profanation of the sanctuary of the Lord which he loveth, that is, of his kingdom in Israel, is mentioned as the chief cause; injustice to their neighbour is described in ver. 13 as merely the *second*.

In the fourth section, chap. 2:17-3:6, the fundamental disposition, against which the prophet is contending, is very conspicuous. They say, “Every one that doeth evil is good in the sight of the Lord, and he delighteth in them; or, Where is the God of judgment?” From their own stand-point they are quite right in their conclusions respecting God. But the prophet tells them in his reply that their stand-point is a false one. God is and will continue to be the righteous One, and will show himself to be so; not, however, on those whom they regard as the sole objects of his righteous judgments, but on those who are so more than any others, namely on themselves, who in their infatuation and blindness are longing for the coming of God to judgment. He first of all sends his messenger to warn them and lead them to repentance. And then the divine angel of the covenant, whom they are eagerly looking for as the supposed destroyer of the heathen, suddenly appears to

punish the transgressors of the covenant. His appearance is destructive to the wicked members of the Church of God, but to the Church itself it is a most salutary event, a fulfilment of the promises it has received from God.

In the fifth section (chap. 3:7-12), the prophet charges the people with neglecting to bring the tithes and heave-offerings,—a neglect which bears witness to their inward apostasy from God. He points out the folly of such conduct. Imagining that they are deceiving God, they are really deceiving themselves. The curse is already resting upon them; and yet they persist in the sin of which it is the consequence. If they will only do their duty, the curse will soon be turned into a blessing.

This section is closely connected with the one which precedes it. What could be more adapted to put to shame those who murmured impatiently against God, and maintained that the continued afflictions of the covenant nation were a practical proof of the want of righteousness on his part, than the declaration which forms the theme of this section, “Even from the days of your fathers ye are gone away from mine ordinances, and have not kept them. Return unto me, and I will return unto you, saith the Lord of hosts.” The very thing which appears to them to be at variance with divine righteousness affords a striking proof of its existence. We have here the second part of the reply to the question which provoked it, “Where is the God of righteousness?” The first reply we find in the previous section, “He will quickly appear, but to your destruction;” the second we have here, “He is appearing already in your present circumstances.” You are already acquainted with one side, namely, the judicial side of his righteousness; it depends entirely upon yourselves whether you shall also become acquainted with the other side.

This section is also closely connected with the sixth or last. The words of the murmurers against God, who are introduced as speaking in vers. 13-15, are so directly related, often verbally, to the prophet’s own words in the foregoing section, that they can only be regarded as intended for a reply. “Prove me now herewith (namely, by a faithful performance of your duties towards me), saith the Lord of hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven, and pour you out blessings in immeasurable abundance” (ver. 10). In ver. 15, the opponents reply, “They (the heathen) *prove* God, and are delivered.” What need then is there of proving, in the manner to which thou invitest us? Even the proving *of the heathen* is sufficient. If he has not shown himself to be the God of righteousness, when this test is applied, what are we to expect from this fresh proof? In ver. 12 they are told, “All the heathen call you blessed, for ye will be a delightsome land, saith the Lord of hosts;” and the murmurers reply in ver. 15, “and now we call the wicked happy.” It is the heathen who congratulate us, the faithful servants of God; but we, on the contrary, who congratulate those who have forgotten God. In ver. 7, the prophet says to them, “Ye have gone away from mine ordinances, and have not observed them.” In ver. 14, the murmurers answer, “We have observed him, and have walked mournfully before the Lord of hosts.” Thou promisest great gain *if* we do this. *We have* done it, and what have we gained? The same question still retains its force, “Where is the God of righteousness?”

The prophet then proceeds, after quoting these replies, which testify of the deepest blindness, to notice first of all the conduct of those who truly fear God, and under the form of a historical statement to warn them against taking part in expressions which are dictated by feelings entirely opposed to their own. The truly pious, hearing the words of those who have the form of godliness but deny its power, express to one another their abhorrence of their conduct. The Lord will bless them abundantly, when his judgments, which are about to break forth, shall fall upon the ungodly. The prophecy closes with an

*exhortation* to adhere steadfastly to the law of God; with a *promise* that God will send Elias the prophet before the great and terrible day of the Lord comes, to revive the spirit of the law in the midst of the nation; and with a *threat* that he will smite the land with the curse, if it does not hearken to the voice of the messenger of God.

We will now proceed to an exposition of the two sections, chap. 2:17-3:6 and chap. 3:13-24.

## CHAP. 2:17-3:6

### PRELIMINARY EXPOSITION OF ISAIAH 40:3-5

Before proceeding to the interpretation of this section in Malachi, and especially of chap. 3:1, we must enter into a fuller explanation of Isa. 40:3-5, which we merely touched upon in a very cursory manner before. The answer which Malachi gives to those who have ventured to impugn the justice of God rests upon this passage. And it is of the greater importance that we should examine it here, since the New Testament citations emphatically show that it is closely connected with the subject of the present section.

*“A voice crying: in the desert: prepare ye the way of the Lord! level in the desert a road for our God. Let every valley exalt itself, and every mountain and hill sink down; and the steep become a plain, and the rugged a valley. And the glory of the Lord is revealed, and all flesh seeth together: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken.”*

Vers. 3 and 4 form an introduction to the coming of the Lord; ver. 5 describes the coming itself.

Are we to connect בַּמִּדְבָּר (in the desert) with the preceding words, as the translators of the Septuagint and the Evangelists after them have done (φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ Ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου), or with the next clause, as modern commentators for the most part suppose? The decision of this question is of no great importance so far as the subject itself is concerned. For even if we connect the word with the following clause, the voice must be understood as sounding in the place in which the command itself was to be carried out. There are difficulties connected with both explanations. The parallel term הִבְרַעַב favours the connection with the words which follow, whilst the situation of רַבְדַּמַּב at the commencement, before the verb, favours the connection with the previous clause. It is in any case a very unusual thing for a subordinate idea to be placed first, in such a way as this. But here there is the less room to suppose that it is merely accidental, since הִבְרַעַב is placed after the verb. רַבְדַּמַּב corresponded exactly to הִבְרַעַב, the order of the words would evidently be faulty. The arguments adduced in support of both connections retain their force, if we place רַבְדַּמַּב in a kind of independent position, between the two clauses, as Vitranga, Rückert, and Stier have done, so that it shall belong equally to both “a voice crying: in the desert: prepare,” etc., equivalent to, “a voice crieth in the desert, prepare in the desert,” etc. Again קוֹל קוֹרֵא is not an independent sentence, but must be explained as a fragmentary expression arising from strong emotion, as the translators of the Septuagint perceived. We must supply in thought some such expression as this, “hark! what do I hear?”

To whom does the voice crying in the desert belong, and to whom is it directed? Modern commentators, for the most part, maintain that the speaker is God, and that the persons addressed are the prophets. The words, “the way of Jehovah,” instead of “my way,” naturally excite suspicion; at the same time, the *יְהוָה* in ver. 2 might be adduced on the other side, though the change to the third person is not so harsh in this instance, on account of *עָמִי* preceding. The question is decided, however, by *לְאֵלֵינוּ*, *our* God. This shows that the voice which calls must proceed from the covenant nation itself. Gesenius refers to ver. 6 as a proof that the voice must be the voice of God. But even there this explanation is inadmissible, as we may see from ver. 8, “the word of *our* God endureth for ever” (compare also *יְהוָה רִיבֵנָה* in ver. 7). For, if God were introduced as the speaker in vers. 3-8, how could we account for the fact that he is invariably referred to in the third person? The only explanation that remains, therefore, is that, in ver. 6, one servant of God addresses another, according to the dramatic character of the whole representation.

The voice, then, must issue from the covenant nation. The question arises here, whether the person crying can be more precisely determined. Gesenius and others reply, both here and in other places, that it cannot be any one but the prophets. It is to them, they say, that the appeal is made in ver. 1; we cannot think of any but a prophet who has received the directions from God, in connection with *אָמַר* in ver. 6; and, lastly, Zion and Jerusalem, the bringers of good tidings in ver. 9, must be altered into bringers of good tidings to Zion and Jerusalem, and these again must be the prophets. But the false materialism which is apparent in this explanation stands out even more prominently in chap. 52:7, 8, where *מְבַשְׂרֵי* and *צוֹפִיִּים*, the messengers who bring good tidings, and the watchmen who stand upon the walls and witness their arrival with joy, are both said to be prophets. If this method of interpretation be adopted, what are we to do with the expression in ver. 9, “Break forth into joy, sing together, ye waste places of Jerusalem.” But the confession reaches its highest point in chap. 62:6, “I have set a watchman upon thy walls, O Jerusalem, which shall never hold their peace day nor night,” on which this comment is made, “the prophet who had made intercession himself according to ver. 1 has placed other watchmen upon the ruins of Jerusalem, who are to importune Jehovah with unceasing supplications on behalf of the city.”

In ver. 1 it is the whole company of the servants and heralds of God to which the divine command is issued, and it is they who here begin to carry out the instructions. As a matter of fact, the prophets occupy a very important position in this company. But this is not the point which the prophet at present has in view. In vers. 1, 3, and 6, just as in ver. 9, it is with an ideal person, *the* messenger of the Lord (Mal. 3:1), that he has to do, and the real individuals take part in his utterances only so far as the idea is realized in them.

When the question is once determined to whom the voice crying in the desert belongs, we can no longer have any doubt as to the persons who are addressed. Members of the covenant nation, furnished by God with the gifts of his Spirit, appointed as his heralds, address the covenant nation itself. This is evident from the use of the expression, “*our* God,” in a connection in which allusion is made to the God of Israel.

Having determined so much, we can no longer feel any perplexity as to what we are to understand by *preparing the way*. The expression itself is a very common one. It denotes the removal of everything that can hinder the manifestation of the Lord. But it is more precisely denoted by the fact that the nation itself is summoned to prepare a way. All the *outward* preparations for the entrance of salvation belong to the Lord himself; the people can only remove the *inward* obstacles out of the way by obtaining help of the Lord, and

turning to him with true repentance. It is this alone, and not something external, to which Malachi refers; and it was *this* which the Saviour himself, as well as John the Baptist and the Evangelist, discovered in the passage.

The meaning of the desert is obvious now. The people are in a state of distress, both mental and bodily; and the latter of the two is to be regarded as merely the reflection of the former. This condition is figuratively represented as a desert, and the figure itself is borrowed from the circumstance that, at a former period, the nation had been in precisely the same condition in a literal desert, not as a matter of accident, but by the appointment of God, who selected the outward dwelling-place as a true symbol of its real condition. The Lord is now about to bring deliverance, but in order that this may be effected, the people must first of all perform their part. The Lord *cannot* prepare a way through the desert till such a way has been prepared by the nation itself, and it is this that he sends his servants to exhort it to do.

The connection between vers. 3-5 and vers. 1, 2 is also obvious now. In vers. 1 and 2 it is announced to the nation that the Lord has resolved to have mercy upon it, and to bestow upon it the fulness of his salvation. This promise is accompanied with an exhortation to the nation to remove everything out of the way that can obstruct the course of the coming salvation. John says, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand;" the prophet, on the other hand, though with precisely the same meaning, says, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand, repent therefore." Every exhortation to repent necessarily presupposes the grace of God; and from every promise of salvation there follows an exhortation to repent. For there is no purely outward deliverance for the covenant nation. There is a perfectly analogous passage, for example, in Jer. 31:22. Apostate Israel is urged to return to her lawful husband, for he is now preparing an entirely new state of things, and is willing to receive her back, though he formerly put her away on account of her unfaithfulness.

Different opinions have been entertained as to the meaning of the closing words of ver. 5. In the Septuagint and the Gospel of Luke they are separated from the previous clause, and an object is supplied to אָרָא: καὶ ὄψεται πᾶσα σὰρξ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ. On the other hand, Gesenius and others explain it thus, "that the mouth of Jehovah hath spoken: namely, that it came from God, when the prophets predicted the deliverance from captivity." Vitringa and Stier understand the expression, "That the Lord *speaketh*," as intended to represent the coming of God in Christ as primarily "a speaking." The first is the correct view. "For the mouth of the Lord hath spoken" is a standing phrase with the prophet, who uses it to strengthen any previous announcement which appears incredible; "it will assuredly be fulfilled, for it does not originate with a weak and short-sighted man, but with the omniscient and omnipotent God (see chap. 1:20, 34:16, 58:14; and also 2 Pet. 1:21, "for prophecy came not at any time by the will of man"). "*Seeing*" is a term which he frequently employs in the sense in which the Septuagint has taken it here; sometimes with a definite object, as in chap. 52:10, from which the translators have borrowed the words which they supply, "and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our Lord," also in chap. 62:6, and 66:18; at other times without an object, which must be supplied from the context, as in chap. 52:14. But even if these analogous passages did not exist, the glory of the Lord must evidently be regarded as the object seen, from the fact that אָרָא is too obviously connected with נִגְלָה for any other explanation to be possible. The glory of the Lord is revealed, and all flesh beholds this glorious spectacle.

But what are we to understand by the revelation of the glory of the Lord? The expression is evidently founded upon Ex. 16:10, "And it came to pass, as Aaron spake unto the

whole congregation of the children of Israel, that they turned towards the desert, and behold the glory of the Lord appeared in the cloud." The glory of the Lord, his glorious essence, of which the fire was a symbolical manifestation, was usually concealed by the cloud, because Israel was not yet prepared for its full revelation, that is, for immediate contact with the divine. Even their leader Moses was not; for when he asked to see God without a veil, he was told that he could not bear the sight. But on this occasion, when it was of especial importance to convince the doubtful and murmuring nation that God was in the midst of it, it shone forth more vividly than usual through the cloud. And the prophet announces here that when the journey through the desert is repeated, and the people have prepared the way, this covering will entirely disappear. A new period is about to commence, when God will manifest himself in a far clearer and more glorious manner, and when the people will behold him far more distinctly, be much more closely connected with him, and possess him with all the fulness of his blessings in a far more literal sense than has ever been the case before.

It need hardly be remarked that the prophecy is essentially Messianic. The return from captivity was merely a prelude and preparation of the true fulfilment. The extent to which the glory of the Lord was revealed was exactly proportioned to the extent to which a way had been prepared. The complete revelation was made in Christ, but the *seeing* was limited to those who had prepared the way, for only the pure in heart can see God.

We now return to the prophecy of Malachi.

Chap. 2 ver. 17. "*Ye weary the Lord with your words, and ye say, Wherewith do we weary him? When ye say, Every one that doeth evil is good in the eyes of the Lord, and he delighteth in them; or where is the God of judgment?*"

In expounding these words, the one question to be determined is, who are the persons introduced as the speakers in this and the second section? The necessary data for answering this question are most of them contained in the introduction. (1.) There are many who, like Theodoret, suppose that the pious Israelites, having suffered severe afflictions and being vexed at the prosperous condition of their ungodly countrymen, had been tempted to utter these weak complaints, and to indulge these doubts with regard to the providence of God. This view originated in the indefinite terms which the prophet applies to those whose prosperity is the ground of complaint, whom he describes as ungodly, evil-doers, and proud; the easiest explanation of which is supposed to be that the prophet avoided the use of more definite terms from prudential considerations; since the Persians were rulers in the land, and spies were actively employed on every hand. But a whole series of arguments may be adduced to disprove this supposition. The superscription of the prophecy itself, *burden*, is sufficient to show that the people whom the prophet had in view throughout were not such as were *tempted*, and needed to be set right with tender consolation and gentle correction, but such as were thoroughly wicked in their hearts, notwithstanding all their outward show of godliness, and needed therefore to be terrified with threats. We have already shown that, in all his addresses, the prophet has precisely *the same* class of men in his mind. The persons, therefore, who are introduced here as murmuring and complaining must be the same as those who are reprov'd in chap. 1:6 sqq. for their contempt of God, in chap. 2:8 for their apostasy from him, and in ver. 10 sqq. for their breach of conjugal fidelity. But even if the indisputable connection which runs through the whole is not admitted, it cannot be denied, as we have already proved, that chap. 3:7-12 is closely connected with the section before us, and also with the last. But the persons alluded to in that passage cannot be the truly pious. Like

their fathers, they have forsaken the laws of the Lord (ver. 7), they have robbed the Lord of what rightfully belonged to him, with as much folly as recklessness (vers. 8 and 9); the land will become *a delightful land* through their conversion, and only through that, whereas now, through their sin, it is for the most part what the land of the Edomites who have sinned against God and his congregation is altogether, a symbol of wickedness (chap. 1:4). But even if we confine ourselves to the two sections, it will still be evident that the hypothesis cannot be sustained. The nature of the complaints themselves does not point to persons who are truly pious. They are essentially different both in tone and spirit from such complaints, for example, as we find in Ps. 37, 49, 73, to which there is an apparent resemblance. The strong expressions, “ye weary me” (chap. 2:17), and “ye overpower me” (chap. 3:13), lead to this conclusion. The haughtiness of fancied righteousness, whose imaginary claims remain unsatisfied, is very conspicuous. Moreover, the truly pious are expressly distinguished from the speakers, and contrasted with them (chap. 3:16). That the speakers themselves, and not those of whom they complain, are pointed out in the reply as objects of the divine judgments, is too apparent to be overlooked. For instance, those who are represented in chap. 3:2 as unable to endure the day of the coming of the messenger of the covenant, are the same as those who seek him according to ver. 1. Again, the words, “I draw near *to you* to judgment,” form an evident antithesis to the judgment on the *strangers*, for which the speakers had been longing. “That I am the God of righteousness will very soon be apparent, not, however, on those whom ye call evil-doers, but on you, who are the greatest evil-doers of all.” Lastly, this hypothesis presupposes a very different state of things from that which actually existed in the nation at the period referred to. The condition of the colony was altogether so wretched and poor, that we cannot imagine even the wicked to have enjoyed sufficient prosperity to tempt the pious to utter such bitter lamentations. Even apart from the fact that the use of אֵלֹהִים instead of יְהוָה leads to the conclusion that the heathen are alluded to, and that this is still more strongly indicated in the evident antithesis, already pointed out to the expression “all the heathen call you blessed” in ver. 12, how could the words “they prove God and are delivered,” in chap. 3:15, possibly apply to the ungodly in Israel?

(2.) The opinion entertained by those who imagine that the complaints are uttered by the whole nation, which is in trouble on account of its own misfortunes and the prosperity of the heathen, is much nearer the truth. This was the view entertained by Jerome, who was much more correct than his predecessors and the greater part of his followers, though he erred in this, that he failed to distinguish between weakness of faith and proud murmuring against God, and consequently compared the complaints alluded to here to those contained in Ps. 73. In his commentary on our passage, he says, “The people who had returned from Babylon, seeing all the nations round about, and the Babylonians themselves, who worshipped idols, abounding in wealth, strong in their bodies, and enjoying all the things which are counted good in the world, whilst they themselves, who possessed the knowledge of God, were sunk in squalor, poverty, and slavery, were offended and said, ‘There is no Providence overruling the affairs of men, but all depends upon the uncertainties of chance, instead of being regulated by the just judgment of God; or else evil things please him best, and he takes no pleasure in the good; for if all things are arranged by God, where is his just and impartial judgment?’ Minds mistrustful of the future were daily asking such questions as these.” But the objections already offered to the first explanation apply to some extent to this view also. For example, the contrast implied in chap. 3:16 sqq. cannot be explained on this hypothesis. It would have to be restricted, therefore, in its application to a portion of the nation, and by the murmurers we



should have to understand the great mass of the people, to the exclusion of the truly pious. This view undoubtedly approximates very closely to the previous one, if we suppose that the wicked mass of the people far exceeded in numbers the small band of the truly godly. And it is apparent from chap. 3:9, where the *whole* nation is charged by God with robbing him, that this was the case.

It still remains to set aside the erroneous view adopted by many expositors, who attribute Epicurean or Sadducean opinions to the persons attacked by the prophet. No doubt the opinions they really held were such as would eventually lead to these, if they were consistent. But it is evident that as yet they were only in the germ, from the fact that, with whatever unwillingness of heart it may have been done, the murmurers continued to attest their fear of the Lord by offering sacrifices, and that among other things they fasted, and longed for the coming of the angel of the covenant. All this shows that in the passage before us, and in chap. 3:13 sqq., they only manifested one side of their character, that there was still another element within them which counterbalanced this one and impeded its development. The expression “*ye weary*” shows the greatness of the crime. What must be the wickedness of words by which the long-suffering God, who has such patience with the *weakness* of his people, is, as it were, overpowered, and forced to display his judicial righteousness! On the words, “*wherein do we weary?*” Calvin observes, “The prophet shows that they have hardened themselves to such an extent in their pride that they boldly resist every admonition; for they do not ask this question as though it were a matter of doubt, nor can we gather from these words that they are ready to be taught. On the contrary, it is just as if they had come down armed for a conflict,—armed, I say, with shamelessness and obstinacy, for there can be no doubt that they despised and even denied the prophet’s appeal.”

Of the expression, “*Every one, that doeth evil, is good in the eyes of the Lord,*” the explanation is contained in the remarks already made. By those who do evil we are to understand the heathen. In accordance with the essential character of hypocrisy, the only sin which the murmurers are conscious of is in others, not in themselves, and the sin which appears to them peculiarly deserving of punishment is that by which they themselves are injured. Self-humiliation under the mighty hand of God (1 Pet. 5:6), which is difficult even to those who know the object of their sufferings, is altogether impossible from such a stand-point as this, especially when, as was the case here, the justice of the cause is still further strengthened by the delusion that the individual has actually claims upon God. Moreover, it is very obvious here that the persons to whom Malachi refers are different from the open blasphemers so frequently mentioned by the earlier prophets. See, for example, Isa. 5:19, “That say, let him make speed, and hasten his work that we may see, and let the counsel of the Holy One of Israel draw nigh and come that we may know it;” and Jer. 17:15, “Behold, they say unto me, where is the word of the Lord? let it come now.” The latter deny the existence of God, or at all events, his omnipotence, and therefore ridicule and scoff. The former fully acknowledge his omnipotence, and for that very reason think that they have ground for denying his righteousness. For if nothing outward could restrain him, and they had acted with perfect uprightness in relation to him, they might very well be perplexed as to this perfect righteousness. They murmur. The nature of their disappointed expectations we learn still more distinctly from the following verse, where they are described as longing for the angel of the covenant. They had hoped that as he formerly led their fathers out of Egypt and punished the Egyptians, he would also come immediately after their return from captivity to judge all the heathen and pour out his blessing upon Israel. *And he delighteth in them.* פָּנָה, a verbal adjective, as both וְהָיָה

and וְהִפְצִיחַ in chap. 3:1 plainly show. The expression appears to refer back to chap. 1:10. The Lord there says to them, "I have no pleasure in you." "It is true," they reply, "thou hast no pleasure in us, who are righteous, but thou hast pleasure in the evil-doers."

"Or where is the God of justice?" This is equivalent to, "or if this is not the case, if God has no pleasure in the ungodly, point out to me the facts in which the righteous God manifests himself." Are not the prosperity of the heathen and the misery of Israel directly opposed to any such manifestation? וְאִם, or, shows that one of these two things must necessarily be true; either that God takes pleasure in wickedness, or that his righteousness is capable of being demonstrated. But since the latter is not the case, the former must necessarily be so. The dilemma is perfectly correct. There is no other alternative. A righteous God, who does not display his righteousness in any way in this life, but merely gives letters of credit which are to be honoured in the life to come, is an absurdity; at any rate, he is not the God of the Scriptures, who will not be in the life to come anything which he has not already been in this present life. It is impossible to declare ourselves too decidedly in opposition to such a view as this, which can only result from the want of inward life, namely, that for us God will first begin to exist in the world to come. Retribution in the future is a delusion, if it does not rest upon retribution in the present. The error in the case of these murmurers consisted in the fact, that they confidently took for granted that the only possible reply to the question, "where is the God of justice?" was "nowhere." The answer was simple enough: "If he is not to be found elsewhere, he manifests himself in your present distress, which corresponds so completely to your moral condition; and if this is not sufficiently obvious to your minds, he will manifest himself in future in the midst of you in such a manner, that you will cease to inquire, "where is the God of justice?" Venema maintains that the article in הַמִּשְׁפָּט is a proof that allusion is made to some particular and well-known judgment, which God had promised to his people. But the article may very well be used generically, and this is confirmed by the earlier passage on which this rests, "The Lord is a God of judgment; blessed are all they that wait for him" (Isa. 30:18), in which the article is wanting.

Chap. 3:1,"Behold, I send my messenger, and he prepareth the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, will suddenly come to his temple, and the angel of the covenant, whom ye desire: behold, he cometh, saith Jehovah Sabaoth."

The allusion to the prophecy in Isaiah (chap. 40) is unmistakeable here. It is especially apparent in וַיִּפְצֹחַ דְּרֹכֵי לְפָנָי as compared with דְּרֹכֵי יְהוָה in Isaiah, the resemblance being carried out even to the omission of the article from דְּרֹכֵי, which may be explained on the supposition that דְּרֹכֵי was regarded, in a certain sense, as a single word (road-making). Our attention being attracted by this similarity in the expression, we soon discover that the same similarity runs through the *contents* of the entire verse. In Malachi, the messenger of the Lord prepares the way before him; in Isaiah, the servants of the Lord are called upon to prepare the way. The meaning is the same in both. For it is self-evident that it is a moral preparation for the coming of the Lord which is intended, and this is confirmed by the parallel passage in ver. 24. But, if this be the meaning, by what other method can the messenger of the Lord prepare the way than by calling upon those to whom he is sent to prepare the way themselves, in other words, by crying loudly and incessantly "repent," דְּרֹכֵי? In Isaiah, the preparation of the way is followed by the revelation of the glory of the Lord; in Malachi, by the coming of the Lord to his temple. This agreement cannot be explained by supposing an unintentional reminiscence on the part of the prophet, as we may clearly see from the analogous allusions to Joel in vers. 2

and 23. The following appears to us the correct explanation. The discontent of the Israelites after the captivity was occasioned by the predictions contained in the second part of the book of Isaiah more than by any other prophecies. It was here that salvation was depicted in its most glowing colours; and threats were kept in the background. The whole of it is chiefly adapted to afford consolation to the *believing* portion of the Israelites. In the time of trouble, therefore, it was principally upon these prophecies that the hopes of Israel rested. And when so little occurred to gratify their hopes after the return from captivity, it was chiefly upon these prophecies that the charges brought against the covenant-faithfulness and righteousness of God were founded. Now, the unfounded character of such charges as these could not be demonstrated in any better way, nor could the guilt be transferred from the accused to the accusers, to whom it properly belonged, in any surer manner than by proving that *they* were not the people to whom God had made such glorious promises by the mouth of his prophet. And the words of Isa. 40:3, 4 were peculiarly adapted to afford the evidence required. If the revelation of the glory of the Lord is preceded by the preparation of the way, the nation, in its present condition, is not ready for the kingdom of God; and therefore, instead of murmuring because the appearance of God is delayed, it ought rather to thank him for first of all affording the means of repentance; and that which the nation without exception regarded as an object of desire, ought to be anticipated by the greater part as an object of dread. The words of the prophet, therefore, are equivalent to this, “Ye, who complain in your considerate zeal that the Lord has not fulfilled his promises, should rather consider that, according to his own declarations, mercy on his part must be preceded by repentance on yours. For this he now furnishes the means, and will continue to furnish them. He will then suddenly appear and make himself known as the God of justice, not merely by the blessings which he will bestow upon the godly, but also by the punishments which he will inflict upon you, the *wicked* members of the covenant nation.

The next question that arises is, who is מַלְאָכִי (*my messenger*). The Jewish commentators are very vacillating (compare the collection of the expositions, which has been made by Frischmuth, *De Angela Foederis*, Jena 1660). Abenezra supposes the Messias Ben Joseph to be intended. Kimchi observes: “An angel from heaven is meant, just as he says in Ex. 23:20, ‘Behold I send an angel before thy face.’” Jarchi conjectures that the angel of death is referred to, who is to be sent to destroy the wicked. Abarbanel explains the word as referring to the prophet himself. The earlier Christian expositors were unanimously of opinion that the “messenger of the Lord” was John the Baptist. Among modern commentators, many, like Eichhorn, suppose either the whole body of prophets to be intended, or some one prophet, though it is uncertain which; Hitzig and Maurer, again, explain it as indicating the actual return of the prophet Elias.

We must first of all prove, in opposition to Kimchi and Jarchi, that it is not a heavenly but an earthly messenger who is referred to here. This is very evident—(1) from Isaiah. We have already seen that the voice which there exhorts to prepare the way proceeds from the covenant nation itself.—(2) From the parallel passage, chap. 4:5. The same person who is called in the one the messenger of the Lord is spoken of in the other as Elias the prophet; and the preparation of a way in ver. 5 corresponds to the restoration of the spirit of the fathers in chap. 4:6.—(3) From the evident antithesis between “my messenger,” and “messenger of the covenant.” If a heavenly messenger were intended, this could only be the “Angel of the Lord,” for he is called *my* angel, not *an* angel. But the person called “my messenger” must necessarily be a different individual from the angel of the Lord, who comes to his temple after him.—At the same time, we must not

shut our eyes to the fact that there is some truth at the foundation of Kimchi's explanation. The allusion to Ex. 23:20 is unmistakeable, and cannot be merely accidental, especially when we consider that it is a journey through the desert which is spoken of here as well as there, and the preparation of a way through the midst of the desert. It serves to direct attention to the essential unity of the two events, notwithstanding the difference in the persons employed. Both the mission of the heavenly and that of the earthly messenger are manifestations of the same covenant fidelity on the part of God, and of the same mercy to the chosen race, and therefore as God formerly sent his messenger to conduct the people through the literal desert, so now he will also send his messenger to prepare the way through the spiritual desert. The truth which lies at the foundation of both is this, God not only bestows the blessing itself, but also provides the means of obtaining possession. At the same time, the allusion to the analogous conduct on the part of God on the former occasion also serves to direct attention to the responsibility which would be consequent upon the abuse of his mercy on this occasion also. The declaration which immediately follows the announcement in Ex. 23:21, "Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not; for he will not pardon your transgression," was also applicable to the present circumstances, and this application is made in the next verse, and also in chap. 3:6. The mission of a divine messenger is never without effect, it is always attended by blessings or else by the severest punishment.

If we may regard it as established that the messenger of God referred to here is an earthly one, our next duty will be to examine the correctness of the most widely adopted opinion, viz. that John the Baptist is the messenger intended. But our inquiry will have respect simply to the form which this explanation usually assumes, namely, that "my messenger" is John, regarded as a historical personage, to the exclusion of every one else. The explanation remains essentially correct, even if we find reason to understand the expression as denoting an ideal person, in other words, the whole company of the messengers of God, who were to prepare the way for the coming of salvation, and make known the approach of the kingdom of grace. For, as the idea of a messenger was most perfectly concentrated in John, and God necessarily sent him because he had given this prophecy, and on the other hand, dictated the latter because he would necessarily send him, he is, and will ever be, in the strictest sense of the word, *the* subject of the prophecy. It is evident, however, on the following grounds, that the ordinary form in which the explanation is given is faulty, and that his coming was merely the culminating point of its fulfilment, not the perfect fulfilment in itself, in other words, *that the prophecy embraces all the means by which God sought to lead his people to repentance, from the time of the prophet onwards*,—(1) This is favoured by the passage in Isaiah, upon which we have commented already, and in which, as we have seen, "the voice crying in the desert" belongs to the whole company of the servants of God. Verse 1, where they are addressed in the plural, shows this very conclusively. (2) By assuming the name Malachi on the ground of this passage, the prophet intimated that he regarded his own labours as resulting from the thought to which he has given utterance here; although he was certainly very far from cherishing the notion that it was fully realized in himself alone, as we may clearly see from ver. 23. How could he ever have imagined that Elijah, the greatest of all the prophets, had come to life again in him as an individual? (3) We have no right to separate the judgment with which the covenant nation is threatened in this prophecy from the rest of the threats which run through the whole book. But the commencement of the execution of the latter was evidently to take place in the immediate future, or rather might be witnessed already. This is obvious, for example, from chap. 2:1, 2. "And now, O ye priests, this commandment is for you, saith the Lord. If ye will not

hear, and if ye will not lay it to heart, to give glory unto my name, saith the Lord of hosts, I will even send a curse upon you, and curse your blessings, and curse them a second time, for ye do not lay it to heart.” (Observe particularly the expression, “if ye do not hear,” even in this case the coming of the Lord is preceded by the preparation of a way by his messenger.) It is also apparent from chap. 3:9, “Ye *are* cursed with a curse, and yet ye rob me, even the whole nation;” from ver. 10, where the windows of heaven are represented as already closed, the blessing as already restrained; and from ver. 11, where “the devourer” is described as destroying the fruits of the ground. Now if, according to the view expressed elsewhere by the prophet, the coming of the Lord to judge, and therefore also to bless, commenced in his own day and continues through every age, we certainly must not assert, without assigning definite reasons for the assertion, that he had in his mind merely the last and most complete fulfilment, to the exclusion of all the rest, without which the last would have no reality at all. But if it is only so far as its perfect fulfilment is concerned that the predicted coming of God belongs to the Messianic age, the same must be the case with the mission of the messenger, which also precedes the advent. (4) We must not overlook the connection between these words and chap. 2:7, 8, “For the priest’s lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth; *for he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts.* But ye are departed out of the way; ye have caused many to stumble at the law, ye have corrupted the Levitical covenant.” As the order of priests, the ordinary messenger of God, has failed to discharge its duties, the Lord sends his extraordinary messenger, who does what they ought to have done, leading many away from iniquity (compare chap. 2:6 with the verse before us and ver. 24). The heavenly messenger then appears to bless or punish, according to the relation to the covenant, and the reception given to the call to repentance on the part of the earthly messenger. Now, if the order of priests regarded as the messenger of God is referred to as an ideal person, we might expect this also to apply to the extraordinary messenger of God, who is to fulfil the duties which they have failed to discharge. *The* prophet is opposed to *the* priest; compare chap. 4:5. With this explanation the prophecy before us embodies the same idea as that of Joel, respecting the mission of the teacher of righteousness. In the Messianic era, its fulfilment is to be found not merely in the appearance of John, but also in the early portion of the ministry even of Christ and his apostles, inasmuch as this was a continuation and completion of that of John, and was intended to announce that the kingdom of heaven was *at hand*, and to prepare the way for its coming. But John is justly to be regarded as the precise object to which the prophecy points, since the idea was not merely relatively but absolutely realized in him. He was the forerunner of the Lord, and that alone. Whatever of Christ’s ministry therefore partakes of the same character may be reckoned as a part of his, whilst the special work of Christ belonged to the second promise, of the Lord coming to his temple and of the covenant angel.<sup>72</sup>—It is only in the Piel that has the meaning “to sweep,” “to prepare.” פָּנּוּ דָרְךָ is an expression peculiar to Isaiah. We find it not only in chap. 40:3, but also in chap. 57:14 and 62:10.

That by יהוה (the Lord) we are to understand *God*, cannot for a moment be doubted. The proofs of this are the following: The constant use of יהוה with the article in this sense; the fact that it is preceded by לפני, *before me* (the person who comes here must be the one who sends his messenger before him); the evident allusion to the question, “where is the God of justice;” and, lastly, the expression *his* temple, with reference to the temple of Jehovah. On doctrinal grounds, namely, to set aside the argument in support of the divinity of Christ, which the earlier expositors founded upon the fact that the temple is spoken of here as belonging to the Lord, who is identified with the messenger of the

covenant, Faustus Socinus explained מַלְאָכִי as meaning the royal palace. It is not difficult to show that this is inadmissible. Ver. 3 furnishes sufficient proof to the contrary. The מַלְאָכִי is spoken of there as the place for priests and sacrifices. At the same time, there is some truth at the foundation of this erroneous interpretation, and that is our reason for mentioning it. There can be no doubt that in this passage God is introduced as a king, and the temple as his palace. The king has long since taken his journey (ἄπεδήμησεν, Matt. 21:33, compare chap. 25:14; or, dropping the figure, his presence among his people has not been clearly manifested in blessings and punishments. He is now about to return and inquire into the conduct of all his servants and subjects during his absence, that he may reward and punish accordingly.

There can be no doubt as to the person intended by “*the messenger of the covenant*,” who is called on other occasions “*the angel of the Lord*.” That we are not to identify the messenger of the covenant with the messenger sent by the Lord before himself and with Elias, as Hitzig, Maurer, and others have done, is evident from the order in which the different events are narrated here; first, the messenger of the covenant comes; and then the Lord himself and the messenger of the covenant suddenly appear; compare the term “before” in chap. 4:5, and also the expression, “whom ye delight in,” which is parallel to “whom ye seek.” *They* both point back to the words, “where is the God of justice?” in chap. 2:17, in which this delight and desire are expressed. But even apart from this particular allusion, the wish for a preacher of repentance to come proceeds from a state of mind the very opposite of that which distinguishes these “just persons who need no repentance.” Again, there would be something very unsuitable in connecting God with his earthly servant in such a way as this. The singular מַלְאָכִי also indicates the essential unity of the Lord and the messenger of the covenant. And our conclusion is still further confirmed by the parallel passages in Isaiah, where the voice is first heard, and then the glory of the Lord appears. These reasons are also to some extent decisive against the view expressed by Hofmann (*Weissagung*. i. p. 359, *Schriftbeweis*) i. p. 162), that the angel of the covenant is “An antitype of Moses, a mediator between God and the nation, through whom God is about to enter into a new, more perfect and eternal fellowship with Israel.” The very fact that Hofmann is the first to entertain this opinion creates a difficulty. The Holy Spirit would have expressed himself very obscurely if this were the meaning. But it is a sufficient reply that, according to ver. 17, the *wish* of the nation (the angel of the covenant, whom ye *desire*) was not for the coming of a second Moses, but for the coming of God; not for the appearance of a reformer, but for the appearance of a judge; and in vers. 2-5 of this chapter it is not of reformation but of judgment that the prophet speaks. A mediator *by the side* of the Lord, a mere counterpart of Moses, would not be distinguishable from “my messenger,” from whom Hofmann would keep him distinct, though his mission is precisely the same. It is more difficult to explain the name which is given here to the angel of the Lord. Bauer and others who adopt the rendering “the promised messenger,” in direct opposition to the rules of the language, have been sufficiently refuted by Jahn. The “messenger of the covenant” is supposed by Jahn himself to mean “the messenger with whom the covenant was concluded.” In his idea the covenant referred to is the Sinaitic. The early commentators, on the other hand, are unanimously of opinion that the new covenant is intended (Jer. 31:31), the “messenger of the covenant” being equivalent to the “mediator of the new covenant” in Heb. 9:15. The following is probably the correct explanation. We have already pointed out at p. 168 the reason why the prophet does not speak of the coming of the Lord only, but also of the divine *messenger*, who is essentially one with him. It is to be found, namely, in the previous mention of the earthly messengers of God, both ordinary and extraordinary. The

divine messenger is called the messenger of the *covenant*, because he is sent in the cause of the covenant, and his coming to bless, as well as to punish, is the result of the covenant. The two earthly messengers might have been called the same. But the prophet had a special reason for applying this term to the heavenly messenger, in the fact that his coming had been desired by the murmurers on the ground of the covenant.<sup>73</sup> “The covenant” does not denote one single act, but the covenant relation of God to Israel, which extends through every age. The violation of this covenant on the part of the people, and especially on that of the priests, was the principal theme of the previous addresses (chap. 2:10, 11); and the violation of the covenant on the part of God was the principal burden of the complaints of the people. The coming of the covenant angel will prove these charges to be groundless, and demonstrate the reality of the covenant by the punishment of those who despise it.

The question still remains, is *punishment* to be regarded as the sole object of the predicted appearance of the covenant angel, as Jahn and others suppose? Certainly not. If it were, why should the messenger of the Lord be sent before him? And with what right could the divine messenger be called the messenger of the covenant, if he would merely do justice to one particular aspect of that covenant? Mere punishment is inconceivable, so far as the covenant nation is concerned. Blessing must always accompany it, or rather the punishment itself, when looked at from another point of view, is really a blessing, inasmuch as it removes the ungodly out of the way, and thus gives free course to the manifestation of the divine mercy towards his purified nation. The fact that the messenger of the covenant also comes to bless is very obvious from vers. 4 and 6. It is so again in vers. 17, 18, and chap. 4:1, where the mercy and righteousness of God are represented as equally manifested on the occasion of his coming. The only thing which has made it appear as though the sole object of his advent would be to punish is the fact that, so far as the men were concerned, with whom the prophet had immediately to do, punishment would necessarily be the result.

Let us now briefly glance, in conclusion, at the whole result. To the people’s complaint, that the idea of a just God is at variance with what they see, the prophet replies, God will soon put an end to this apparent contradiction. Though he now appears to be absent, he will soon come in the person of his heavenly messenger, and, before that, will make known his covenant-faithfulness by sending earthly messengers. That this announcement received its ultimate fulfilment in the coming of Christ, in whom the angel of the Lord, the *Logos*, was made flesh, we need hardly stop to observe. It is also self-evident that this ultimate fulfilment is neither to be looked for in his state of humiliation, nor his state of exaltation alone, but that the two are rather to be regarded as constituting together an inseparable whole. The advent of Christ in humiliation contains the germ of all the blessings which he bestows, and all the punishment which he inflicts, in his subsequent exaltation.—We have but one other remark to make, namely, that the emphatic repetition, “Behold he cometh, saith the Lord of hosts,” is evidently intended to meet the doubts expressed as to his coming, and the open denial of the same, which are implied in chap. 2:17.

Ver. 2. “*And who endureth the day of his coming, and who shall stand when he appeareth? For he is like the refiner’s fire, and like the lye of the washers.*”

The answer to the question, who? is not “very few,” but “no one,” as in Isa. 53:1. The prophet is addressing the ungodly. Appealing to their consciences, he endeavours to convince them of the fearful contradiction between their moral character and their longing

for the coming of the Lord, which must be particularly disastrous to them. We find a parallel passage in Amos 5:18, except that the persons alluded to there are *openly* ungodly, and are merely scoffing when they express a wish for the day of the Lord to come, “Woe to those who desire the day of the Lord! To what end is the day of the Lord for you? it is darkness, and not light! The resemblance between the expression, “who endureth the day of his coming,” and Joel 2:11, “The day of the Lord is great and very terrible, and who can endure it?” (וַיִּמְי יְיָ לְיָנֹכַח) cannot be regarded as accidental, especially when we consider the fact that there is a similar verbal allusion to Joel in ver. 23. The prophet adopts the same course as in ver. 1, and takes his stand upon the authority of an honoured predecessor, who wrote centuries before, and announced the day of the Lord as a disastrous event for the covenant nation itself; whereas these hypocrites looked upon the heathen as the sole objects of the judicial righteousness of God. The term, “*stand*” is used as a contrast to the falling of the guilty, when overpowered by fear and dread in anticipation of coming events. This passage is hinted at in Eph. 6:13, “That ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand;” in Luke 21:36, “Watch, therefore, and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of man” (in ver. 34 we find the words, “And so that day come upon you unawares,” with evident allusion to the expression, “shall suddenly come,” in ver. 1 of this chapter); and, lastly, in Rev. 6:17, “The great day of his wrath is come, and who shall be able to stand?” These passages bear the same relation to Malachi as the words of Malachi to Joel. They are not merely the result of an unintentional reminiscence, but resemble a quotation, and show the esteem in which our prophecy was held by the Lord and his apostles.

In the second half of the verse, Gesenius (*Thesaurus*, s.v. בִּרְיִית) would change the double figure,—the fire by which metals are refined, and the lye by which clothes are made clean,—into a single one, on the ground that potash is employed in the refining of metals. J. D. Michaelis had previously expressed the same opinion. But the word מְקַבְּצִים is a sufficient proof that there is no allusion to any such custom here. Moreover, what ground could we possibly have for getting rid of the second figure, seeing that it frequently occurs in other passages (e.g. Isa. 4:4)? The two figures of the fire and the lye are employed with a twofold meaning. Viewed in relation to the dross and the dirt, they burn up and extirpate; but viewed in relation to the metal and the clothes, they cleanse and refine. The former of the two is the more prominent here, as the י shows,<sup>74</sup> on account of its being the more applicable to the persons addressed.<sup>75</sup> But it is evident from the following verse, where the refining process is introduced as a promise not as a threat, that the prophet had the other also in his mind (compare Isa. 1:25).

Ver. 3. “*And he sitteth melting and purifying silver: and he purifieth the children of Levi, and refineth them as gold and as silver, and they become the Lord’s offering meat-offerings in righteousness.*”

The figure employed in the previous verse is still retained, but somewhat altered. There the Lord is represented as the fire; here, as the refiner. The covenant nation has this advantage over the heathen, that with all the admixture of dross it always retains a basis of pure metal, and therefore *can* be subjected to the refining process, and also that, on account of the covenant, the Lord *must* refine it. Such passages as Ezek. 22:18, “Israel is all become dross,” are to be regarded as rhetorical, since it is there that the figure of the smelter is most elaborately carried out. That which is true of the covenant nation as a *whole*, namely, that a number of those who are outwardly members of the nation have



become *mere* dross, also applies to the individual believer.—יָשַׁב may either be understood as denoting constancy,<sup>76</sup> or as merely contributing to the pictorial character of the whole description, like עָמַד in Mic. 5:4, “he shall *stand* and feed.” The circumstance, that the children of Levi are specially mentioned as undergoing this refinement, may be explained from the fact, which has already been demonstrated, that, throughout the entire prophecy, the attention of the prophet is chiefly fixed upon them, as being at that time in every respect the centre of the life of the nation. He had already described them as causing many to stumble at the law (chap. 2:8), and therefore as the chief authors of the prevalent corruption; and they had certainly been the leaders of the murmurers, to whose words, as quoted in chap. 2:17, the prophet is here replying (compare chap. 1:13). According to the accents, לַיהוָה יְהוָה must not be connected with the clause which follows, but must be rendered, “they are *to* the Lord,” or the Lord’s, they belong truly to him again, whom they so shamefully left, and who cast them off (chap. 1:10, 2:8). The explanation given by Jahn, “And the Lord has such as offer meat-offerings in righteousness, not the priests but persons generally,” has originated exclusively in the endeavour to do away with the allusion to the priests. But even if we look merely at the period of fulfilment, such passages as Acts 6:7 (“and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith”) show that there is nothing to justify such an attempt, whilst it is also at variance with the fact that the work of the Lord, so far as the children of Levi are concerned, is represented in the earlier part of the prophecy (that is, if we look at the drift of *the whole*) as refining and not destructive. In consequence of this they now come forth from the furnace like (refined) silver and gold; or, dropping the figure, “They are the Lord’s offering meat-offerings in righteousness.” The last clause points back to chap. 1:7, “Ye offer polluted bread upon mine altar.” In ver. 11, the prophet had already opposed to the polluted bread offered by the priests of his day the *pure* meat-offering which the heathen would one day present; he now places in contrast with the former the righteous meat-offerings of the purified priesthood.—בְּיָדָם is interpreted by many as denoting the outward faultlessness of the sacrifices. But צִדְקָה is never used to denote mere legality, a merely outward conformity to the commandment of God. It is true, the prophet had previously reproached them for the outward defects connected with their offerings, but simply because the outward reflected the inward, and was a proof of the utter want of fear and love. The little importance attached by the prophets to outward service, considered in itself, may be inferred from such passages as Jer. 6:20, “To what purpose cometh there to me incense from Sheba, and the spice-cane, the good, from distant lands? your burnt-offerings are not acceptable, and your sacrifices are not pleasant unto me.” It is evident, therefore, that the prophet was far from thinking of the outward legality of the offerings alone, and expected something entirely different when this glorious appearance of the Lord should take place. The contrast between the present and the צִדְקָה of the future is fully described in ver. 5, where the particular forms of unrighteousness are mentioned. There is a parallel passage in Ps. 4:5, “Offer the sacrifices of righteousness and put your trust in the Lord” (see the commentary on this passage).—With the exception of several of the Catholic theologians, who make use of this passage, as well as chap. 1:11, as proofs of the necessity for the sacrifice of the mass,—an exposition in connection with which “the sons of Levi” cause no little perplexity,—the earlier commentators for the most part understand by the meat-offering the spiritual sacrifices of the New Testament, spoken of in 1 Pet. 2:5 (“to offer spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ”), Rom. 12:1, and Heb. 13:15, 16. But it is more correct to say that the prophet, by representing the essence, which never changes, under the Old Testament form, leaves it undecided whether the essential element, viz. diligence in good works and not being unfruitful, would always be manifested in this form or not. It formed no part of his purpose to settle

this point; and the question must be answered from other passages. There is the more ground for this explanation when we consider that it is only in its ultimate meaning that the prophecy is Messianic, and that it was provisionally fulfilled even under the Old Testament, when the form was indispensable. Moreover, it is evident from chap. 1:11, that the prophet did not attribute the same eternal character to the form as to the substance. The announcement made there, that in all places of the earth a pure meat-offering will be presented to the Lord, involves a total overthrow of the form, the abrogation of the stringent laws respecting unity of worship, and the cessation of the Levitical ceremonial altogether. A great change is also implied in chap. 4:6. If the land is smitten with the curse, the temple must also be profaned and destroyed, and the offering of sacrifice be rendered, in consequence, absolutely impossible.

Ver. 4. *“And the meat-offering of Judah and Jerusalem is pleasant to the Lord, as in the days of old, and as in the years of the past.”*

We have here the very opposite of chap. 1:10, 13, and 2:13 (compare Isa. 1:11). According to ver. 3, the efficient cause of the great alteration, and therefore the point of comparison between these sacrifices and the previous ones, is righteousness. This is also apparent from chap. 2:6, where it is stated, with reference to the priestly order in the earlier and better times, that “The law of truth was in his mouth, and iniquity was not found upon his lips; he walked with me in peace and equity, and did turn many away from iniquity.” If the priestly order returns to this its former condition, and the nation with it, after the ungodly have been cut off by the judgments of the Lord, then the former mercy of the Lord will also return. *The former* mercy of the Lord. It is not without a reason that the prophet lays stress upon this. The future will not bring anything absolutely new to the covenant nation. The change is merely an ἀποκατάστασις (Acts 3:21); and the guarantee of the reality of the promise is to be found in that which has existed already. If the former state of things resulted from the nature of God, whenever in the future the same circumstances should return again, his nature would necessarily be manifested in the same way (compare Isa. 1:26 and Lam. 5:21). The thoughts of the prophet were directed more particularly to the time of David, *possibly* also to that of the patriarchs, and the earlier years of the sojourn in the desert (Jer. 2:2). The complete fulfilment of the prophecy contained in this verse is still future, and belongs to the period referred to in Rom. 11. The judgment predicted in the previous verses is still to be witnessed in all its fulness. The *fruit* of the judgment, repentance and mercy, must still to some extent be patiently waited for; at the same time, a striking commencement has been made, and the fulfilment is still going on under our own eyes.

Ver. 5. *“And I come near to you to judgment; and am a swift witness against the sorcerers, and against the adulterers, and against those who swear to a lie, and against those that oppress the hireling in his wages, the widow, and the fatherless, and that turn aside the stranger, and fear not me, saith the Lord of hosts.”*

The means in God’s hand for bringing in this better time are the infliction of judgment upon those who are longing for judgment, in the vain delusion that it has no connection with them, and who murmur at its delay. “The meaning of the prophet is by no means ambiguous. His design is to point out to them the perversity of their complaints with reference to God, seeing that they themselves are apostate, addicted to impure lusts, cruel, avaricious, and faithless, and therefore have deserved to perish a hundred times” (Calvin). That the prophet is not speaking of a judgment which was simply future, but of one which had already commenced, and which would still continue to increase, keeping pace with

the increase of sin until it reached its culminating point, is so very obvious that many of those who are of opinion that vers. 1-4 must necessarily be understood as relating to something absolutely future; for example, Abarbanel and Venema are unable to discover any other escape from the difficulties in which this involves them than by forcibly disconnecting this verse from the others, and explaining it as relating to a totally different judgment from that mentioned in vers. 2 and 3, notwithstanding the fact that the prophet speaks throughout of only *one* judgment, both present and future. That the coming to judgment had already commenced is especially evident from the following section, which is closely connected with the one before us, and where the expression occurs, “ye *are* cursed with the curse” (ver. 9); compare also ver. 11, where the devourer is spoken of as existing already. To this we may add the term מְמַהֵר, speedily, in which there is evidently a contrast intended to the tardiness and delay with which the murmurers had been charging God.

The words are addressed to all the murmurers, to the whole body of the ungodly, as we may perceive from the evident allusion to chap. 2:17. In their *own* fate, God will so clearly prove himself to be the God of justice that the complaint “he delighteth in the wicked,” and the inquiry, “where is the God of justice?” will never be heard again. The *witness* of God against the sorcerers, etc., is not limited to words. The punishment that awaits them will bear witness to their guilt, which they have so carefully concealed that they have even gone so far in their presumption as to invoke the judgment of God. The particular crimes alluded to which are traced in conclusion to one fundamental sin in the words “they fear not me,” are all such as were severely punished under the Mosaic law; and the prophet intentionally employs the words of the law in nearly every instance. According to the law, *witchcraft* was a capital crime (Ex. 22:17 and Deut. 18:14). The extent to which the Jews were impregnated with it after the captivity is apparent from such passages as Acts 8:9, 13:6, and also from Josephus, *Antiquities*, 20. 6, and *Wars of the Jews*, 2.12. 23). In chap. 2:10-16, the prophet had already characterized as *adultery* the marriages which had been contracted with heathen wives, and the consequent wrong done to the women of the covenant nation, and also the frivolous pretences on which wives were divorced. When these, the more refined species of adultery, are common, the grosser kinds are never rare. In the words, “*and those who swear to a lie*,” there is an allusion to Lev. 19:12, “And ye shall not swear in my name (לִשְׁקֵר) to a lie,” that is, so that your oath bears the character of a lie, in other words, is false. In the expression, “and those that oppress,” etc., there is a reference to Deut. 24:14. The only other passage in which the verb is followed by the accusative of the thing, as in this instance, is Mic. 2:2; in every other case we find the accusative of the person. A rendering is therefore required which, though it be applied poetically to the thing, refers, strictly speaking, to the person. In the passage before us, the latter is mentioned afterwards; in Micah, it is written first. “*And turn the stranger*;” the allusion here is to Deut. 27:19 and 24:17. We must not assume, on this account, as many commentators have done, that מְשַׁפֵּט, which occurs in these passages, is also to be supplied here. הִטָּה may be applied to the person as appropriately as to the right; compare Amos 5:12 (“they turn the poor *in their right*”), and Prov. 18:5. The law breathes the tenderest affection towards “the stranger,” that is, towards the foreigners who lived in the midst of the Israelites; and the term is employed in the widest sense, not merely to denote those who had been incorporated by circumcision into the covenant nation itself, but those also, who were not so closely connected with the nation (for the former, see Ex. 12:19; and for the latter, Deut. 14:21). In this we have the strongest proof that the charge brought against the religion of the Old Testament, of *odium humani generis*, is unfounded, and that the special love towards their

fellow-countrymen, which is there enjoined upon the Jews, is not intended to exclude, but rather to prepare the way for the love of all mankind. Thus, in Ex. 23:9, it is said, “And thou shalt not oppress the stranger, for ye know the feelings of the stranger; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt.” The words, “and fear not me,” ought properly to stand at the head, as showing the source of all the other sins. But the prophet places it last, because he has to do with hypocrites, to whom it is necessary to show the corrupt state of the tree from the corrupt character of the fruit.

Ver. 6. “*For I am Jehovah, I change not; and ye children of Jacob, ye are not consumed.*”

וַי must be regarded here as a *causative participle*. The attempts which have been made to fix some other meaning upon the words are to be accounted for on the ground that the commentators have failed to observe how every judgment upon the people of God, and, according to Rom. 11, even the last and severest, the effects of which continue still, is also an act of mercy. There is the less reason to be astonished at the prominence given to this aspect here, from the fact that it has already been mentioned in vers. 3 and 4. That emphasis is laid upon the meaning of the name, in the words, “I am Jehovah,” is evident from the next clause, “I change not.” The name Jehovah (properly *Jahveh*, the future of the verb יהיה, the earlier form of היה, “he is,” or “the existing one”) represents God as pure existence, in contradistinction to every created object, the existence of which is always comparatively a non-existence. *Pure* existence leads to immutability of essence. Because God is, he is also that which he is, invariably the same (compare Ex. 3:14, and *dissertation on the Pentateuch*, vol. i. p. 231 sqq.). And from the immutability of his nature there follows of necessity the immutability of his will, which is based upon his nature. If then God has concluded a covenant with Israel, if he has sealed its election, he must cease to be Jehovah and therefore to be truly God if he suffer Israel to perish; and just because he is and remains Jehovah, the existing one, the unchangeable, he is now executing judgment that he may preserve the covenant nation from destruction.—Again the words אֲנִי יְהוָה אֵל אֱלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב are also explanatory of the expression, “sons of Jacob,” as אֱלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב of the name of Jehovah; and, therefore, the meaning would be just the same, if nothing more had been said than, “for I am Jehovah and ye are the sons of Jacob.” “Sons of Jacob,” is an emphatic expression for “the covenant nation” (compare Ps. 24:6). Such individuals as are sons of Jacob in nothing but appearance and the name, the faithless children (Deut. 32:20), the souls which are cut off their nation for having made the covenant of none effect, not only *can*, but *must* be destroyed by the judgments of God; but the whole nation can never be destroyed. For parallel passages relating to the immutability of Jehovah in general, see Num. 23:19, “God is not a man that he should lie; neither the son of man that he should repent; hath he said and shall he not do? or hath he spoken, and shall he not execute?”—1 Sam. 15:29, “Also the Eternity of Israel lieth not, nor repenteth; for he is not a man, that he should repent;” and James 1:17, “With whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.”—Parallel passages relating to the indestructible character of Israel, as founded upon the immutability of Jehovah, we find in Jer. 30:11, “For I am with thee, saith the Lord, to save thee; for I will make a full end of all the heathen, among whom I have scattered thee, but I will not make a full end of thee;”<sup>77</sup> Lam. 3:22, 23; and also Rom. 11:29, where it is stated with reference to Israel, “The gifts and calling of God are without repentance.”

### THE SECTION-CHAP. 3:13-4:6

Ver. 13. “*Ye force me with your words, saith the Lord, and ye say; What do we say, then, against thee?*”

הִזְק with עַל; to be strong over a person, always in the sense of forcing, overpowering (compare, especially, Ex. 12:33; Ezek. 3:14; 2 Sam. 24:4; and 2 Chron. 27:5). The rendering to be heavy, hard, troublesome, which the commentators have generally adopted here, is not confirmed by the usages of the language. The use of the word הִזְק in chap. 2:17, which precisely corresponds, is sufficient to lead us to prefer the rendering “to force.” In relation to his people, God is merciful, gracious, long-suffering (Ex. 34:6). He restrains his wrath (Isa. 48:9); but they carry their wickedness to such an extent that at length they exhaust his patience.—נִדְבָקֵר is expressed in Ezek. 33:30 by “they speak one to another, every one to his brother.” That we are to think of *conversations* is obvious, not merely from the form of the word, which cannot mean directly “to say,” but also from the words cited in the present verse, in vers. 14, 15 of this chapter, and also in chap. 2:17. They do not speak *to* God, but they speak to one another *about* God. This is also apparent from the corresponding words of the godly, which are in the form of a conversation, as the expression “one to another” clearly shows. The reciprocal meaning of the Niphal is as easily explained as the reflective. In both cases the action alone is expressed. The persons engaged must be supplied from the context.

Ver. 14. “*Ye say: It is vain to serve God; and what profit is it that we keep his keeping, and go about dirty before the Lord of hosts.*”

The words מִשְׁמֶרֶת followed by a genitive—a construction which occurs with extraordinary frequency in the Pentateuch, and has also been borrowed from it by the later writers (see Ezra and Chronicles), who have used it very often, but which is very rarely met with in any book belonging to the intermediate period—has been variously misinterpreted. The difficulty of deciding upon the correct interpretation, may be seen in the fact that one rendering is adopted in one passage, and a different one in another, although in the case of so very singular a phrase nothing but the most cogent reasons can justify the conclusion that the expression is employed in different senses. Gesenius, De Wette, and Rodiger explain the word מִשְׁמֶרֶת as signifying in most passages *law, command, custom*, and understand the whole phrase as meaning “to observe what ought to be observed towards any one.” But Josh. 22:3 is quite sufficient to show the incorrectness of this (“and ye shall keep the keeping of the *commandment* of the Lord your God”). Compare also 1 Chron. 12:29; Num. 3:6; Ezek. 40:45; Lev. 1:53, 18:3-5. The true explanation is undoubtedly the following. מִשְׁמֶרֶת means *observance, notice, care*. See, for example, Num. 18:8, “Behold I give thee the observing of my heave-offerings.” “*To observe the observance*” of a person or thing, is to attend to the one or the other. This meaning may be applied in every instance. A few examples, taken from the different classes, will suffice to show this. In Gen. 26:5, we read “Because that Abraham hearkened to my voice and attended to me, to my commandments, to my ordinances, and to my laws” (compare Lev. 8:35, 18:30, 22:9; Num. 9:19, 23; 2 Chron. 23:6, “Let all the people attend to the Lord,” and from fear of him abstain from forcing their way into the holy places); and 1 Kings 2:3. In 1 Chron. 12:29; “and hitherto the greater part of them had attended to the house of Saul” (compare κατανοεῖν Heb. 3:1). In Num. 3:6-8, “Bring the tribe of Levi near, and present them before Aaron the priest, that they may minister unto him, and they shall attend to him and to the whole congregation before the tent of

assembly, that they may do the service of the tabernacle, and they shall *attend to* all the furniture of the tent of assembly, and attend to the children of Israel.” In Ezek. 44:8, “And ye have not attended to my holy things, but ye appointed persons to attend to my holy things.” See also vers. 14, 15, chap. 40:45, 46; 1 Chron. 23:32; Lev. 1:53, 18:4, 5; Num. 18:3-5.

קָדְרָנִים, *dirty*, refers to the outward appearance while fasting. It relates not merely to the clothing, but also to the face (compare the commentary on Ps. 35:14). The expression employed in the *Pentateuch* to denote fasting is עָנָה נְפִשׁוֹ, to chastise the soul; צוּם with its derivatives is never found in the *Pentateuch*. By self-humiliation and self-inflicted sufferings, a practical confession was made of the consciousness of sin and the desert of every kind of punishment. In this instance, reference is especially made to voluntary fastings, whether on the part of the whole nation or of individuals, in which the notion of merit was uppermost. Allusion is made to voluntary suffering even in the Mosaic law (Num. 30:14), in which the only fast expressly commanded is the one associated with the day of atonement (Lev. 16:29-31), though voluntary fasting is also indirectly enjoined. For since it requires penitence for every sin, and fasting was at that time so universally the form in which penitence was embodied, that it was scarcely possible to think of the thing signified without the sign, the latter was virtually included in the law which enjoined the former.—מִשְׁנֵי cannot be used as a simple equivalent for לִפְנֵי. Fasting is represented as *proceeding* from the face of the Lord, because it is undertaken for his sake, and for that very reason the people regard it as unjust that they reap no benefit from it.—So far as the meaning of the whole verse is concerned, we must not look for the indication of a wicked disposition in the words, “what *profit* have we?” The demand for that species of resignation, which is superior to all the alternations of joy and sorrow, may do very well for modern philosophers, to whom God is absolutely restricted to the world to come, but is not in accordance with the Scriptures, which merely teach us to expect the manifestation of the omnipotence, the justice, and the love of God in the future, because they are already manifested here. “Godliness,” says the apostle in 1 Tim. 4:8, “is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come.” And where this promise is apparently not fulfilled, where the state of things which meets the eye appears at variance with it, we frequently hear sounds of complaint even from true believers, which outwardly resemble the expression cited here, though they do not partake of the same sinful character. Compare, for example, Ps. 73:13, “Verily I have cleansed my heart in vain, and washed my hands in innocency.” The sinfulness of the whole appears to have consisted in the delusion, that the merely *outward* service, which was bad enough in itself, judging from the prophet’s previous reproaches, was true worship, and that their fasting was true fasting, though it was nothing but an *empty* form, a body without a soul. “They fancy that their life is conformed to all the precepts, and yet they have not observed a thousandth part. . . . This is no common thing in connection with the worship of God, to lay aside all pride and give up all vain confidence, and walk humbly before him. *But hypocrites copy, like monkeys, the things which God requires and approves.* The change of heart, however, is entirely overlooked” (Calvin).

That we are correct in the observations we have made, is evident from a comparison of Isa. 58, which the prophet certainly had in his mind, as we may gather from the allusions apparent in other passages also. If this fact be once admitted, the opinion that the prophet was writing of those who were truly godly—an opinion which there are many other reasons for rejecting—is at once overthrown. The reproaches of Isaiah are generally directed against the one leading form of apostasy which prevailed in his day, namely,

idolatry; but in this instance he attacks the other form, which was afterwards formally organized in Pharisaism, and in this shape gained entirely the upper hand. Even their fasting was the outward work on which the greatest reliance was placed, and by which the consciousness of the emptiness within was most completely extinguished. This was perfectly natural; for of all outward works fasting was the most painful, and therefore assuming the absence of any confession of sin, and the want of any correct idea of the holiness of God, which is closely related to it, it is with this that the false notion of merit is most readily associated. Malachi leaves the pretenders for the most part to their own consciences, which he endeavours to awake from their slumbers by announcing the judgment of God; but Isaiah fully exposes the folly of this delusion, “Cry with the throat, spare not; show my people their transgression, and the house of Jacob their sins. And they inquire of me daily, and desire to know my ways (my acts which appear to them incomprehensible), as a nation that did righteousness, and forsook not the ordinance of its God; they ask of me judgments of righteousness, (compare chap. 2:17), ‘where is the God of justice?’ they desire (יִחַפְּצוּ, compare אֲשֶׁר־אַתֶּם חֹפְצִים, chap. 3:1), a drawing near on the part of God (compare chap. 3:5, ‘and I draw near *to you* to judgment’). Why do we fast, and thou seest not; chastise our soul, and thou knowest not? Behold, in the day of your fast ye find your pleasure (the reality is the very opposite of the idea implied in עֲנָה נַפְשׁוֹ nay, ‘afflicting the soul;’ the rendering, ‘ye carry on your business,’ is not only at variance with the usages of the language, but also distorts the sense); and ye oppress all your dependents,” etc.

Ver. 15. “*And now, we call the proud happy; they that work wickedness are built up, they tempt God and yet escape.*”

The allusion to ver. 12 has already been pointed out; and this allusion is a sufficient proof that by the יִבְנוּ we are to understand the heathen (Isa. 13:11). They *are built up*; that is, they prosper. Compare Jer. 12:16, 17 and Ex. 1:21, “And it came to pass, because the midwives feared God, he built them houses.” It is probable that the murmurers had the latter passage more particularly in their mind. How can God still continue to be God? In former times he built houses for those who feared him; and now for those who proudly despise him.—A comparison of ver. 10 will show us what sense we are to attach to the expression *tempt God*. The prophet had then called upon the nation to test God by true righteousness, and see whether he would not bestow his blessing upon them, and prove himself to be the God of justice. What necessity is there, the murmurers reply, for this test, so far as we are concerned? The heathen have already applied such a test. They devote themselves, as it were intentionally, to the task of bringing out the righteousness of God by means of their sins. Now if God is not affected by the test they apply, if he does not manifest his righteousness by punishing them, what reason have we to expect that he will prove himself to be the God of justice by bestowing blessings upon us?

Ver. 16. “*Then they that feared God conversed one with another, and the Lord listened and heard, and a book of remembrance was written before him for those who fear the Lord and think of his name.*”

The conversations of the truly pious handful, in defence of God, are here opposed to the charges brought against him in the conversations of the ungodly, mass of the people (the *whole* nation in ver. 9), who thought themselves religious. וְ, *then*, shows that the former were occasioned by the latter, and are here contrasted with them. The substance of what they said is sufficiently indicated by this contrast, and there was the less necessity for any verbal account of their creed from the fact that it must have been essentially the same as

that of the prophet himself. They said the same as Peter in similar circumstances during the closing period of the Jewish state, when the spirit of murmuring had not only reached its height among the Jews, but had even extended from them to the weaker Jewish Christians. Compare 2 Pet. 3:9, “The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness, but is long-suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance” (see also vers. 15 and 17). Since, then, the substance of the conversation is sufficiently determined, we have no reason to attribute to the prophet a citation of the very words, as has been done by as v. Til, J. D. Michaelis, Schmieder, and others, who render the verse thus: “On the other hand, they that fear the Lord say among themselves, Jehovah observes,” etc. That this is incorrect is sufficiently evident from the fact that a new address never commences with a future with *vav conversive*. Moreover, it is self-evident that we have here an *injunction* to such as were pious, clothed in a historical form. The prophet, by describing what they *have done*, shows them what they *are to do*, and that in a more emphatic manner than if he had merely expressed it in the form of a command. He clearly shows that no injunction is really required; that faith, from its very nature, expresses itself in this way; and that he who does not speak thus must renounce all claim to the possession of faith.—The promise is also clothed in a historical form as well as the injunction.—The figure employed, the writing in a book of remembrance before the Lord, may be explained from the custom of the Persians, to enter in a book the names of all such persons as had performed anything meritorious in the service of the king, along with an account of the peculiar services they had rendered, that they might in due season receive their reward. (With Esth. 6:1, compare Dan. 7:10, and Ps. 56:9.)

Ver. 17. “*And they shall be to me, saith the Lord of hosts, in the day which I create, for a possession; and I will spare them, as a man spareth his son who serveth him.*”

The reason is here assigned for the entry in the book of remembrance. According to the accents (for example, the *Munach* under *עשׂה*, which indicates a connection with the following words), the words ought apparently to be rendered, “And they shall be mine in the day when I create a possession.” This rendering undoubtedly furnishes a very good meaning. It gives peculiar prominence, in harmony with ver. 18, to the fact that the design of the great day, which is coming, will be to create a *הַגָּדֹד*, to erect a wall of partition in the midst of Israel itself, and not merely between the whole of the Israelites according to the flesh and the heathen world, as these hypocrites anticipate. But the other construction, “They shall be to me for a possession, in the day that I create,” which is adopted in the Septuagint *καὶ ἔσονται μοι εἰς ἡμέραν ἣν ἐγὼ ποιῶ εἰς περιποίησιν*), is undoubtedly sustained by the earlier passage, upon which this is founded, Ex. 19:5, “and ye shall be to me a possession,” etc.; and also by chap. 4:3, where there is a similar allusion to the day which the Lord creates.—*הַגָּדֹד* does not mean a possession in general, but one of peculiar worth, and highly esteemed, strictly speaking, what is treasured up and laid by, a treasure; compare Eccles. 2:8, “I gathered me silver and gold, and a *treasure* of kings and provinces.” (Even the word *περιούσιος*, which is frequently used as an equivalent to *Segullah* in the Septuagint and New Testament, does not mean *proprius alicui, peculiaris*; the *Gloss. in Oct.* is perfectly correct, *περιούσιον, ἐξάιρετον*, literally “what is over,” “what is stored up,” compare Bengel on Titus 2:14.) In the passage before us, there is evidently an allusion to the passages in the Pentateuch, in which *הַגָּדֹד* is used of Israel in contrast with the heathen, for example, Ex. 19:5, “Now therefore if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, ye shall be to me a *הַגָּדֹד* out of all nations;” Deut 7:6, “For thou art a holy people unto the Lord thy God: the Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be to



him a people of possession out of all nations that are upon the earth;" and Deut. 26:18 (*cf.* Ps. 135:4). As God at that time made Israel a *Segullah* out of all nations, so does he now make the true Israel a *Segullah* out of the whole of Israel according to the flesh, or rather he points out, as his *Segullah*, those who alone have always been so. For the expression, "if ye will hearken to my voice and keep my covenant," is a proof that the new exaltation to the position of a *Segullah*, which is predicted here, is to be regarded as merely the continuation of the former condition, and that the ungodly, strictly speaking, never did form a part of the *Segullah* at all. In the word "if," the prophecy which is here plainly announced is already implied. According to this, God can just as little allow that those who fulfil the required conditions should continue to be deprived of the promised blessings on account of their connection with the others, as that those who fail to fulfil these conditions should be treated as part of the *Segullah*) for the sake of such as are faithful. After the preparatory siftings, which run through the whole course of history, there must at last come one grand sifting, when the uncircumcized in heart will be mixed up with the outwardly uncircumcized (compare Jer. 9:24, 25), whilst the true children are fully installed in all the rights of children. This great division took place at the coming of Christ. The expression "to spare," in the sense of to manifest tender affection, is evidently used as a contrast to the treatment of those who are not children, and therefore are "not spared." A similar antithesis, implied, but not expressed, is found in 1 Sam. 23:21, where Saul says, with reference to the unsparing conduct of others towards the Ziphites, "Blessed be ye of the Lord, for ye have spared me." The expression "that serveth him" is peculiarly emphatic here. If the love of the father is to be manifested in all its strength, there must be something more in the son than a merely physical descent, which is simply the first foundation of the connection between father and son. He must assume the character of a son by an act of free will. The same rule was applicable to Israel in its relation to God. Admission to the family of God by circumcision corresponds to physical descent. Many relied upon this, and fancied that nothing more was wanting to constitute the ground of a claim upon fatherly treatment on the part of God. But the prophet shows that if what had been merely received continued outward alone, it would not only not support any claims at all, but would rather tend to heighten responsibility, and render their ultimate retribution the more unsparing.

Ver. 18. "And ye will see again the difference between the righteous and the wicked, between *Me* that serveth God, and him that serveth him not."

The evident allusion to the complaint of the murmurers, that God made no difference between the righteous and the wicked, a distinction which, in their estimation, coincided with the division between the nation of Israel and the heathen, is a proof that the *hypocrites* are here addressed. "Ye will discover that your complaint is unfounded, but ye will find it out to your shame." The expression "ye return" refers to similar distinctions that had already been made, for example in Egypt (Ex. 11:7, "That ye may know how that the Lord doth put a difference between the Egyptians and Israel"), and to which the hypocrites appealed, as proving that God could not be God now, seeing that no traces of such a distinction as this could any longer be found.<sup>78</sup> —בֵּין is regarded by most commentators as a noun (difference). But among the whole mass of passages in which בֵּין occurs, it would be difficult to find one in which it *must* be taken as a noun. (In Isa. 44:4, the meaning of בֵּין is *in the meantime*, and in 1 Sam. 17:4, the preposition is merely *treated* as a noun.) The rendering "between" is also perfectly suitable here. "We do not see," say the murmurers, "what 'between the righteous and the wicked' means." "The time will come," replies the prophet, "when ye will see once more the *between*, in relation

to the righteous and the wicked.” In a similar manner, a grand division, in the midst of the covenant nation itself, is announced by Isaiah in chap. 45:13, 14, “Behold, my servants shall eat, but ye shall be hungry: behold, my servants shall drink, but ye shall be thirsty: behold, my servants shall rejoice, but ye shall be ashamed: behold my servants shall sing for joy of heart, but ye shall howl for vexation of spirit” (compare Dan. 12:2). In its fullest sense, this division will only take place in the future state (compare the description in Matt. 25:31 sqq., which embodies the same idea, and therefore is essentially the same). But as surely as God not merely will be, but from all eternity and through all ages is, the God of justice, so surely must the fanning of the floor, the burning of the chaff, and the gathering of the wheat into the barn, be carried on in every age.

Chap. 4:1 (chap. 3:19). “*For, behold, the day cometh burning as an oven; and all the proud, and every one that doeth wickedness, shall be stubble: and the coming day burneth them up, saith the Lord of hosts, who will not leave them root or branch.*”

In the previous verse, a great division was announced to be made between the righteous and the wicked. “We have here a description of the judgment upon the wicked, and the blessings upon the righteous, by which this division will be followed. Commentators differ as to the day alluded to. “Some suppose the prophet to refer to the last and general judgment, others to the particular judgment inflicted upon the Jews by the Romans, and others again to both” (Venema). But even if we adopt the last explanation, which embraces the other two, we shall still come short of the *whole* truth, just as they do who entertain the same view in connection with the declaration made by Christ in Matt. 24 and 25. For what right have we to exclude the striking examples of the fulfilment of this prophecy, which are to be met with in the centuries that intervened between the utterance of the prediction and the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, such, for example, as occurred in the time of the Maccabees, when the ἀνομοί, παράνομοι, ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀδικίαν, ἀσεβεῖς, ἄνδρες λοιμοὶ, as they are called in the book of Maccabees with evident reference to this prophecy, learned by experience the truth at which they scoffed, that God is the God of justice? Or what ground have we for passing over the constant fulfilment which runs through the whole of this period, though imperceptible except to the eye of faith, including the manifestation of the righteousness of God in the fate of particular individuals? Or, lastly, what right has any one to look upon the entire period between the destruction of Jerusalem and the judgment day as having no connection with this prophecy, just as if the first and last leaves had been written with the finger of God, and the rest had been left a perfect blank? The judgment of God upon the bad seed, the dead members of his Church, is here depicted. But his Church is one and the same in every age; and therefore the prophecy cannot be regarded as terminating with the commencement of the New Testament times. The fulfilment both commences along with the object especially referred to, namely, judgment, which is never very far off, and also keeps pace with judgment through all ages to the end of the world. It is seen most conspicuously, though not *exclusively*, at the close of the two economies (at that of the latter so far as it is a kingdom of grace).—With reference to הַיָּהּ, Calvin says, “He calls the attention of the Jews, as it were, to something actually present, that they may perceive that the judgment of God is not far off, but is already threatening their own heads.” The life-giving sun is opposed in the following verse to the destroying fire. כַּתְּנִיף, “as the (burning) oven,” serves to strengthen the announcement. In the furnace the fire burns more fiercely than in the open air. Fire, consuming chaff and stubble, has already been used by Isaiah (5:24) as a figurative representation of the fate of the ungodly. “*The proud*” and “*they that do wickedness*” are evidently introduced with special reference to

ver. 15: “Ye to whom this pre-eminently applies, not those whom ye have so designated.” ἡ ῥίζα is not to be referred to the Lord, but to the coming, day. We find the same antithesis “*root and branch*” in Job 18:16. The tree in this instance, as in Amos 2:9, is a figurative representation of the nation generally, or of the whole body of the ungodly.

Ver. 2 (chap. 3:20). “*And upon you, that fear my name, the Sun of righteousness arises, and healing is under his wings, and ye go out and skip like fattened calves.*”

The Sun is righteousness itself. It is compared to the natural sun, because, though now obscured, it will then shine brightly, but more especially because it will so thoroughly invigorate those that are cast down. It is not *subjective* righteousness, but the righteousness imparted by God on the ground of this, which is an inseparable attendant of salvation; or rather, strictly speaking, it is salvation itself, though from a different point of view, namely, regarded as actual justification and acknowledgment as righteous. Compare, for example, Ps. 132:9, “Let thy priests be clothed with righteousness, and let thy saints shout for joy.” We must not regard it as meaning, in this instance, justification in the sense of the forgiveness of sins. This would be at variance with the entire context; for here the *judgment* is spoken of, the great division to be made between those who are *already* righteous and those who are *still* wicked (compare ver. 18). A reference to the forgiveness of sins would be as much out of place here as in Matt. 25:31 sqq. The righteousness mentioned here corresponds rather to the ἀπολύτρωσις in Luke 21:28, with which the reign of appearances is brought to an end, the harmony between the outward and inward restored, and every secret thing brought to light, whether it be good or bad. The fathers, from Justin downwards, understood by the Sun of righteousness, Christ (*Suicer*, p. 1320), and they have been followed by the majority of modern commentators.<sup>79</sup> This explanation is on the whole well founded. According to chap. 3:1, he through whom the godly are to become partakers of righteousness, with whose coming the Sun of righteousness rises, is the *Angel of the Lord*, the heavenly mediator of the new covenant, who fulfils its promises and threats, the *Logos*. But two things are to be observed in connection with this explanation. (1.) Its supporters discover here a distinct allusion to the person of Christ; he is said to be himself the Sun of righteousness, because righteousness is represented as the sun. The distinction, however, merely affects the form. For he, who causes the Sun of righteousness to rise, may also be regarded as the Sun of righteousness himself, just as the bringer of peace in Micah 5:4 is also called peace, and Jehovah is represented as the sun and light in Ps. 84:12 and Isa. 66:19 (compare John 1:5, 9, and 8:12). (2.) They understand by righteousness, at least principally, the forgiveness of sins. Thus, for example, Luther explains the Sun of righteousness as meaning “The sun which makes righteous, which emits such splendour that the people thereby become righteous, and are delivered from sins.” The difference in this case is of a more essential character. *The murmurers had asked for the judgments of righteousness, for God to give to every one according to his works, to the just and also to the unjust; and the prophet confines himself to the judgment, namely, to the reward of the righteous and the punishment of the ungodly.* Hence, there is no allusion here to the forgiveness of sins. This was involved in the more general announcement, that God would send his messenger to prepare the way before him. Whoever permits this messenger to fulfil the duties of his office upon him will receive forgiveness of sins; but if any refuse, the wrath of God remaineth on them. When once the Lord himself has come to judgment, there is no longer any question of a change of relation towards him, but only of its manifestation. The passage before us, therefore, is parallel to Ps. 112:4, “unto the upright there ariseth light in the darkness.” *Wings* are attributed to the dawn in Ps. 139:9, as they are here to the sun,

and also to the wind in Ps. 104:3; in both passages to represent swiftness.<sup>80</sup> In this case, then, the wings are to be regarded either as furnishing the means by which the sun *approaches swiftly* with the healing that he brings, or as spread out over his own people to afford them warmth and protection; compare Ps. 36:8, 91:4, and Matt. 23:37. The latter is the better explanation. For it is the healing itself, not the rapidity with which it is effected, that is attributed to the wings. In the healing spoken of, there is an allusion to the healing, refreshing, and invigorating energy of the natural sun. The winter and night of suffering have thrown the righteous into a state of exhaustion and distress. The expression “*go forth,*” implies that their former condition was one in which they were shut up and imprisoned (Mic. 2:13; Ps. 88:9). But now they are led out of their gloomy dungeons to the open fields, which are lighted up by the cheering rays of the sun.<sup>81</sup>

Ver. 3 (chap. 3:21). “*And ye tread down the wicked, for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet, in the day that I create, saith the Lord of hosts.*”

In the figure of the *ashes*, there is an allusion to that of the fire in ver. 19. According to the entire context, the contrast between the righteous and the wicked is of an inward character. The little flock has much to suffer from the ungodly multitude. The conflict arising out of this is met by a reference to the day appointed by the Lord, in which everything will be entirely changed (Luke 21:38).

Ver. 4 (chap. 3:22). “*Remember ye the law of Moses, my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel, laws and judgments.*”

This injunction, to the great importance of which the Septuagint directs attention by placing it at the close of the whole book, and the Masoretes by *the littera majuscula*  $\tau$ , was generally misunderstood by the earlier expositors, who interpolated the idea of *provisionally*.<sup>82</sup> There is nothing to warrant such an interpolation; for Elias introduces nothing new; he only brings the old to life again, and the angel of the covenant does not come to teach and legislate, but to judge. There is also no *inducement* to make it. The law is referred to here (and this is the very point which has been overlooked), not according to its accidental and temporary *form*, but according to its essential character, as expressive of the holiness of God, just as in Matt. 5:17. In this light, it is eternally the same in the eyes of God, and no jot or tittle of it can pass away.—It is only from this point of view that we obtain a correct idea of the connection between the verse before us and the adjoining verses both before and after. The prophet has announced a coming judgment, and here he traces it to its source, and shows at the same time in what manner the whole nation and every individual may successfully *avoid it*. The law of God and his people are inseparable. If the law is not fulfilled *in* the nation, it must be executed *upon* the nation. But before God accomplishes the latter, before he smites the land with the curse, he does everything to bring about a *reformation*, which is the only safeguard against the ban. He sends Elias, the prophet.—The two expressions “my servant,” and “which I commanded him,” serve to eliminate every human element from the law, and consequently to enforce the duty of observing it. Moses was merely an instrument; God was the lawgiver. From this fact it necessarily followed,—as is expressly stated in the words, “for all Israel,”—that it did not merely apply to the generation to which it was originally given at Horeb, but that its demands extended to all generations. Compare Deut. 29:14, 15, “Neither with you only do I make this covenant and this oath, but with him that standeth here with us this day before the Lord our God, and also with him that is not here with us this day.”<sup>83</sup>—The laws, which were afterwards given in the plains of Moab, are also included in the expression “in Horeb.” For they were merely a

continuation and further development; the foundation was fully laid at Sinai.—In the injunction “remember,” there is an allusion to chap. 3:7, “From the days of your fathers ye have *gone back* from my commandments.” It is not without cause that the prophet exhorts them. He is not merely warning them against a *future* apostasy. The axe is already laid at the root. *Let Israel of its own accord remember the law, before the Lord arouses it from its sleep of forgetfulness by the thunders of his righteousness.*

Ver. 5 (chap. 3:23). “*Behold I send you Elias, the prophet, before the great and terrible day of the Lord come.*”

There can be no doubt whatever that Elias the prophet is identical with the messenger, whom the Lord will send to prepare the way before him (chap. 3:1). If, then, we have already proved, in our remarks upon that verse, that the reference there is to an ideal messenger, the personified preacher of repentance, the same proofs are equally valid in connection with the passage before us. The same idea is expressed in both cases: before God proves himself to be the covenant God by inflicting punishments and bestowing blessings, he shows that he is so by placing within the reach of the children of the curse the means of becoming the children of the blessing. Of course we must not separate the power of the Spirit of God from the outward mission of his servants, and thus change the gift into mockery. There was no necessity to allude particularly to this, because it *always* accompanies the outward preaching, and in fact is in exact proportion to it; so that we may infer with certainty the amount of inward grace, from the extent to which the outward means of grace are enjoyed in any age.

The only point which we have to examine in connection with this passage has reference to the one thing which is peculiar to it, the designation of the messenger by the name of Elias. The reason for this must be sought in the prophet’s own description of the office and work of the messenger and of Elias, namely, “to prepare the way of the Lord,” and “turn back the heart of the fathers to the children, and of the children to the fathers.” Hence the messenger, as a *reformer* raised up by God, is called by the name of that one of the earlier messengers of God who exceeded all the rest in spirit and power, who lived in a remarkably corrupt age, and whose rejection was followed by a particularly terrible day of the Lord, viz. first the calamities inflicted by the Syrians, and then the captivity of Israel, the ban with which the land was smitten, because it did not realize its destination to be a *holy* land. The name of Elias recalled all these circumstances; when the people heard this name, they were wakened out of their dream of self-righteousness, and found themselves placed upon a level with the corrupt generation of the time of Elias. The coming of the Lord in that former age afforded a firm foundation for his future coming. Again, the reason why Elias should be especially selected becomes still more obvious if we trace the view, which is very perceptible in the historical books, that he was the head of the prophetic order in the Israelitish kingdom, or rather in a certain sense the only prophet, inasmuch as his successors merely received the spirit *indirectly*;—a view to which we are also led by the striking resemblance which the acts of Elisha bore to his own. We find a perfectly analogous resemblance in the case of Isaac and Abraham, Joshua and Moses, In 2 Chron. 21:12, there is brought to the king a writing from “Elijah the prophet,” for *Elijah as an individual* had departed this life long before. In 1 Kings 19:15, 16, the Lord says to Elijah, “*Thou shalt go and anoint Hazael to be king over Syria; and Jehu, the son of Nimshi, shalt thou anoint to be king over Israel.*” Elijah himself did not perform either of these acts; but Elisha anointed one (2 Kings 8:13), and a pupil of Elisha the other (2 Kings 9:4-6). Elisha, who modestly acknowledged that his

relation to God was not originally the same as that of his leader, desired the portion of the first-born in his spiritual inheritance (בְּרִוְהוּ, 2 Kings 2:9). Hence he also looks upon the rest of the prophets as the spiritual children and heirs of Elijah, and as standing in the same relation to him in which the seventy elders, *upon whom God put of the spirit of Moses*, stood to Moses himself. According to 2 Kings 2:15, the sons of the prophets said, “The spirit of Elijah (that is, the Spirit of God in the particular form which it assumed in Elijah) doth rest upon Elisha.” And as an outward sign that his ministry was merely a continuation of that of Elijah, Elisha received his mantle. But a similar relation as this may be found existing altogether apart from scriptural ground. Look, for example, at the connection which existed between Luther and Jonas or Bugenhagen, or again between the Reformers generally and the churches of which they were the founders. It might also be shown that, since this relation is an appointment of God himself, the words which are so frequently abused, “be not the servants of men,” do not apply to it at all; though sin creeps into this, as into every thing human. But this does not form part of our present subject. We merely call attention to the fact that if, according to these proofs, we are not limited to one single historical character, even when the Elijah of former times is referred to, but everything is attributed to Elijah, which constituted a continuation of his mission till the coming of the terrible day upon Israel, there is still less ground for seeking the Elijah of the future exclusively in one individual.—We have already observed that the prophet intentionally borrows from Joel (2:31) the expression, “Before the great and terrible day of the Lord come.” The day foretold by Joel, the judgment on the enemies of the kingdom of God, was ardently desired. By the announcement of the coming of a preacher of repentance (μετάνοια), the prophet shows how wrong it is for them to identify themselves with the kingdom of God, and expressly declares in the following verse that, if his preaching makes no impression, the great day will inevitably be terrible to those who fancy themselves the supporters, but are in reality the enemies of the kingdom of God.—Our remarks on ver. 19 are also applicable to the “day of the Lord” alluded to here.

## HISTORY OF THE EXPOSITION OF VER. 5

1. *Among the Jews.* It is well known that, on the strength of this passage, the Jews anticipated the reappearance of Elijah in the flesh, before the coming of the Messiah. The earliest traces of this view we find in the book of Wisdom (chap. 48:10)<sup>84</sup> and the Septuagint, in which אֵת אֵלֵיָהּ הַגִּבּוֹרִי is rendered Ἡλίαν τὸν Θεσβίτην instead of Ἡλίαν τὸν προφήτην. The prophet adds הַגִּבּוֹרִי for the express purpose of showing that *the point in question is not* the person of Elijah, but his office, his πνεῦμα and δύναμις;<sup>85</sup> but Jesus the son of Sirach, and the translators of the Septuagint, change the official allusion into a personal one. It is true that if we had nothing but this single fact, we could not draw any certain inference from it, any more than we should be able to conclude from the word הַתְּשׁוּבָה if it actually stood in the Hebrew text, that the prophet referred to the personal reappearance of Elijah, seeing that nothing is more common than for the recurrence of the essence of a thing to be figuratively represented, as the reappearance of the form in which the previous manifestation had taken place. But since we find the belief in a personal coming of Elijah the prevailing one at a later period, we are warranted in attributing demonstrative force to the passages referred to. There are several codices of the Septuagint, it is true, in which we find the reading τὸν προφήτην, and it is also to be found in the *Ed. Complut.* But this is undoubtedly an unintentional emendation.

The passages in the New Testament which serve to show that the expectation of Elijah was very prevalent among the people at that time, are well known. We shall have occasion to notice them more particularly by and by.—In the *Dialog, c. Tryphone, c. 40* (ed. Ven. p. 152) Trypho says, “We all expect that the Messiah will be born a man of men, and that Elias will anoint him when he comes.” And from the fact that Elias has not yet come, he argues that Jesus is not the Christ. The passages from later Jews may be found collected in Frischmuth (*De Eliae Adventu*, Jena 1659; reprinted in the *Thesaurus Antiquus*) and in Eisenmeyer (book ii. chap. 13). In the book *Chissuk Emunah* (p. 1, c. 39, in Wagenseil’s *Tela*, ii. 318) Rabbi Isaac says, “It was well known in the nation of Israel that the Messiah would not be manifested till Elias the prophet had come, as we find from this passage (in Malachi).” According to the *Schulchan Aruch* (in Frischmuth) the Jews were in the habit of remembering Elias every Sabbath, and praying that he might at length come and announce their redemption, which they regarded for the most part as the sole object of his coming, thus erring more grievously with regard to his work than they did even with regard to his person. And Abenezra concludes his commentary on Malachi with the words, “Deus propter misericordiam suam vaticinium suum impleat, finemque adventus illius acceleret.”

The sole origin of this view was the crude literality which characterized the expositions of the Jews, the “realism” which is so strongly recommended in the present day. The earlier Christian commentators very properly brought forward such passages as 2 Kings 9:31, where Jezebel addresses Jehu as Zimri, the murderer of his lord, a *new* Zimri (see Thenius on this passage); and Isa. 1:10, “Ye rulers of Sodom, ye people of Gomorrah;” not to mention such expressions as “alter erit turn Tiphys,” and “Homerus aut Maro pro optimo poeta, Maecenas pro benefico in doctos, Cato pro homine severo,” etc. They also appealed to a passage in *Jalkut Chadash*, where the current phrase, *Pinchas est Elias*, which many employed with equally rude literality, is interpreted as merely denoting an ideal identity: “Hoc est, quod dixerunt Rabbini b. m.: Pinchas est Elias. Non est res secundum litteram intelligenda, etc., sed quia Pinchas venit, ut in ordinem redigeret Nadab et Abihn, ita etiam Elias, quod ille reliquit in ordinem redigendum, id ipse perfecit.” At the same time, there were not wanting men of intelligence, who not only perceived the fallacy of the current interpretation, and felt the force of the argument, *that no other example can be found in the whole of the Scriptures of one who had already entered the church triumphant, returning to the church militant to discharge the duties of an ordinary office*, but had also no wish to enter into the wearisome dispute as to what became of the body of Elijah. (The different opinions which were entertained on this question have been collected by Pococke in the *Not. Misc.*) p. 218). The observations made by Rabbi Tauchum on the passage before us are very remarkable. He says, “We have here undoubtedly a promise of a prophet, who was to appear in Israel shortly before the coming of the Messiah, and some of the doctors think that this prophet will be Elijah the Tishbite (an opinion which is to be found in most of the homiletical writings); but others are of opinion that a great prophet will be raised up of the same rank, eodemque loco constitutum quod cognitionem dei et nominis ejus promulgationem, and that he is called Elias on this account, as the learned doctor Maimonides has said (Pococke, p. 219). Maimonides was probably the first of the Jews to depart from the popular view. It is true, the manner in which he speaks of this view (“there are some of the learned men, גַּמְ שֵׁי בִּימְכַהּ, who think that Elias himself will be sent before the Messiah”) seems to imply that there had been dissentients already; and hence this view may have been but partially adopted after all. But we cannot lay much stress upon this. It is probably only a *ruse* on his part.

2. *Among the Christians.* Even among the Christians themselves the opinion was very ancient, and at certain periods very widely spread, that Elijah himself was intended here. In John the Baptist and the judgments upon Israel, the prophecy was supposed to have been only imperfectly and not literally fulfilled; the literal and complete fulfilment was still to be looked for in the personal appearance of Elijah and the general judgment. Thus, for example, the author of the *Dial. c. Tryph.* appeals to the words, “before the great and terrible day of the Lord come,” which, he says, “is the second coming of Christ.” Elias is to come before that event occurs. Christ himself has declared as much by speaking of the coming of Elias as still *future* (Matt. 17:11). In support of the opinion that the fulfilment commences in John, he affirms that “the prophetic spirit which was begotten of God in Elias, was also begotten of him in John.” Chrysostom observes (in the 57th homily on Matthew), “As John was the forerunner of the first coming, so will Elias be the forerunner of the second coming,” and again, “Christ called John Elias on account of his performing the same service.” Theophylact (on Matt. 17:11, 12) says, “By saying that Elias cometh, he shows that he has not yet come; he will come as a forerunner of the second advent, and will restore to the faith of Christ all the Jews who are open to persuasion, restoring, as it were, to their family inheritance those who have fallen away.” In his notes on Matt. 11:14, he endeavours to make it appear that the Redeemer himself represented John as being merely in a figurative sense the promised Elias, “If he will receive it, he says, that is, if ye will understand it wisely (if ye will not take it too literally), this is he whom the prophet Malachi spoke of as the coming Elias. For the forerunner and Elias perform the same service.” (For other quotations from Chrysostom and Theophylact, see *Suicer, s.v. Ηλιάς*, p. 1317 sqq.) Among the Latin Fathers the same view prevails. Tertullian (*De Anima*, c. 50) says, “Enoch and Elias were translated; their death was, as it were, deferred. They are reserved, however, for death, that they may destroy Antichrist with their blood.”—Jerome observes (on Matt. 17:11), “Elias himself, who will truly come in the body at the second coming of Christ, has now come in the spirit through the medium of John the Baptist.” He also says, in another place, “Not that the same soul animated the bodies of Elias and John, as some heretics affirm, but that they had the same grace of the Holy Spirit,” from which it is evident that there were some, probably Jewish Christians, who thought to do more justice to the express declaration of Christ that John was Elias by assuming that the soul of Elias passed into John.”—Augustine says (*De Civ. Dei.* 20, c. 29), “That the Jews, when their law has been explained to them by this great and wonderful Elias in the last days before the judgment, will believe in the true Christ, that is, in our Christ, is a thought which is constantly cherished in the discourses and hearts of believers. It is not without reason that we anticipate his coming before the advent of the Judge and Saviour, since it is also not without reason that he is believed to be still alive. For he was taken from the earth in a chariot of fire, of which we have the surest testimony in the sacred Scriptures.”—There were undoubtedly some who strongly dissented from the general opinion, even in the days of the Fathers (see Grotius on Matt. 17:11), but there were no opponents of any importance. (In addition to those already mentioned, Origen, Cyril, and Theodoret expressly declare themselves in its favour.) The expectation of Elias previous to the last judgment was even entertained by Mahometans (Herbelot, *s.v. Iliā*), who had undoubtedly imbibed the view from the Christian Church rather than from the Jews. That the commentators within the Catholic Church would adhere to the opinion entertained by the Fathers, we should expect at the very outset. Bellarmine says the opposite view is “vel haeresis, vel haeresi proximus error” (*De Rom. Pontif.* 1. 3, c. 6). The expositors belonging to the Protestant Church, on the other hand, unanimously reject this view, and maintain that the passage refers exclusively to John the Baptist. Lately,



indeed, the earlier explanation has found defenders, including Von Ammon, Hitzig, Maurer, and even Olshausen.

Grotius and others speak of this view as having arisen simply from trusting to the Jews; whilst Frischmuth and others trace it merely to the use of the Septuagint. But both explanations are superficial and unsatisfactory. Such slender reasons would not suffice to produce so general an agreement. The principal cause was undoubtedly the fear of deviating from the letter, arising from a conscious inability to defend the ideal interpretation, and “strengthened by a reference to the Jews, who adhered to the literal interpretation, as the *Dial. c. Tryph.* clearly shows, and to whom it would have been impossible with any consistency to refuse the same liberty in other cases, if the letter were given up in this instance without sufficient and conclusive reasons. The change made in the Septuagint of τὸν προφήτην into τὸν Θεσβίτην (the early Latin version has also *Thesbitem*) simply served to strengthen the opinion of the necessity for the literal interpretation. A second reason, which led to its adoption, was the general opinion that “the great and terrible day of the Lord” meant the general judgment. The two supported each other. That the second was not the sole ground for the first, is evident from the fact that many who regarded John as Elias, supposed the final judgment to be the one referred to. We have already seen that there is a certain truth at the foundation of this view. The prophecy so evidently depicts judgment in its most complete form,<sup>86</sup> that any interpretation which regards the passage as referring *exclusively* to some inferior judgment, even to one of so terrible a character as the destruction of Jerusalem, must always leave a feeling of dissatisfaction, especially if we consider the blessing which accompanies the judgment. A third reason was the connection supposed to exist between the translation of Elias and his reappearance (compare Augustine *l.c.*).

It must be admitted that it is just as correct to refer it to a future Elias as to restrict it exclusively to John. They are both wrong in their own way; and both are based upon the same unfounded assumption, namely, the opinion that prophecy must necessarily relate to one definite point of time and one single individual. It is only in connection with the passages in the New Testament, which bear upon the question, that the former appears the less feasible of the two. The difficulty of sustaining a literal reference to Elias, and a merely figurative one to John, is evident from the very forced expositions to which all these commentators, including even Olshausen, have been compelled to resort.

Ver. 6 (chap. 3:24). “*And he turneth the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers, lest I come and smite the land with the curse.*”

Very different explanations have been given of the first part of the verse, notwithstanding its simplicity. There are many who follow the Septuagint (ὃς ἀποκαταστήσει καρδίαν πατρὸς πρὸς υἱὸν καὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ) and the book of Wisdom (chap. 48:10), in which the restoration of love in the midst of the covenant nation is treated as the germ, and understand the passage as relating to the *cessation of strife* in the midst of the covenant nation, of which the restoration of peace between parents and children is introduced as one particular example. But this furnishes by no means a fitting conclusion to the last prophecy of the last prophet, nor was this the sin which primarily and especially led to the curse. The crime laid to the charge of the nation in chap. 3:5 was something very different. Moreover, the *leading back* would by no means harmonize with the *preparation of the way* announced in chap. 3:1, to which it ought to correspond. Even Isaiah had something far more exalted before his mind.—

Passing over a number of pointless expositions which have been given by Jews, and which may be found in Frischmuth, we will merely notice that of Kimchi: “He converts alike both fathers and children,”<sup>87</sup> which has been approved of even by Christian expositors. But this explanation, which is defended by Steudel and Hofmann, is open to the following objections: (1) that such an use of הָשִׁיב as this, without anything to indicate whence or whither, is altogether without analogy; (2) that if this were the meaning, we should expect לִב to be repeated before the first בָּנִים and before אֲבוֹתָם, whilst the omission shows that it is to the fathers and children that the heart is turned: and, lastly, that “the fathers with the sons” and “the sons with the fathers” would be mere tautology.—We find the true explanation in the New Testament, and in Augustine, who expressly affirms that the Septuagint rendering is false (*De Civ. Dei.* 20, 29). Its most able defender is Conr. Iken (see his *Dissertat. de Anathem.*, etc., on Matt. 4:6 [3:24], Bremen 1749).—The fathers are the pious forefathers, the patriarchs, particularly David and the godly belonging to his day.<sup>88</sup> The hearts of the pious fathers and the ungodly children are estranged from one another. The bond of union is wanting, viz. common love to God. The fathers are ashamed of their children, the children of their fathers. The great chasm between the two is filled up once more by Elias the prophet. He leads the children back to God, and in God the fathers and children are reconciled again. שׁוֹב is not infrequently construed with עָל, even where a literal return is intended. Compare, for example, Job 34:15, “Man returneth to the dust” (עָל עָפָר); Prov. 26:11, “As a dog, that returneth to its vomit;” and Eccles. 12:7. In the case before us, however, it is still more appropriate, since inclination is very commonly regarded as resting upon its object, which renders עָל more graphic than אָל. An ἀποκατάστασις, a *restitutia*, is also predicted here (see the notes on chap. 3:4). If there had not been pious fathers already, if the Lord had not proved himself to be a covenant-God in former times, by giving them a heart to fear him, the hope of a reformation of the children to be effected by him would be a mere *fancy*. The hopes of the future, so far as the kingdom of God is concerned, are always founded upon the past. This is not only a guarantee of the possibility, but also a proof of the necessity for a repetition. Every word addressed by the prophet to the corrupt priestly order would be entirely lost if its former purity (chap. 2:5, 6) had not afforded a pledge that the idea could and must be realized again. The meat-offering of Judah and Jerusalem is not to become pleasant to the Lord for the first time after the lapse of many centuries, but it is *once more* to become what it was in the days of old and in former years (chap. 3:4).<sup>89</sup> Isaiah complains (in chap. 1:21) that the city, which was once *faithful*, has become a harlot; and that whereas righteousness dwelt in her, there are now murderers. Compare ver. 26, “And I will give thee thy judges again as *at the first*, and thy councillors *as at the beginning*.” We have only to observe further, that the outward work of Elias is not to be separated from the work of the Spirit of God by which it is necessarily accompanied (compare 1 Kings 18:37, where the *first* Elijah says to God, “thou turnest their heart back again”), and also, that הָשִׁיב does not denote the effect so much as the *divine intention*, though this, of course, can never be really without effect. That the prophet was well aware that the great mass of the people would despise the mercy of God, which was offered to all (Luke 7:30), and therefore would be exposed to the judgment threatened, is evident from the earlier passages in which this judgment is unconditionally announced.

In the second half, חֵרֵם either be rendered “with the ban” (Ewald, § 204 a), or “as a ban,” that is, so that it shall become “a ban.” All the dreadful things that can possibly be thought of are included in this *one* word.<sup>90</sup> The meaning of the *Cherem* has already been discussed in another of the author’s works (see the *Dissertation on the Pentateuch*, vol. ii. Transl., Art., “The right of the Israelites to Palestine”). We will first of all quote the

passage referred to. "The conduct which the Israelites were commanded to observe, and actually did observe towards the Canaanites, is designated throughout as *banning* (*Verbannung*, proscribing or laying under the ban). This designation shows that the highest object of the war of extermination against the Canaanites was the vindication of the divine glory, which had been dishonoured by them. The idea of *banning* is always that of the forcible dedication to God of such persons as have obstinately refused to dedicate themselves voluntarily to him, the manifestation of the divine glory in the destruction of those who, during their lifetime, would never serve as a mirror for it, and therefore refused to realize the great purpose of man's existence and of the creation of the world. God will sanctify himself *on* those *in* whom he is not sanctified. The temporal destruction of anything which does not serve him makes known his praise. His glory shines forth in the waitings of the lost, which are typified by this temporal destruction. This idea of the ban, which J. D. Michaelis describes in a truly characteristic manner as "*a master-stroke of legislative sagacity*," is very conspicuous in Deut. 13:16-18, where the command is issued to *ban* every Israelitish city which should introduce idolatry (compare ver. 16, "And thou bannest the city and its spoil entirely *to the Lord thy God*, and it becomes an eternal heap, it shall no more be built again." So again in the account contained in Num. 21:1-3. The Canaanitish king of Arad opposed the Israelites, "And Israel vowed a vow unto the Lord, and said, if thou wilt indeed deliver this people into my hand, I will *ban* their cities. And the Lord heard the voice of Israel, and delivered up the Canaanites, and Israel banned them and their cities." The banning is evidently represented here not as something resulting from human caprice, or subservient to human purposes, but as an act of worship enjoined by God, which was regarded by Israel as a sacrifice offered up for the sake of God. And so again in 1 Kings 20, where the king of Israel, himself an ungodly man, is doomed to destruction for neglecting to execute the ban pronounced by God upon Benhadad, the king of Assyria, and haughty despiser of God. The ban pronounced upon the Canaanites generally related to their persons alone; and, strictly speaking, it was solely to these that it actually applied. Their cities and possessions were conferred upon the Israelites. But, in order that it might be seen that the former possessors had not been destroyed by a mere act of caprice on the part of man, but by the vengeance of God, and also that their country and possessions had not been acquired by the Israelites as booty, but as a confiscated fief which was now conferred by God upon another vassal, to see whether he would faithfully render the services appertaining to its possession, in the case of the *first* city that was taken, viz. Jericho, the ban was laid upon the city itself and all the property found within the walls." To this we have now to add the following remarks. (1) That the word *בָּרַח* does not mean a *holy* thing generally, but rather a thing which is holy in the sense of being devoted to God by being destroyed, and therefore is distinct from *קָדָשׁ* is evident from its connection with<sup>[1]</sup>, *rescivit, succidit, excidit, abscidit*, from which the Hebrew word *קָרוּם* (a man with a short or mutilated nose) is derived, and probably also *בָּרַח*, a net, so called on account of its causing destruction to the fish. Hence Vitranga's remark (on Isa. 11:5) is incorrect. He says, "The word *מִרְחָה* signifies to set apart a thing or person from common use, which is done either by *consecration* or by devoting it to destruction with imprecations, as an accursed thing; hence to cut off, to destroy, to exterminate with a curse." The only part of this which is correct is contained in the words "devoting it to destruction," etc. In the sense of *consecrate*, it is never used.— (2) J. D. Michaelis says (§ 146), "Moses speaks of the *Cherem* in one passage in a manner which presupposes that a man sometimes consecrated his own field, and that such a field of *Cherem* as this could be redeemed in the ordinary way. Lev. 27:28." If this explanation of the passage were correct, we should have to alter the notion of *חֵרֵם* altogether. But this very passage furnishes a proof that it cannot be correct. The things which are devoted to

the *Cherem* are always represented simply as an appurtenance of the persons. There is not a single instance to be met with of the persons being spared, and the property alone put under the ban. Compare, for example, Deut. 2:34; 1 Sam. 15:3; and Ezra 10:8, “And that whosoever would not come within three days, all his substance should be banned, and he himself separated from the congregation of those that had been carried away.” A *voluntary* devotion of the person or property to the *Cherem* cannot therefore be thought of, since the fundamental idea of the חֵרֵם is that of a *forced* dedication, in *opposition* to a voluntary one. God takes what belongs to himself when men have refused to give it to him. Hence the *Cherem* and a disposition to give mutually exclude each other. How are we to interpret the passage in Leviticus then? The explanation may be obtained from ver. 29, “Everything *banned*, which is *banned of men*, shall be put to death.” In the previous verse, the possessions are alluded to; here the men. If by the men we are to understand those upon whom God had pronounced the ban, then by the cattle and the field we can only understand that which had formerly been in the possession of persons who were banned, which had afterwards been seized by the conquerors, and thus, regarded merely in a material point of view, had become their property. If this was once placed under the ban, it could on no account be redeemed again. In many instances a special command of God was issued, to decide whether the possessions were to be banned along with the men (cf. 1 Sam. 15:3; Josh. 6:18); and he who under these circumstances took any part of the things that were banned became *Cherem* himself in consequence (Josh. 7:12). In other cases it was left to the covenant nation itself to determine what it would lay under the ban, and what it would retain for its own use. In a certain sense the latter was also a *Cherem* (see Mic. 4:13).—The want of a clear perception of the nature of the *Cherem* is also apparent in the remark made by Michaelis, to the effect that Jephtha’s vow was an abuse of the *Cherem*. How could a *Cherm* be sacrificed as a burnt-offering? A sacrifice and a *Cherem* stood in the same relation to one another as ἀνάθεμα and ἀνάθημα.—(3) The prophet undoubtedly alludes to those passages of the Pentateuch in which the banning of the Canaanites is spoken of. Even in the Pentateuch this is described as a visible prophecy of the future fate of Israel. Israel obtained possession of Canaan as the holy nation of the holy God; and had simply to choose between *holiness* and *Cherem*. If Israel became Canaan in heart, it would also become Canaan in its fate (Lev. 26; Deut. 12:29 sqq., and 28).

### ***THE NEW TESTAMENT AND THE PROPHECIES OF MALACHI***

We intend in the present section to adduce facts to prove that the connection between the Old and New Testaments is much closer than is commonly supposed, and that it is impossible to arrive at either an inward or outward acquaintance with the latter without the closest and most careful study of the former. To the prophecy of Malachi we add that of Isaiah, which is inseparable from it.

#### **MATTHEW 3:1-12**

Matthew simply quotes the words of Isaiah. But it can be proved that both the Evangelists and the Baptist himself regarded the prophecy of Malachi as a necessary expansion and completion of that of Isaiah, and that they had the former continually in their minds. The word “repent” is sufficient of itself to indicate this. Elias the prophet is expressly

described by Malachi (4:6) as producing repentance. And the account of John the Baptist's mode of life (in ver. 4) leads to the same conclusion: "And the same John," we read, "had his raiment of earners hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins, and his meat was locusts and wild honey." The design of John, viz. by means of an outward resemblance to Elias, to call attention to the inward one, is very conspicuous here. In 2 Kings 1:8 (Septuagint), Elias is said to have been Ἀνὴρ δασύς καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην περιεζωσμένος τὴν ὄσφυν αὐτοῦ. δασύς does not refer to his person, but to his clothing, to the rough garment of camel's hair.—On ver. 7, Lightfoot has observed, "There is an allusion here to the closing words of the Old Testament, 'Lest I come and smite the land with the curse,' and the disastrous fate of the nation is represented as already impending over it." "We must also add the reference to the *coming day* predicted in Mal. 4:1; compare the κοπάσαι ὄργην πρὸ θυμοῦ of the book of Wisdom (chap. 48:10). John declares that the great day of decision and separation foretold by the prophets has now arrived. Happy is he who listens to him, the risen Elias, and is led to repentance, the only means of escaping the coming wrath.—In ver. 8, "Bring forth, therefore, fruits meet for repentance," there is an allusion to Mal. 4:1, "which shall leave them neither root nor branch." Compare ver. 10, "And now also the axe is laid unto the *root* of the trees (Bengel, 'the axe is not directed against the branches alone'); therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire." The bad trees must become good through repentance, and consequently bring forth good fruit; otherwise, according to *God's* own threat through the mouth of his prophet, neither root nor branch will be left. In ver. 11, "I indeed baptize you with water into *repentance* (cf. Mal. 4:6), but *he that cometh after me* is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear," the allusion to Mal. 3:1 is unmistakable. John is merely the human messenger of the Lord, sent to secure the μετάνοια embodied in baptism, that is, to prepare the way. After him, the heavenly messenger, the angel of the covenant, the Lord himself, comes to his temple. This allusion is the more important on account of its affording an insight into the opinion which John himself entertained of Christ. He was not in his estimation, as in that of the mass of the people, a man endowed with extraordinary gifts, but the revelation of the glory of God, predicted by Isaiah, the Lord whose way he was to prepare, the angel of the covenant, and the Lord, foretold by Malachi. And lastly, in ver. 12: "Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner, but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire," there is a reference to Mal. 4:1: "Behold the day cometh burning as an oven, and all the proud and all the wicked become stubble, and the coming day burneth them." Thus the prophecy of Malachi is, throughout, the text upon which John comments in precisely the same manner in which Malachi himself comments upon Isaiah. The close connection between prophecy and fulfilment is pointed out by the evangelist in the particle γὰρ in ver. 3, upon which Bengel observes: "The reason why John necessarily appeared at that time in the manner described in vers. 1 and 2, was because it was so foretold."

We will now cite a few examples, which show the importance of a clear perception of the connection referred to in its bearing upon the present section. The reason for the sojourn of John in the desert is thus explained by Olshausen: "But the real character of this witness to the truth is to be seen in the fact that John preached in the desert and not in cities. It was an essential characteristic of John that he *avoided* men, and preached to those who sought him out, whereas the Redeemer sought the men to whom he preached." The inappropriateness of this explanation is at once apparent, if we bear in mind the connection with the prophecy. In Isaiah the desert is the symbol of that state of natural and spiritual destitution in which the nation was at the time referred to, and in which it

had formerly been after the exodus from Egypt. By appearing in a desert, then, John proclaimed in deeds what he afterwards expressly declared in words—that the nation was a spiritual desert, and that he was the messenger sent by the Lord to prepare the way before him; in other words, the preacher of repentance. (Complete conformity with the prophecy would have required that he should appear in *the* desert, viz. the Arabian; but this would have operated prejudicially to his design, and therefore, just as in the case of the temptation of Christ, only the essential features were exhibited in an outward form.) According to the reception given to his preaching, the bodies of some were to fall in the desert, whilst others would be conducted into the promised land by the Lord, who was coming after him to punish and to bless.

Different opinions have been entertained as to the meaning of the outward mode of life adopted by John. The majority regard him as an ascetic. Grotius, for example, says (or chap. 3:4): “habitus haud dubie severior, victus parsimoniae congruens.” The correct explanation can only be obtained by seeking for the reason why a similar outward mode of life was adopted by Elijah; for John copied it from him, not indeed as something purely external,—this would have been puerile and very unworthy,—but as something highly significant, the symbol of an inward relation between himself and Elijah. Now there can be no doubt that in the case of Elijah this mode of life was a “sermo propheticus realis.” The preacher of repentance comes forward as repentance personified. In his own conduct he shows the people what their conduct ought to be. Take as a single example 1 Kings 21:27, where Ahab imitates the marks of repentance which the prophet had set before him. “And it came to pass, when Ahab heard those words, that he rent his clothes, and put a garment of hair upon his flesh, and fasted.” The words “and fasted” also serve to show in what light we are to regard the fact that “his meat was locusts and wild honey.” Fasting in connection with the wearing of a garment of hair were the ordinary signs of repentance under the Old Testament. John’s eating was a kind of continuous fast, and the Saviour himself describes it as being so when he calls it in Matt. 11:18, “neither eating nor drinking,” an uninterrupted שֶׁנֶּחֱמָה וְנִשְׁתֵּי. He would have fasted *altogether*, if this had not been an impossibility. Regarded in this light<sup>91</sup> the mode of life adopted by John is most intimately connected with his sojourn in the desert. The two together serve to represent the condition of the people as a deeply-degraded one, repentance as indispensably necessary, as the work of the age, and punishment as close at hand. The latter also shows the essential unity of the time of John and that of Elijah. In Elijah’s days there was the same degradation; compare, for example, 1 Kings 19:10, “I have striven for the Lord, the God of hosts; for the children of Israel have forsaken thy covenant.” There was also the same call on the part of the prophet to lead them to repentance; compare 1 Kings 18:37, where, in perfect accordance with Mal. 4:6, Elijah says to God, “and thou hast turned their heart back again.” Punishment was also just as close at hand; the mission of Elijah, of which that of Elisha and his disciples is to be regarded as a continuation, was the *last* grand attempt on the part of God to rescue Israel, which, after this attempt had failed upon the whole, moved forward without interruption towards destruction, the הַיּוֹם, which certainly awaited it.

If we look back from the fulfilment to the prophecy, we see at once the incorrectness of the view entertained by many, and lately adopted by Olshausen, with regard to the office held by John. The “μετάνοια,” he observes, “was something *purely* negative, which required a positive side to make it complete, namely, the Spirit, which was brought by Christ, and which men received by faith.” Repentance answers to the “turning of the hearts of the fathers to the children and of the children to the fathers,” of which Malachi

speaks. But this is something more than purely negative. It presupposes an inward renovation, a change in the character of the entire life. This is apparent from the fact that the mission of Elias is followed immediately by the appearance of the angel of the covenant with a blessing and a curse. If the repentance of John had been something merely negative, he would have been inferior to all the prophets of the Old Testament, and in this case the prophecy of Malachi could not be regarded as fulfilled in him. Even Josephus judged differently from this, when he said that the baptism of John, the embodiment of the repentance which he preached, served ἐφ' ἀγνείᾳ τοῦ σώματος, ἅτε τῆς ψυχῆς προκεκαθαρμένης. How could repentance be conceived of as something purely negative? This would deprive it of the character of repentance altogether. Repentance and faith must necessarily be the same thing from different points of view: "thou shalt cease from thy doings" (repentance), "that God may have his work in thee" (faith). The faith is exactly proportioned to the repentance. The difference between the baptism of John and that of Christ was not that in the former there was repentance and not faith, but that though it contained them both it was in a very inferior degree. They are both the work of the Spirit; and the contrast, which is represented as absolute in the words of John (ver. 11), so far as the form is concerned, is really only relative. Otherwise the work of John would have been merely a mockery and delusion. But if this were the case, the idea which was symbolically represented in his person could not have been so perfectly realized in Christ, that in this respect there should have been nothing more than a difference of degree in the work which he performed (the work of Christ, as the Lord and the angel of the covenant, was of a different kind); compare the remarks of Mal. 3:1, Moreover, the disputed opinion with regard to the office of John is quite as much at variance with the words of the evangelist as with those of the prophet. According to Matt. 3:6, those who repented were baptized in Jordan, "confessing their sins." That we have not to imagine the sins confessed as reserved for forgiveness at some future time, but that, on the contrary, forgiveness was associated in this instance, as in every other, with confession (compare Ps. 32:5)—of course in proportion to the confession made—is evident from the parallel passages in Luke (3:3) and Mark (1:4), in which the baptism of John is represented as "the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." It is true that Olshausen follows Tertullian (see Grotius on Mark),—who explained εἰς ἄφεσιν as meaning "for the remission at some future time," and who so completely shared the whole view with regard to the office of John that he understood by μετάνοια not a change of life, but merely certain external rites,—and says, "the preaching of John was not intended to secure remission, but to prepare the way for the remission to be effected by Christ." But Bengel overthrows this explanation by appealing to Acts 2:38, where Peter says, "repent, and be baptized every one of you ... for the remission of sins." If the remission of sins is represented *there* as belonging to the time then present, the same must be the case here also. Otherwise how could the baptism of John be represented in Matt. 3:7 as protecting from the coming wrath, in the same manner as Christian baptism, which is essentially the same, is represented by Peter in 1 Pet. 3:20, 21?

If we bear in mind the allusion to the prophecy, we shall not be inclined to follow Olshausen, and take ἡγγικε in the sense of the present, "it is already in existence, namely, in the person of the Messiah." In Isaiah there is first the cry, "prepare ye," and *then* the glory of the Lord is revealed. In Malachi the messenger *first* prepares the way, and *then* the Lord suddenly comes. On comparing the prophecies, we see that the kingdom of heaven does not come till the Lord has appeared as Lord, both blessing and punishing, according as the preaching of repentance has been received.

Lastly, a sure basis for the interpretation of the words, “and with fire,” in ver. 11 (Luke 3:16), can only be obtained from the prophecy. Such remarks as those of Bengel, who says, “The Holy Spirit with which Christ baptizes has the force of fire;” and Olshausen, who says, “The baptism of fire indicates the transformation of the new-born, higher life in its peculiar nature,”—need no refutation then. The fire cannot be any other than that which Malachi frequently refers to, as associated with the coming of *the* Lord, the angel of the covenant. That John regarded him as the Messiah, is evident not only from ver. 11, but also from ver. 12, where the same things are directly attributed to the Messiah, which Malachi ascribes to the angel of the covenant. The fire alluded to by Malachi is exclusively destructive; it does not affect the righteous at all (they rejoice in the beams of the sun), but simply the ungodly. That John adheres closely to the prophecy in this respect, is obvious from the expressions, “cast into the fire,” which occurs immediately before, and “he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire,” which he employs immediately afterwards.

In the parallel passage, Mark 1:1-8, the manner in which the quotation is made attracts our attention. It is headed with the words, “as it is written in Isaiah the prophet.” Then follow, first the quotation from Mal. 3:1, and afterwards that from Isaiah. The only clue to the reason of this is to be found in the connection between Malachi and Isaiah, to which we have already alluded. We saw that the prophecy of the former was not an independent one, but that Malachi was merely the *auctor secundarius*; and the evangelist indicates this by quoting both commentary and text as belonging to the *auctor primaries*, and placing the commentary first, as being indispensably requisite to the correct interpretation of the text. From this it is obvious that there is a perfect analogy between Mark 1:2, 3, and Matt. 27:9 (compare the remarks on Zech. 11:13). It also follows, from what has been stated already, that Matthew had the words of Malachi in his mind, though he only quotes those of Isaiah, and that there is an essential agreement between Matthew and Mark, the peculiarity in the latter being restricted to the form.—And lastly, this serves to overthrow all the attempts which have been made to get rid of the difficulty (to which even Porphyry appealed as an argument against the credibility of the evangelists) on external grounds alone, reckoning from Beza, who thought the passage from Malachi had crept from the margin into the text, and coming down to Olshausen and De Wette, who maintain that Mark copied the formula of quotation from Matthew and Luke, and then, without having altered the heading, introduced into the text the passage from Malachi, which accidentally occurred to his mind,

### MATTHEW 11:1-14

This passage is founded upon the question which John, who was then in prison, sent two of his disciples to propose to Christ, “Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?” (ver. 3; compare Luke 7:19, 20). Whatever then will throw light upon this passage must contribute to the interpretation of the whole section. It is admitted by most commentators, that the expression ὁ ἐρχόμενος (the coming one) had a doctrinal meaning, and was one of the proper names of the Messiah, which had been taken from the Old Testament, and were current at the time. But they differ as to the place from which it was originally taken. Grotius says, “ille de quo verbum illud veniendi usurpavit Jacobus, Gen. 49:10, et Jes. 35:4.” Bengel supposes that there is an allusion to Ps. 40, and Olshausen to Ps. 118:26. For our part we have no hesitation in deciding in favour of Mal. 3:1, and that on the following grounds:—(1) Since, as we have already seen, the prophecy



of Malachi formed the text of the preaching of John, the centre of his thoughts and of his whole spiritual existence, the idea which most naturally suggests itself is, that this is the prophecy to which he refers. (2) There is no other prophecy in which such prominence is given to the idea of coming as in this prophecy of Malachi. The prophet first announces, "He will suddenly come," etc., and then at the close of the verse strengthens his announcement by the assertion, "Behold he *cometh*, saith Jehovah of hosts." Hence there is no passage which would be more likely to give rise to the current expression, "the coming one." (3) We must not overlook the words of the Saviour himself in ver. 14, "This is Elias, which was for to come (ὁ μέλλων ἔρχεσθαι)." This leads us at once to the conclusion that the expression is to be traced to a prophecy, in which both the coming ones, Elias and the Messiah, are connected together, especially when we observe that in the previous verse ("all the prophets and the law prophesied until John. . . . this is Elias, which was for to come")<sup>92</sup> the Saviour himself alludes to a prophecy in which the two coming ones are associated together, and represents the coming of the one as a visible prediction of the coming of the other, precisely as we find it announced in Malachi. If there is an allusion throughout to the prophet, the declaration, "This is Elias, which was for to come," contains at once the answer to the question, "Art thou the coming one?" Since the two were inseparable, John could not doubt whether Christ were the coming one without at the same time doubting whether he himself were "Elias, who was to come." (4) On comparing the expression, "he that cometh after me" (chap. 3:11 and elsewhere) we are also reminded of Malachi. (5) The whole affair is perfectly unintelligible apart from the allusion to Malachi. It may now be regarded as fully demonstrated that John sent to Christ on account of his own doubts, and not because of those of others. These doubts appear to have been chiefly founded upon the prophecy of Malachi. The conflict which arose in the mind of John in consequence of his gloomy confinement in prison could not but become peculiarly dangerous if the word of God itself, by which those doubts ought to be met and removed, should apparently afford a foundation for them. Now, there was no prediction so, calculated to do this as the very one around which the whole spiritual life of the prophet revolved. According to this, it seemed as if the coming of the Lord and of the angel of the covenant to punish and to bless was to follow *immediately* upon the appearance of the forerunner and the preaching of repentance. In the Septuagint the prophecy read, καὶ ἔξαιφνης ἦξει εἰς τὸν ναὸν ἑαυτοῦ κύριος, κ.τ.λ., ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται. John was therefore astonished to see that the work of the Saviour was pre-eminently an Elijah work, a simple continuation of his own. But he *overlooked* the fact that along with this continuation there was an absolutely new beginning, namely, the manifestation of the Lord and of the angel of the covenant; and to this the Saviour refers him in his reply in vers. 4 and 5. Hence there arose doubts in the mind of John, both as to his own vocation and that of Christ as well; at the same time, they were doubts which remained simply upon the surface. For how would he otherwise have sent to Christ to have them set at rest? If, then, it may be regarded as established that the expression ὁ ἐρχόμενος (the coming one) was founded upon Malachi, it may also be regarded as certain, as we have already proved, that John possessed a far deeper insight into the person and work of Christ than is commonly attributed to him. He had no doubt about the Messiah being "the Lord" and "the angel of the covenant."

In ver. 10, "For this is he of whom it is written, Behold I send my messenger before thy face, who shall prepare thy way before thee," the double σου (thy) instead of (σου) strikes us at once, There is the stronger reason for supposing it to be intentional from the fact that it is also found in Luke 7:27, and even in Mark 1:2, where the passage is quoted in a totally different connection.<sup>93</sup> There is nothing in the Septuagint that could give rise to the

alteration. The quotation is treated throughout in a perfectly independent manner. (Sept. ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐξαποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου, καὶ ἐπιβλέψεται ὁδὸν πρὸ προσώπου σου; the Kal קִיָּפּ being erroneously substituted for the Piel קִיָּפּ.) The reason for the change was probably the following. The more precise representation of the Lord as the angel of the covenant in the prophecies of Malachi, pointed to a difference between the sender and the sent. But this difference falls into the background behind the unity of essence. Before Jehovah himself, his messenger prepares the way; the Lord comes to his temple. The Saviour, on the other hand, in a manner befitting the time, when a clearer insight had been obtained into the relation between the sender and the sent, the Father and the Son, through the incarnation of the Logos, gave greater prominence to the difference, and spoke of the sender as addressing him the sent. Examples of a similar deviation from the form, for the purpose of a closer approximation to the substantial reality, we have already pointed out in the discourses of the Saviour (see the remarks on Zech. 13:7). Moreover, this very deviation is a proof of the most lively consciousness on the part of Christ of the essential unity with the Father. For how could, he otherwise have applied to *himself* the words which Malachi has employed with reference to *God*?

In ver. 11, a comparison of the passage with Malachi will serve to show that there is no ground for the assumption, that in the words, ὁ δὲ μικρότερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν μείζων αὐτοῦ ἐστίν, the comparative is used for the superlative. If the least in the kingdom of heaven was greater than John, he cannot have been in the kingdom of heaven at all, and must have been without true repentance or true faith, the sole conditions of an entrance into the kingdom. Olshausen does not shrink from this conclusion. He describes the Baptist as a δίκαιος in the legal sense of the word, a true representative of the law, to whom the higher life of faith, even to the extent to which it was manifested in Abraham and Israel, and therefore the whole sphere of regeneration was entirely closed. But if we turn to Malachi, and notice his connection with Isaiah, the mission of such a preacher, who would have been in reality nothing but a sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal, would not certainly be appealed to as the strongest proof of the covenant faithfulness and mercy of God, unless, indeed, the intention was to carry out the doctrine of the *efficacia muneris irrogenitorum* to the furthest possible extent. He who is to prepare the way before another, must first have made a way in *his own* desert; he who is to turn the hearts of the children to the fathers, must first have been truly and thoroughly converted himself. Besides, as Lightfoot has shown, such a use of the comparative for the superlative is at variance with the rules of the language. The examples brought forward by Grotius (Luke 9:48 and Matt. 18:1) are not conclusive. If μείζων must be construed as a comparative, μικρότερος must be the same. And the description of John, as the greatest under the Old Testament, and yet less' than the least under the New Testament, would contain an inward contradiction. For even if the former refers primarily to official dignity (Luke 7:28, "Among those that are born of women, there hath not arisen a greater prophet," etc.), the possession of this presupposes maturity in the inward life. If this were not the case, there would be no ground of comparison at all. The true meaning is the following. John is the greatest under the Old Testament; but one who under the New Testament is *comparatively* small is greater than he: the spiritual quality of the man who occupied the highest place among the members of the Old Covenant is equal to that of one who occupies a comparatively inferior place among the members of the New Covenant, to whom the Spirit of Christ is given, a higher manifestation of the Spirit of God, which stands in the same relation to it as Elohim to Jehovah. Hence, according to the grammatical interpretation, the Baptist has his place expressly assigned him within the kingdom of God; and not only so, but even a higher

place than that occupied by the μικροὶ within it, the μικρότεροι, alone being greater than he. From this it follows that he had been the subject of regeneration, and that this belonged to the Old Testament quite as much as to the New. For regeneration is the indispensable condition of participation in the kingdom of God.

Ver. 13. “For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John.” The prophecy throws light upon this passage also. According to the former, in Elias the prophet there is both the highest concentration and also the conclusion of the preaching of repentance to Israel. The prophets and the law come to life once more in him; and the Lord himself appears, to bless the penitent, and for judgment (κρίσις, see chap. 4:4) upon the impenitent. This momentous day of decision has now arrived.

The expression, “if ye will receive it,” has frequently been adduced to support the opinion that a reappearance of Elijah is actually to take place at some future time. Olshausen observes, “The words, ‘if ye will receive it,’ point unmistakably to the fact that it was only in a certain sense that the Redeemer called him by this name—Elias, that ardent preacher of repentance, had as it were his antitype in John.” But the express declaration in ver. 10, “this is he of whom it is written,” where the prophecy of Malachi (chap. 3:1) respecting the forerunner of the Lord is directly referred to John, is sufficient in itself to render it probable that this view is incorrect. As the forerunner and Elias must evidently be identical, whatever applies to the one must be applicable to the other also. We obtain still greater certainty from ver. 15, “he that hath ears to hear let him hear.” This phrase is always employed in connection with a subject, the meaning of which does not lie upon the surface, and for the understanding of which something more is required than merely the outward ear (for proofs of this see the *Dissertation on Daniel*, p. 211, 212, translation). Accordingly, the words, “if ye will receive it,” serve to intimate that the truth about to be announced is one which cannot be forced upon a person’s mind or drummed into his head, but for the comprehension and reception of which a willing heart is also indispensable. The carnally-minded, who were destitute of this, were constantly ready with their “Elias is Elias,” that they might shut their eyes to the fearful fact that the time of decision had arrived, and might not be frightened out of the pleasant slumber of false security. The phrase, “he that is able to receive it, let him receive it” (Matt. 19:12), is perfectly analogous (see the *Dissertation on Daniel*, p. 212). Ability and willingness are most intimately associated. The truth is not dependent upon either. The true explanation has been given by Lightfoot, Heumann, and others. In the words of the former, “the expression implies a kind of suspicion that they would not receive this doctrine; ‘and we have a proof of this in the obstinacy with which “the nation, even to this day, clings to the expectation of the personal advent of Elias.”—It follows, therefore, that the expression, “if ye will receive it,” instead of modifying the assertion, “this is he,” rather tended to strengthen it, by showing that the failure to discover Elias in John proceeded from some fault in the disposition of the mind (for examples of a similar use of the phrase εἰ θέλετε δεῖξασθαι by classical authors, see Wetstein *in loc.*).

### MATTHEW 14:2, 16:14

In the former of these passages, Herod expresses the opinion that Christ is John the Baptist risen from the dead; in the latter, the same opinion is expressed by some of the people. The source of this opinion is apparently to be looked for in the prophecy of Malachi. Elias the prophet is represented there as appearing first, and as followed by the Lord himself, who comes to punish and to bless. Now, as it was generally supposed that Elias the prophet was simply an individual, and as it was also believed that Elias had

reappeared in John, there appeared to be no other way of explaining the existence of another preacher of repentance, who was indisputably sent from God, than by assuming that John had come to life again, or that a second incarnation of Elias had taken place in him; in other words, that there were two distinct manifestations of Elias in John and Christ, the latter more glorious than the former. The truth which lay at the foundation of this error was that, from one point of view, the work of Christ, as well as that of John, was actually included in the prophecy of Malachi.

## MATTHEW 17

The appearance of Elias, along with Moses, as the representative of the prophetic order, is not altogether unconnected with our prophecy, the only one in which the two are so immediately connected together, the former as founder, the latter as restorer (chap. 4:4, “Moses, my servant;” ver. 5, “Elias, the prophet”).

The question put by the disciples in ver. 10, “Why then say the scribes that Elias must first come?” is correctly regarded by the majority of commentators as occasioned by the disappearance of Elias. His appearance threw the disciples into perplexity as to the previous assertion of Christ, that John was Elias; and his sudden disappearance they were unable to bring into harmony with the opinion of the scribes, which was founded upon the prediction of Malachi, namely, that Elias was to come before the Messiah, to engage in permanent and successful labours.

In the answer given by Christ, the former declaration that John is the Elias predicted by Malachi, is confirmed. The Saviour then removes another discrepancy “which appeared to exist between the fulfilment and the prophecy. The Elias of the prophecy was apparently to effect something far superior to what the Elias of the fulfilment actually had effected, namely, the turning back of the hearts of the fathers to the children, and of the hearts of the children to the fathers,—an ἀποκατάστασις on a large scale, and embracing everything. Into this expression the substance of chap. 4:6, according to our explanation, which lies at the foundation of it, is strikingly condensed. The manner in which the Saviour met this objection may be seen most clearly in the form in which his words are reported by Mark (chap. 9:12, 13): “And he answered and told them, Elias verily cometh first and restoreth (ἀποκαθιστᾷ) all things; and how is it written of the Son of man, that he must suffer many things, and be set at nought? But I say unto you, that Elias is indeed come, and they have done unto him whatsoever they listed, as it is written of him.” The present ἀποκαθιστᾷ in this passage, and the future ἀποκαταστήσει in Matthew, show very clearly with what justice the inference has been drawn from the expression ὁ μέλλων ἔρχεσθαι in Matt. 11:14, that there will be a future appearance of Elias. In both passages the Saviour determines the meaning of the prophecy from itself, irrespectively of the fulfilment. The objection, that “In the prophecy there is merely an announcement of the gift and grace of God, and his purpose in sending Elias, the full realization of which is rendered impossible by sin (compare Luke 7:30, “The Pharisees and the lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, not being baptised of him”), is merely answered indirectly by a reference to the predictions of the Scriptures, respecting the severe sufferings of the Messiah which proceed from the same cause, by which the greater part of the nation is excluded from the salvation intended for *all*, namely from sin. The Saviour goes somewhat further. He shows that John *could* not be Elias, if he did not endure opposition, rejection, and sufferings at the hand of sinners. “When the prophet calls the Baptist Elias, he intends that at the same time it shall be understood that there

will not be wanting either Ahabs or Jezebels” (Grotius). In this world of sin, hatred and persecution are the necessary consequence of the preaching of repentance, and the strength of the hatred is always proportioned to the earnestness and force of the preaching. Hence all the opposition endured by Elias<sup>94</sup> is to be regarded as a visible prophecy of the fate of John. If John resembles Elias in the earnestness of his demand for repentance, he must also resemble him in the sufferings and persecution which he endures. It was arranged by the providence of God that the *essential* equality which necessarily existed should also assume a definite form, that Ahab should reappear in Herod,<sup>95</sup> and Jezebel in Herodias. Olshausen is of opinion that the history of Elias cannot be regarded as typical of that of John, because the former did not suffer a martyr’s death. But this objection is perfectly analogous to the one which the disciples founded upon the fact, that no ἀποκατάστασις could be pointed out. As in the one case we have only to look at the will of God, so in the other we must look only at that of men. But in this respect Jezebel completely resembled Herodias. She was very desirous of putting Elijah to death, and the fact that God delivered him out of her hands does not make the least difference. The hatred was the same, and upon this everything depends. The sufferings of Elijah were also quite as great. He would certainly rather have died once for all, than have died daily. In fact, he once entreated of God, as the greatest favour, that he might die.

### **MATTHEW 12:12, AND JOHN 2:13-22**

In both these passages we have an account of Christ driving the buyers and sellers from the temple. In Matthew, just as in Mark and Luke, it is placed at the end of Christ’s ministry; in John, at the commencement.

We may see at the first glance that these are symbolical acts. They would otherwise be indefensible. In fact, Origen was led to deny the historical credibility of the accounts, in consequence of his failing to keep this distinctly in mind; and Lampe, for the same reason, brings forward a considerable number of difficulties, which he solves in a very unsatisfactory manner. Nothing but the most superficial observation could have led any one to regard the abuses, which existed in the outward temple, as the immediate object of Christ’s attack. If we look at the whole state of things in existence at that time, we shall see that it was a matter of comparative indifference whether a few buyers and sellers, more or less, transacted their business in the temple. An intimate acquaintance with human nature shows, that every kind of outward purification, unless preceded by an inward one, is thoroughly useless. Of what avail is it to keep hack for a time the water of a brook, if the fountain itself is not stopped up? To overlook the symbolical meaning of the transaction is derogatory to Christ, especially as such an outward mode of proceeding would have encouraged the disciples to have recourse to similar acts of a merely outward character. A John the Baptist never acted like this. With him repentance is always a thorough change of the disposition and character. How much less then could the Saviour act in this manner, when his own words, “first make the tree good,” put the stamp of worthlessness upon every attempt at a merely outward reformation. But if we look upon the whole affair as symbolical, it assumes a totally different aspect. The abuses in the temple come into consideration in that case, merely as representing the sin of the covenant nation, and gross sins were better adapted for this purpose than such as were more refined, though the latter might really be far worse in themselves.

But what is the meaning of the repetition of this symbolical action? Here is a new rock on which many have foundered. They start with the assumption that the meaning in both cases is the same. By this assumption they put weapons into the hands of those who, like

Liicke, change the two occurrences into one, thus impugning the credibility of the evangelists, and suppose the chronological data to have been lost by tradition.

They are both connected with the prophecies of Malachi, and merely embody a twofold figure which is employed by him. Under the figure of a double purification of the temple, he announces a double purification of the theocracy. There first appears the messenger of the Lord, who prepares the way before him,—that is, the way *to* the temple and *into* the temple, since it is to the temple that the Lord afterwards comes,—and then the Lord himself, even the angel of the covenant, suddenly appears, who purifies and refines the children of Levi, and draws near to the sinners to judgment. The actual meaning of the two representations is subsequently given in plain terms in chap. 4:5, 6. Elijah the prophet first appears, and seeks to rectify everything (*reformation*); he is then followed by the Lord himself, who smites the land with the curse (*revolution*). The messenger makes the last attempt to sanctify the Lord *in* his people, and then the Lord sanctifies himself *en* those upon whom this attempt has produced no effect. Now by the first act the Saviour declared that the idea, of which John had hitherto been the representative, namely, the mercy of God, which calls sinners to repentance, was most completely realized in himself. By the second he declared that he was now about to unfold the other side of his nature, that he would no longer act as a prophet, but as the Lord and angel of the covenant, and would destroy the obdurate sinners. It was certainly not without a reason that in both instances the covenant festival, the feast of the Passover, was close at hand. On the first occasion, the despisers of the covenant were threatened with the destroying angel conditionally (compare the expression, “lest I come,” in Malachi), namely, if they did not restore the covenant, the only thing that could secure his passing them by; in the other case the threat is absolute.

That our explanation of the first expulsion is correct, is most obvious from the whole connection in which the account stands. That, at that time, the ministry of Christ resembled chiefly that of John, that its central point was the demand for repentance (“repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand”), is evident from Matt. 4:17. With such a ministry as this, a symbolical declaration of the unconditional decree of destruction, at the very outset, would have been altogether irreconcilable, since any symbolical action performed on entering upon an office must necessarily embody a prediction of the work about to be performed. The quotation in John 2:17, from Ps. 69:10, must also be borne in mind. From this it is evident that the first act was not one befitting Christ alone. This passage could not have been quoted in connection with the second. We have here no longer the culminating point of those labours which were common to all the true servants of God (compare the expression used by Elijah, “I have been very *jealous* for the Lord”), but a work peculiar to Christ, the Angel of the Covenant. We should also observe the mild expression employed on the first occasion, as compared with that which is used in connection with the second. In John the temple is called “a house of merchandize;” in the first three evangelists, “a den of thieves.” In the latter greater prominence is given to the contrast between the reality and the idea, which rendered the continuance of the former absolutely impossible.

In the second instance also, the meaning must be determined from the circumstances. It happened immediately after the entrance of Christ into Jerusalem as a king, and constituted a positive declaration that his prophetic labours were drawing to an end. Just as his entrance had symbolized the immediate fulfilment of the prediction of Zechariah, *announcing salvation*, the sole object of which was to set forth the relation of the Saviour

to his own disciples, so did his entrance into the temple symbolize the approaching fulfilment of the threatening prophecy of Malachi.<sup>96</sup> It is the Lord and angel of the covenant who comes to *his* temple. Closely connected with this (Matt. 21:18-20) there is another symbolical action, the cursing of the fig-tree, the meaning of which is precisely the same, and which embodies the figure contained in Mic. 7:1, where we may find an explanation of the much tortured ὁ γάρ καιρὸς οὐκ ἦν σύκων of Mark. The prophet goes to look *after* the harvest, and finds nothing. In the case of the spiritual fig-tree, it is its own fault if it is not the time of figs. All that follows is of the same description. The purification of the temple forms the commencement of a whole series of discourses, symbolical actions, and parables, all relating to the same subject. The Pharisees are never introduced as the objects of any reformatory efforts. The reckoning is represented in every instance as already closed; the staff is broken, the sentence pronounced. In Matt. 23:38, the Saviour expresses in words precisely the same as he here sets forth in deeds, “Behold your house is left unto you desolate.” The temple is represented here as the home of the whole nation, the previous inhabitants of which have been expelled (compare Luke 19:2-7).—The fact of John’s omitting to mention the second incident may be explained on the ground that, so far as the history of the closing part of the ministry of Christ was concerned, whilst the first evangelists described it more according to its outward aspect, and therefore narrated all the events to which the purification of the temple formed an introduction, John confined himself more to that which was internal, of which the entrance into Jerusalem might be regarded as the superscription.

Josephus (*Wars of the Jews*, 5. 9. 4) says, “You have not avoided so much as those sins that are usually done in secret, I mean thefts and treacherous plots against men, and adulteries. You are quarrelling about rapines and murders, and in vent strange ways of wickedness. *Nay, the temple itself is become the receptacle of all.*” Here, then, we have the “den of thieves” once more, a description which is sufficient in itself to show the symbolical character of the whole transaction. It proves that those whom the Redeemer expelled were simply the representatives of far greater and more hardened sinners. And, as we have already said, the reason why *these* representatives in particular were chosen, is to be found in the fact that the Lord had Zech. 14:21 in his mind as well as Mal. 3:1.

Lastly, we need hardly direct attention to the tangible proof afforded by these two purifications of the temple, of the correctness of the explanation which we have given of the prophecy of Malachi, so far as its leading features are concerned, especially with reference to the identity of “my messenger” and Elias; or to the explanation which Christ here gives with reference to his own divine nature, by performing on the second occasion the work, which Malachi ascribes to the Lord and Angel of the Covenant, as a work peculiarly his own.

#### MATTHEW 21:24

*“And Jesus answered and said unto them, I also will ask you one thing, which if ye tell me, I in like wise will tell you by what authority I do these things.”*

The explanation generally given by commentators is that the words, “I also will ask you one thing,” etc., are simply a counter-question, with which, in their opinion, the Lord dismissed the Pharisees, and evaded their inquiry. But if we compare the prophecy of Malachi, we shall see that the counter-question contained at the same time a *reply* to their inquiry, or at least furnished the groundwork of such a reply. For if John received his authority to baptize, that is, to preach repentance and impart the forgiveness of sins, from

God; if he was the messenger sent by God (compare the expression “from heaven”), the Elijah, who was to turn the hearts, —then the infinitely greater follower, who was to come immediately (ἐξαιφνης) after the forerunner, must be already in existence; and if this was the case, who else could he be but Christ, who had already proved himself to be so both by words and deeds. This evasive reply was naturally followed by the declaration “neither do I tell you.” They showed plainly enough that their hearts were not turned. Without faith in the divine mission of John, they could not believe in Christ for the very same reason, that belief in the former would necessarily have led to belief in the latter. They had not said A, and therefore could not say B, and every attempt to lead them to do so would have been in vain.

### LUKE 1:16, 17

The angel says to Zechariah: “*And many sons of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God. And he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just, to make ready a people prepared for the Lord.*”

The two principal passages in Malachi relating to the coming of John (chap. 3:1, and 4:5, 6) are here combined. To the former belongs, first of all, the clause, “And he shall go before him (ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ),” where the αὐτοῦ refers to the κύριος ὁ θεός, which goes before; a fresh proof of the divinity of Christ and his identity with the Lord and the angel of the covenant. To the first passage also belongs the last clause ἔτοιμάσαι, etc., which is to be regarded as a paraphrase of פָּנֵה דָרָךְ, “he shall prepare thy way.” Grotius explains this clause as meaning, “A people ready to receive the kingdom of heaven;” and Bengel says, “The people is to be made ready, lest the Lord, finding the people not ready for him, should crush them with his majesty.” All the rest belongs to the second passage. The careful manner in which the words, “And he shall turn the hearts of the fathers to their children, and the hearts of the children to their fathers,” are explained, apparently presupposes the existence at that time of misinterpretations such as we find, in fact, in all the Jewish expositors, from the Septuagint downwards, and also in most of the Christian. First of all, the essential element of the whole is brought out in the words, “he will turn to the Lord their God.” The restoration of their union with God through true conversion lays the foundation for the restoration of the union between the *pious* fathers and their *ungodly* children. Further light is then thrown upon the thought in its more particular form. This is done by the omission of the second half of the passage in Malachi, namely, the clause, “and the heart of the children to their fathers,” which is necessarily implied in the first half, inasmuch as the relation is a mutual one—and substituting in its place the explanatory words καὶ ἀπειθεῖς ἐν φρονήσει δικαίων. The ἀπειθεῖς were the existing rebellious generation; the δίκαιοι their pious ancestors. φρόνησις is used in the sense of *disposition*. “In the disposition,” etc., is equivalent to “so that they will have the disposition.” The ordinary construction of verbs of motion with ἔ, when the object moving remains in the place to which it moves, is perfectly analogous. “The angel says, *in* the prudence, not *into* the prudence. The *feeling* (*sensus*) of those who are just, is immediately *put on* in conversion.” Hence the hearts of the fathers are brought back to the children, that is, the bond of affection is restored between them, in consequence of the pious dispositions of the former being reproduced in the latter. By this means they become a “people prepared.” Particular attention should also be paid to the πολλούς. Care is taken here to guard against a mistaken notion, which the Saviour afterwards expressly condemns—namely, the idea that a *universal ἀποκατάστασις* was to be expected from the



forerunner of the Lord, an idea which would never have existed if the fact had not been overlooked that Malachi simply speaks of the gift and purpose of God. The words, “in the spirit and power of Elias,” were also as thoroughly opposed as any of the rest to the notions prevalent at the time. They teach that “the flesh profiteth nothing.” Wherever the *pars melior* of Elias, his spirit and power, may be, there is Elias himself.

### LUKE 1:43

*“And whence is this to me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me.”*

By direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit (ver. 41), Elizabeth recognised *the Lord* in the unborn child of Mary, who, because he was *the Lord*, was also *her Lord*, the *Angel of the Covenant* foretold by Malachi, and whose advent had been announced by the angel. Such a recognition as this belonged to the same sphere as its object, and equally transcended the limits of nature.

### JOHN 1:6

*“There was a man sent from God, whose name was John.”*

In the expression ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ θεοῦ, there is evidently an allusion to the words of Malachi, “Behold I *send* my messenger before me.” The whole of the description which follows forms a simple commentary upon his prophecy. A verbal reference is apparent again in ver. 9.

### JOHN 1:9

*“That was the true light, which lighteth every man coming into the world.”*

Why does John say ἦν . . . ἐρχόμενον (was . . . coming) and not more briefly and clearly ἦλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον (he came into the world)? The reply is, that the former gives greater prominence to the connection with the prophecy. The great ἐρχόμενος (the coming one) was in every mouth, σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος; (art thou the coming one?) Matt. 11:3, ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος in vers. 15, 27, 30 of this chapter. The evangelist retains the form, of the prophecy, but shows by the ἦν which he prefixes that it had already been fulfilled, he *was* a coming one. The elaborate way in which the relation between John and Christ is afterwards described evidently refers chiefly to Malachi, and is intended to hold up Christ as the Lord and Angel of the Covenant foretold by Malachi, an intention which was more likely to exist in the case of John the theologian than in that of the other evangelists. The contrast between the heavenly and the earthly one is made as marked as possible (compare the ἄνθρωπος in ver. 6, which is. certainly not equivalent to τίς in *this* connection).

### JOHN 1 VER. 15 COMPARED WITH VER. 39

*“John bare witness of him, and cried, saying, This was he of whom I spake, he that cometh after me is preferred before me; for he was before me.”*

*“This is he of whom I said) After me cometh a man which is preferred before me; for he was before me”* (Ἐμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν, ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν).

My successor is my predecessor, for he is (according to the very prophecy which forms the centre of my own existence) infinitely older than I. John alludes to Mal. 3:1, where the sacred enigma to which he gives utterance here was already to be met with. He who follows “my messenger” (ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἔρχόμενος) also sends “my messenger.” He is therefore his predecessor, and, as the Lord and Angel of the Covenant is infinitely older than he, or rather than everything else in existence (for an explanation of πρῶτός μου, compare ἐν ἄρχῇ ἦν). There is nothing like tautology here. The absolute pre-existence, which is clearly implied in the names, “the Lord” and “Angel of the Covenant,” that occur in the original prophecy, constitutes the *antecedent*. We have no ground, therefore, for interpreting ἔμπροσθέν as denoting superiority in rank, an explanation for which we can find no warrant either in Gen. 48:20, or in the passages which Lücke has quoted from Plato.—If the Baptist everywhere expressed the firm conviction that the Messiah was the Lord and Angel of the Covenant foretold by Malachi, we cannot possibly see on what ground it can be maintained that he had no clear or well defined idea of his divinity. And if the Baptist was not ignorant of the divinity of the Messiah, if it was because he was *aware* of it that he declared πρῶτός μου ἦν; then whenever we meet with the assertion, “The Baptist was certainly not thinking of the λόγος when he used the words πρῶτός μου ἦν,” we must erase the *not* to make it correct. A time will come when the artistically constructed edifice into which the doctrine of the λόγος has been built in modern times will have to be pulled to pieces, and the materials used for a little outhouse adjoining the principal building, which will be formed exclusively of stones taken from the Old Testament. In fact, if they were lost altogether, no harm would be done to the *question* itself, and only some trifling injury in cases where verbal criticism was concerned. That in “the Lord, even the Angel of the Covenant,” predicted by Malachi—(as explained by everything contained in the Old Testament with reference to the “Angel of Jehovah”)—the essence of *his* Logos is fully contained, is shown clearly enough by the evangelist in the fact that he takes the words of Malachi as the basis of the remarks which he has made upon the subject of the Logos.

### JOHN 1:21-23

*“And they asked him, art thou Elias? And he saith, I am not. Art thou that prophet? And he answered, No. Then said they unto him, Who art thou? that we may give an answer to them that sent us. What sayest thou of thyself? He said, I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, make straight the way of the Lord, as said the prophet Esaias.”*

In what has already been stated, we have sufficient evidence that the Baptist merely gave a *negative* answer to the question whether he were Elias, on the ground that those who asked it had in their minds the false notion of a personal reappearance of Elias himself. We would only remark, in addition, that to the *relative* denial in this case, a *relative* affirmation (in ver. 23) is immediately afterwards opposed. For by declaring himself to be “the voice crying in the desert,” as foretold by Isaiah, he at the same time asserts that he is the Elias, and “my messenger,” predicted by Malachi. The proof of this is also to be found in what has already been said. We have shown that the prophecy of Malachi is merely a resumption of that of Isaiah, and that it was constantly referred to in this light by the Baptist, by Christ, and by his apostles. There can be no doubt whatever that John regarded the κύριος of Isaiah as the Christ, and therefore also as truly God.

### JOHN 1:27

“He it is, who, coming after me, is preferred before me, whose shoes latchet I am not worthy to unloose.”

“It was the *duty of a slave* to carry the sandals of his *lord*, and to untie them when they were taken off.” He who is represented by Malachi as first sending “my messenger,” and then coming himself, is יהוה, the Lord; for him, therefore, the service rendered by a servant to a lord is far too small.

### JOHN 1:31

“And I knew him not: but that he should be manifested unto Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water.”

The allusion to Isa. 40:5 is unmistakeable here,—a fresh proof of the knowledge possessed by John of the divinity of the Messiah. The design of his baptism, which was equivalent to the preparing of the way announced by Isaiah, the latter being a figurative description, the former a symbol (*Verkörperung*, lit. embodiment) of repentance, was to manifest the glory of the Lord, which was now concealed. This allusion is rendered the more certain by comparing the words in chap. 2:11, “and manifested forth his glory.” In the miracle of Christ recorded there, John perceived a fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaiah respecting the “manifestation of the glory of the Lord.” As Christ is Jehovah, the manifestation of the glory of Christ necessarily involves a manifestation of the glory of Jehovah.

### 1 COR. 16:22

“If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maran-atha.”

The word *Maran-atha*, which is so striking in an epistle written in Greek, and written to Greeks, is in itself a sufficient indication of an Old Testament foundation. The retention of the Aramean form can only be explained on the supposition that it was a kind of watchword common to all the believers in Israel; and no expression could well have come to be so used if it had not been taken from the Scriptures. There can hardly be any doubt that it actually was taken from Mal. 3:1. We have already shown that this passage was regarded as the basis of the anticipation of the *coming* of the Lord. And to this we may add, that ἦτω ἄναθεμα is evidently also taken from Malachi, namely, from chap. 4:6, where there is a similar reference to *coming*. For the preparation of the way, and the turning of the hearts mentioned by Malachi, the apostle substitutes love to the Lord Jesus. They both refer to the same thing, though in different relations. One cannot be conceived of without the other.

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX I—IMPORTANCE OF THE MESSIANIC PROPHECIES

THE term Messianic is derived from Ps. 2: 2 and Dan. 9: 25, 26, where the Redeemer is called משיח, “anointed one.” In the symbolical phraseology of the Scriptures, anointing represents the communication of the gifts of the Holy Spirit. The kings of Israel, especially, were called anointed men, because they received a peculiarly abundant measure of the Spirit for their exalted office, whenever they opened their hearts to the grace of God. In Ps. 84:10, and 132:10, 17, David is called the anointed of the Lord, with reference to the occurrence recorded in 1 Sam. 16:13, 14, where the figure is embodied in

a symbolical action; and the whole family of David is similarly described in Ps. 18:51, 89:39, 52; Hab. 3:13; and Lam. 4:20. In the highest sense, however, this term was applied to him in whom the family of David reached its culminating point, and who received the Holy Spirit without measure. (John 3:34; compare Isa. 11:1.)

When we observe that the Messianic announcements, which are peculiar to Israel alone, have their origin in the primeval age; that for many successive centuries they continue to reappear again and again; that they do not occur merely incidentally, and in an isolated form in the midst of other prophecies, but constitute the very centre and soul of all prophecy; that they stand out in great prominence even in the Psalms, in which utterance is given to the living faith of the people of God, under the quickening influence of the law and the prophets,—we cannot for a moment doubt that to the people of the ancient covenant the anticipation of a Messiah must have been one of all-absorbing importance.

1. The members of the ancient covenant were in imminent danger of looking merely at the present, and indulging, in consequence, a spirit of narrow-minded exclusiveness, which could not fail to lead to the most disastrous results. It led them, on the one hand, to form low and unworthy conceptions of God, and to detract from either his love or his power (for if the God of Israel were to be regarded as nothing more than this, he would cease to be God altogether); and, on the other, to form extremely pernicious ideas of their own merits, since it was very natural that, supposing the pre-eminence of Israel above the heathen nations to be permanent in its character, they should trace it to a certain innate superiority, which rendered them more worthy than any other to be the recipients of the grace of God. It was of the utmost importance, therefore, for the maintenance of a living faith in Israel, that its view should be directed beyond the preparatory institutions to the ultimate issue, in order that the means should be fully recognised as means and nothing more. Hence, even before the establishment of the Old Testament economy, it was distinctly announced, and after its establishment the fact was again impressed upon the minds of the people, that the peculiar relation in which God stood to Israel was merely a temporary one; that the day would come when the Redeemer and King of the whole world would appear; and that, until the time of his appearance, the form assumed by the kingdom of God was merely provisional. The necessity for this announcement is especially obvious when we observe how, notwithstanding these lucid prophecies, the greater portion of the Jews were blinded by a carnal mind, and were the victims of the most disastrous exclusiveness.

2. The announcement of the Messiah was one of the means employed to maintain the fidelity of the nation towards the Lord in the midst of troublous circumstances. Proclaimed by the different messengers sent by God with the confidence produced by the Holy Ghost, depicted in the most glowing colours, and brought, as it were, from the future into the present, the Messiah became more and more the banner around which all the downcast, the spiritually downcast of Judah and the dispersed of Israel, collected together. Thus, for example, in Isa. 7:14, the image of Immanuel is placed before the eyes of the nation, which is in despair on account of Aram and Ephraim. And thus also do Jeremiah (in chap. 23:5, 6) and Ezekiel (in chap. 34:23) comfort those who are terrified at the aspect of the imperial power, by directing their minds to the coming Redeemer. And if it not infrequently happens that the prophets administer consolation by pointing to joyous events of an inferior kind in the immediate future, they almost always come back to this as the most important, the condition of all the rest, the centre of all the hopes of salvation. For example, when the existence of the nation is threatened by Assyria, Isaiah first of all

predicts the overthrow of Assyria in chap. 10:5-34, and then in chap. 11 points to the complete salvation to be effected in Christ for the people of God, which constitutes the pledge of every inferior communication of blessing. This design of the Messianic prophecies had respect to the entire nation, and was partially secured even when they were falsely interpreted in consequence of a misapprehension of their figurative disguise. For that portion of the nation whose Messianic expectations were for the most part sinfully carnal was thereby preserved from outward apostasy; and even this was of consequence, since the maintenance of the outward form of the kingdom of God was the primary condition of the coming of Christ, and, in addition to this, the kernel was protected by the shell.

3. The glaring contrast between the idea of the nation of God and the form which it actually assumed during the whole of the Old Testament period, would inevitably have given rise to erroneous opinions as to the former if the fact had not been forcibly impressed upon the minds of the people, by the constantly repeated announcement of the Messiah, that the contrast was only a transient one. In the outward condition of the nation, this contrast was especially apparent. The nation of God, which, from the very fact that it was such, was necessarily called to universal dominion, was for many a long and anxious century kept in subjection by the powers of the world. The “kingdom of priests” groaned in utter prostration under the oppression of the heathen. Such a state of things would have been intolerable if hope had not furnished a counterpoise. From this point of view, for example, Isaiah predicts, in chap. 2:2-4, that the kingdom of God, which is now despised, will be exalted in the days of the Messiah above all the kingdoms of the world, and will become an object of desire even to the proud heathen themselves. From the same point of view, Daniel also announces, in chaps. 2 and 7, that the kingdom of Christ will follow the four kingdoms of the world, and bring in the world-wide dominion of the people of God. Haggai, again, in chap. 2:1-9, points to the completion of the kingdom of God in Christ as a solace to the people, who have just been awakened to a consciousness of the glaring contrast between the idea and the reality, by the comparative insignificance of the new temple. When Amos has foretold (in chaps. 9, 11, and 12) the passing away of every kind of glory from Israel and Judah, he passes at once to an announcement of the restoration of the tabernacle of David and the extension of the kingdom of God far beyond the limits of the heathen. The hope that the time would arrive when the actual condition of the nation of God would be brought into harmony with its primary idea, could never have taken root, unless in the reference to the person of a mediator, at once human and divine, there had been given a pledge of the reality of such a hope, which could not have been realized in any other way;—unless, in fact, this exalted person had been placed before the eyes of the people in as distinct a form as possible, and the *Logos* had, as it were, become a partaker of flesh and blood in this prophetic announcement, even before the period of his incarnation.

At the same time, there was no less ground for anxiety on account of the contrast between the true idea of the nation of God and its visible realization in a *moral* point of view. Under the Old Testament, the nation of God was still, to a great extent, destitute of the gifts which are its essential characteristics, and by which it is distinguished from the world. The righteous and the wicked were also mixed up together, and in most ages the latter had the upper hand. But if this contrast were regarded as permanent, as surely as the commandment, “Be ye holy, for I am holy,” involved a promise, so surely would the contrast give rise to errors respecting the kingdom of God. In allusion to this, Joel announces that in the times of the Messiah the Lord will pour out his Spirit upon all flesh;

Jeremiah speaks of the new covenant, which will be attended by more abundant provisions of transforming grace; and Ezekiel declares that in future the Lord will take away the heart of stone, and give in its place a heart of flesh. But these hopes would never have acquired their proper consistency if there had not been set before the mind, in the personal appearance of the Redeemer, a new and hitherto unheard of union between heaven and earth, and between God and man. In this alone could a reasonable basis for such hopes be found. But along with the inwardly-transforming power, an outwardly-sifting and judicial process must take place, even to remove the existing contrast so far as morality was concerned. It is from this point of view that we are to understand such announcements as that of the Messianic judgment in Zech. 5 and 11, and that of the destruction of the city and temple in Dan. 9. "Thy people all righteous;" this is a necessary postulate of the kingdom of God, which is sure to be realized in due time, though possibly not till the development is complete. The wheat must eventually be separated from the chaff, and the latter burned up with unquenchable fire.

4. The announcement of a Messiah contained within itself the strongest motives of an ethical description. As the Messianic era was represented as the consummation alike of blessing and of punishment, the contemplation would inevitably act in the case of the righteous as a powerful impulse to steadfastness, and in that of the wicked as an impulse to conversion. We may learn from Mic. 2:12, 13, 4:1-8; Isa. 40:3-5; and Mal. 3:19 sqq., in what manner the prophets availed themselves of this announcement as a motive to repentance.

5. Even under the Old Testament, the gospel, which proclaims the forgiveness of sins through the mercy of God, existed side by side with the law. How greatly then must it have facilitated the acceptance of mercy in the case of those in whom the object of the law had been secured, to have the condition of salvation, the coming of him who was to bear their sins as he has borne our own, placed before their minds in such prophecies as that contained in the 53d chapter of Isaiah! That the prophecy did answer its end in this respect is evident, to take a single example, from John the Baptist, who bore witness, on the simple ground of Isa. 53, to "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." According to Luke 1:77, forgiveness of sins was the centre of all the hopes of salvation indulged by the more earnest minds.

6. But the principal design of the Messianic prophecies was to prepare in such a way for the coming of Christ, that, when he should come, he might at once be recognised from a comparison of prophecy with its fulfilment. And the very fact that, notwithstanding this preparation, the greater portion of the people failed to recognise him, is in itself a proof of its necessity. As it was, the only persons who did not receive him were such as had lost their capacity for an impartial examination of prophecy and history through their ungodliness of mind. But if there had been no signs at all, the recognition would have been rendered infinitely difficult even to the *upright in heart*. The importance of the Messianic prophecies from this point of view is attested by New Testament authorities. "When John the Baptist says, in John 1:20, "I am not the Christ," he points to Jesus as the Christ. As Bengel says, "By thus limiting his speech . . . (*I*) ... he gives a handle to the thought which suggests itself, that the Christ is not far off." He speaks of Him with evident allusion to the prophecies of the Old Testament, as he, who, coming after him, was before him" ( Jn 1:27vers. 27, 30), and with a reference to Isa. 53 as "the Lamb of God." Andrew, his disciple, on the strength of what he has heard from him, says to his brother Simon in ver. 41, "we have found the Messiah." It is true that Christ himself

teaches that the first prerequisite to a recognition of himself is a certain state of mind, which creates a susceptibility for the outward proofs of his divine mission (John 7:17), and traces the unbelief of the Jews to the fact, that this is not their state of mind (John 5:39-47); see vol. i. p. 99. He represents himself as the promised Messiah, in John 4:25, 26; Matt. 26:63, 64, and 11:3 sqq. In Luke 24:25, 26, he reproves the apostles as being "fools and slow of heart," because they do not discern the harmony between prophecy and its fulfilment, which is so conspicuous in his history. In Luke 24:45, he is said to "open their understanding" that they may understand "the prophecies relating to his person," and in this way to strengthen their faith. He sets forth these prophecies in various ways, describing their great importance as the force by which history is determined, in such words as these, "thus it is written," and "thus it *must* be;" Luke 24:26, 46, and Matt. 26:54. The importance which he attached to the agreement between prophecy and its fulfilment, as forming part of his credentials, is apparent from the fact that, on the occasion of his last entry into Jerusalem, he arranged all the incidents in such a way as to ensure an exact correspondence to the statements of prophecy, Matt. 21:1, and John 12:12-16.<sup>97</sup> The first of the evangelists brings forward proofs at the very outset that Jesus is the Christ, the Messiah promised in the Old Testament. This was the problem that had first of all to be solved. That Jesus was the Christ, was one of the leading topics in the preaching of the apostles (Acts 3:18, 10:43; 1 Cor. 15:3, 4; 2 Cor. 1:20). In Acts 26:22, Paul claims to obtain a hearing for his preaching of the gospel, on the ground that he says nothing but what Moses and the prophets have already foretold; and in ver. 27 he expressly asserts that whoever believes the prophets must of necessity believe in Christ as well.

There can be no doubt, therefore, as to the great importance of the Messianic prophecies, so far as the people of the Old Testament were concerned. But the question still remains whether they are of the same importance to the Christian Church. To this question an affirmative reply has been constantly and decidedly given. A passage written by the excellent Pascal may serve to exhibit the attitude which the Church has assumed towards these prophecies. In his *Pensées* (Art. 10, "Preuves de Jesus Christ par les Prophéties"), he says, "La plus grande des preuves de Jesus Christ ce sont les propriétés. C'est aussi à quo! Dieu a le plus pourvu; car l'événement qui les a remplies est un miracle subsistant depuis la naissance de l'Eglise jusqu' à la fin. Aussi Dieu a suscité des prophètes durant seize cents ans; et pendant quatre cents ans après, il a dispersé toutes ces prophéties avec tous les Juifs, qui les portaient, dans tous les lieux du monde.—Quand un seul homme aurait fait un livre des prédictions de Jésus-Christ, pour le temps et pour la manière, et que Jésus-Christ serait venu conformément à ces prophéties, ce serait une force infinie. Mais il y a bien plus ici. C'est une suite d'hommes qui, constamment et sans variation, viennent l'un en suite de l'autre, prédire ce même avènement. C'est un peuple entier, qui l'annonce." But, following the example of the rationalists, Schleiermacher in particular has broken away from this common conviction of the whole Christian Church.<sup>98</sup>

The question of primary importance here is whether there are really any Messianic prophecies in the Old Testament. Schleiermacher answers this in the negative. He found nothing but indefinite presentiments, utterances of a subjective consciousness of the need of redemption, "a yearning of human nature for Christianity," such as may be proved to have existed in heathenism as well. In making such an assertion, he placed himself in decided antagonism to the authority of Christ and his apostles. For it is evident, not only from the passages just quoted, but from many others which have been referred to in the course of this work, that they did acknowledge the existence of actual prophecies in the

Scriptures. And the fallacy of the assertion is quite as apparent, if we examine the prophecies themselves. We have brought forward proofs that the Scriptures contain a long series of genuine prophecies. Compare, for example, what has already been observed in vol. iii. p. 267 with reference to Zechariah's description of the future. Compare also Dan. 9, where the anointing of Christ with the Holy Ghost, his death, the forgiveness of sins to be secured by him, and the judgment to be executed on Jerusalem by a foreign prince, are announced. The nation from which the Redeemer is to arise is foretold in the Old Testament, and even the tribe (Gen. 49 and other passages), the family (first of all in 2 Sam. 7), the place (Mic. 5), and the *time of his birth*, viz. during the period of the political existence of Judah (see vol. i. p. 62), previous to the destruction of the second temple (Haggai), in the time of the fourth monarchy (Dan. 2:7), and in the seventieth week (Dan. 9). The prophets point out clearly and distinctly the *condition* of both the family and nation at the time of the coming of Christ, and fully agree in predicting that before that event all the glory of Israel will pass away (vol. i. p. 516), the tabernacle of David fall into ruins (Amos 9:11), and the line of David sink into the obscurity of private life (vol. ii. p. 110). The prophets foretell that with Christ's coming a new spiritual and vital principle will begin to work in the human race (Joel 3; Jer. 31:31-40; Ezek. 11:19), and history has confirmed the announcement. "All nations," says Pascal, "were sunk in infidelity and concupiscence; but the whole earth now burned with charity, princes forsook their glory, and girls endured martyrdom. Whence came this power? The Messiah had arrived." The prophets also place in connection with the coming of Christ a severe judgment upon Judah, and its expulsion from the Lord's own land (*e.g.* Zech. 5 and 11; Mal. 3). The fulfilment is before our eyes, as well as that of the prophecies which announce the spread of the kingdom of God among the heathen in the days of the Messiah, such, for example, as Ezek. 17:22-24, and Mal. 1:11, "from the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles."

Again, the assertion that an agreement between the prophecies and the actual result in matters of detail is of no importance whatever, is no more reconcilable with the authority of Christ and the apostles than the denial of the existence of genuine prophecies. For if this be the case, why is the harmony between prophecy and fulfilment expressly pointed out in connection with the most remarkable circumstances of the life of Christ? Why did Christ explain to his apostles, after his resurrection, the passages in all the Scriptures relating to his sufferings and glory? Why did he add, after saying to his disciples "all ye shall be offended because of me this night;" "for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad?" (Matt. 26:31) Why did he say to the disciples (ver. 54), "how then shall the Scriptures be fulfilled?" and to the crowd (ver. 56) "all this was done that the Scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled?" He that is of the truth will listen in this matter to the voice of him who has said, "I am the truth." If Schleiermacher's views were correct, how could it be recorded of the people at Berea as a thing deserving praise, that they carefully compared the gospel statements with the Scriptures of the Old Testament, "searching the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so." Philip would rather be deserving of blame for founding his address to the treasurer of Queen Candace upon Isa. 53. If it was a matter of importance to that age that the perfect agreement between prophecy and fulfilment should be clearly demonstrated, it is of no less importance now. This is obvious from the fact that the apostles themselves do not attach importance to it solely when they have to do with Jews, but also when writing and preaching to the Gentiles. In the present day, not merely the great mass of the Jews, but also a great portion of those who are living in outward fellowship with the Christian Church, are in just the same condition as the Jews of the time of Christ. They



have no true knowledge of Christ, but have yet to learn to know him. It is true that this knowledge can no more be obtained by them from the Messianic prophecies *alone* than by the Jews of that day. On the contrary, external evidence of the truth of Christianity, whatever its objective validity may be, can never accomplish anything without the existence of the only state of mind that can create a susceptibility for the impression, which evidence of this description is fitted to produce. But where this state of mind does exist, a perception of the harmony between prophecy and fulfilment may produce the most beneficial results. There is the less room to deny this on account of the clear testimony of history itself. Conscientious converts from Judaism are hardly ever to be met with, whose convictions are not to a great extent attributable to this.<sup>99</sup> And even in the case of many who had fallen victims to rationalistic unbelief, such prophecies as Isa. 53 have frequently afforded important aid in leading them back to the way of salvation. But the importance of the Messianic prophecies is not restricted to the first stages of Christian experience; it continues even in the case of such as are further advanced. For, on the one hand, there are none whose faith is so strong that they can afford to despise one of the means of fortifying it, which have been provided by God himself; and the more firmly a Christian holds by the *historical* Christ, and breaks away from the nebulous image of an ideal Saviour, who, if he want no credentials, can afford neither strength nor consolation, the greater is the improbability of his ever doing this. On the other hand, advanced Christians feel more and more the need of comprehending the divine institutions of salvation as a connected whole, and tracing the whole plan devised by the wisdom of God. This is a delightful study, full of incitement to seek the knowledge and love of God. In this nothing can be regarded as trivial, since even the smallest line acquires importance from its connection with the whole. There is nothing isolated; action and reaction are visible everywhere, and whilst light is thrown by the fulfilment upon the preparatory stages, the latter throw light upon the fulfilment in return.<sup>100</sup>

Another objection adduced by Schleiermacher against the Messianic prophecies is this, that we cannot desire to base our firm faith in Christianity upon our much weaker faith in Judaism. But Steudel has justly replied to this, that we do not attribute the force of proof to the prophecies themselves, but to the harmony between the prophecies and their fulfilment. And Sack (*Apologet.* p. 258) has pointed out the unscriptural character of the contrast which is thus drawn between Judaism and Christianity, by showing that prophecy forms no part of Judaism as dissociated with Christianity, but according to the New Testament view, the prophets are organs of the Holy Ghost, of the Spirit of Christ, who thus manifested himself to the Church of God through their instrumentality before his actual appearance in the flesh, 1 Pet. 1:11.

The really classical passage of the New Testament by which this thoroughly abnormal and unchristian theory of Schleiermacher is completely refuted, is contained in 2 Pet. 1:19-21, a passage the depth of which is a sufficient proof of its apostolical origin. "We have," says the apostle, "a more sure word of prophecy, 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; knowing this first, that no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation, for the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." The Messianic prophecies (that the "word of prophecy" relates especially to these, is evident from the connection with what precedes) are of *even greater importance* to Christians than to Jews. The word of prophecy is to them a *surer* word, since they can compare the predictions with the fulfilment. The apostle's preaching of Christ did not rest upon arbitrary speculations, but

according to ver. 16, upon the fact that the apostles were “eye-witnesses of his majesty.” From these historical facts the word of prophecy acquired still greater firmness and importance.—For this reason it is doubly advantageous to Christians to pay attention to those things from which Schleiermacher attempted with all his might to draw away the Church of Christ. The apostle does not say “ye did well,” but “ye do well.” It is not Jews but Christians whom he praises for giving heed to the word of prophecy, and that not merely as the foundation of faith, but also as the means of strengthening their belief. It could only lead to confusion<sup>101</sup> to connect ἕως οὔ, etc., with προσέχοντες, instead of φαίνοντι (compare Matt. 11:13). In this case the present would be unsuitable. The apostle is writing to those who already are, not to those who are to become, Christians, “to them that have obtained like precious faith with us” (ver. 1). Hence he does not say how long they are to be attentive, but how long the light has shined. The period when the light first shone in the dark place (a light which could only be kindled by the inspiration of God) was the coming of Christ in the flesh, when the day-star immediately rose in the hearts. It is to those on whom the day has dawned that the light shining in a dark place first gives a really brilliant light. (Bengel: “By the greater light the lesser is both acknowledged to be less, and is strengthened.”) The importance of Messianic prophecy depends upon the relation between the preparatory or preliminary stages and the thing itself, and this relation cannot be properly discerned till the fulfilment has taken place.—“Knowing this first” (=“First of all,” 1 Tim. 2:1), he who is ignorant of this is blind as to the whole affair, a blindness which is far more culpable since the day has dawned. What the apostle here represents as the *first* step, namely, the inspiration of God, without which it would be impossible to speak of a light shining in a dark place, is the very thing which Schleiermacher denies. For prophecy he substitutes a merely subjective presentiment; and in his estimation the “prophecy of the Scripture” is throughout ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως. It is evident from the passages in Philo, which may be found quoted in Wetstein and Knapp (e.g. προφήτης ἴδιον οὐδεν ἀποφθέγγεται, ἀλλότρια δὲ πάντα ὑπηξοῦντος ἐτέρου) and also from the entire context, that it is not to the interpretation of the prophets by others that the apostle here refers. The explanation is given afterwards: in prophecy throughout we have not a mere production of “Judaism,” or certain disclosures made by the prophets on their own authority. The prophecies of the Bible do not belong to the sphere of personal conjecture, like those of heathenism; and the prophets of the Scriptures are not, like the false prophets referred to in Jeremiah, to whom Schleiermacher’s theology would compare them, “prophets of their own heart.”

## APPENDIX II—MESSIANIC EXPECTATIONS AMONG THE HEATHEN

In heathen antiquity we find indications of a hope of the arrival of a period of restoration, and sometimes even of the coming of a personal redeemer. To these anticipations a certain independence has frequently been attributed. They have been placed on a level with those of the Bible, and traced to some primitive revelation. But a critical examination of the whole of the material in our possession<sup>102</sup> leads to the conclusion that all such expectations, so far as they have a definite character at all, and have any essential connection with those of the Bible, are merely the *echo of the latter*; just as in the case of the creation, the fall, the flood, and the tower of Babel, the result obtained from a truly critical investigation is, that the heathen analogies are not in any instance traceable to a primeval revelation, but, on the contrary, are invariably dependent upon the biblical accounts to which they present an analogy.

From the energy which characterized the belief in a coming Messiah among the Jews, we should naturally expect at the very outset that it would exert an influence in various ways upon the heathen world around; especially as the religious consciousness of the heathen was always distinguished by uncertainty, and resembled a soft clay, upon which impressions could easily be made by the stronger and more definite convictions of the people of revelation. An Old Testament proof of this dependence on the part of the heathen we find in the case of Balaam; a New Testament example in that of the Wise Men from the East. That the Messianic anticipations of the latter had no independent root is perfectly obvious. It is apparent from the evident connection between their star and that of Balaam (see my work on Balaam, p. 177, p. 480 translation). According to Matt. 2:2, they are seeking “the king of the Jews,” the ruler who is to come forth from the Jews and extend his kingdom from the midst of them. And where they expect the dominion to commence, *there* will the source of their expectations be found. They travel to Jerusalem to learn something more as to the new-born king; and if they go for further instruction to the centre of Jewish life, it must certainly have been from the same centre that the first impulse was received.

Let us direct our attention first of all to the nations of classical antiquity. Hesiod clearly anticipated the return of better days:

“Oh, that I had not been born a companion of the fifth of men! Oh, that I had died before, *or else had not been born so soon!* For the present race of men is one of iron! Zeus will also one day destroy this race of diverse men.”<sup>103</sup>

Among the Platonists and Stoics this expectation was subsequently developed into the doctrine of the great year of the universe.<sup>104</sup> On this subject Voss says, “The idea of a great year of the universe arose, and to a great extent took its shape, in part from the earlier descriptions which poets had given of four successive ages of the world, the golden, the silver, the brazen and the iron age, and in part also from the dreams of astrologers as to the influence of the stars upon the fate of men. The great year denoted the period of time in which all the stars and planets complete their revolutions and return to the same place in the heavens, ἀποκατάστασις, and thus bring back the previous order of events once more. It was called the great or greatest year, the celestial year or year of the universe, the year of the *soeculum*, and also the Platonic year.” This great year of the universe is evidently not an object of faith, but partly a poetic fancy, and partly a scientific or pseudo-scientific hypothesis.

Everything on classic ground, in which an actual agreement with the Messianic anticipations of the Bible is manifest, is unquestionably dependent upon the latter. This is especially true of the two well-known passages of Suetonius (*Vita Vespasiani*, chap. iv.: “percrebuerat oriente toto vetus et constans opinio esse in fatis ut eo tempore Judaea profecti rerum potirentur”) and Tacitus (*Historia*, 5. 13, “pluribus persuasio inerat, antiquis, sacerdotum literis contineri, eo ipso tempore fore ut valesceret oriens profectique Judaea rerum potirentur”). In Tacitus it is evident from the context that the reference must be to Jewish expectations. It is after relating some miraculous events, which had taken place among the *Jews*, that he says, “which things caused a few to fear; for they had a conviction in their minds that it was recorded in the writings of the ancient priests,” etc. The priests here referred to are the Jewish priests. The passage continues thus, “quae ambages Vespasianum ac Titum praedixerat. Sed vulgus more humanae cupidinis sibi tantam fatorum magnitudinem interpretati, ne adversis quidem ad vera mutabantur,” and we find the commentary upon the whole in the Jewish War of Josephus

(vi. c. 5, § 4), where he says, “But now, what did the most elevate them in undertaking this war, was an ambiguous oracle that was also found in their sacred writings, how *about that time* (Tacitus: eo ipso tempore fore) one from their country should become governor of the habitable earth. The Jews took this prediction to belong to themselves in particular, and many of the wise men were thereby deceived in their determination. Now this oracle certainly denoted the government of Vespasian, who was appointed emperor in Judaea.” We have already shown (vol. iii. p. 229) that the Jewish anticipations referred to by Josephus rested upon a prophecy of Daniel. We have all the more ground for tracing the opinion, mentioned by Suetonius, to the influence of this prophecy, from the fact that it was not restricted to the merely general notion that a Jewish empire would arise, but bore a more special character (esse in fatis ut *eo tempore* Judaea profecti rerum potirentur), and also from the fact that it was not a rumour of recent date, but had been handed down from ancient times. Moreover, it was not by any means fluctuating in its character, but assumed a fixed and constant shape, “percrebuerat oriente toto *vetus et constans* opinio.” We are thus shut up to Daniel’s prophecy of the seventy weeks of years, which was more than five centuries old (*vetus*), possessed an authority so trustworthy, that the belief reposed in it could not but be characterized by constancy (*constans*), and pointed precisely to that time (*eo tempore*).

The fourth eclogue of *Virgil* has frequently been adduced as a proof of the existence of certain Messianic anticipations of an independent character in classical antiquity. Virgil there appeals to the Sibylline books in support of his announcement, that the period predicted in the Cumsean Song is close at hand (ultima Cumaei venit jam carminis aetas), and that even during the consulship of Pollio, in whose honour the ode is composed, the expected boy will be born and the golden age return. (“Even during the consulship of Pollio, his son will appear as the firstfruits of the new creation, to occupy, along with other god-befriended heroes, the highest offices of the kingdom of peace in the reconciled and purified world:” Voss). The emperor Constantine believed this eclogue to contain a Messianic prediction, taken from the prophecies of the Cumsean Sibyl (see Eusebius, *Vit. Const.*, v. 19, 20). Augustine also maintains the same opinion in several places, but more especially in his *De Civitate Dei*, 10. 27, and *Epistola ad Martianum* (155), where he says, “Nam omnino non est, cui alteri praeter domirium Christum dicat genus humanum;

Te duce si qua manent sceleris vestigia nostril  
Irrita perpetua solvent formidine terras.

Quod ex Cumaeco, *i.e.* ex Sibyllino carmine se fassus est transtulisse Virgilius, quoniam fortassis ilia vates aliquid de unico salvatore in spiritu audierat, quod necesse habuit confiteri.” There can be no doubt that Virgil actually refers to a prophecy of the Cumaean Sibyl. The supposition that he alludes to Hesiod, whose father came from Cumae, is untenable, for this simple reason, that *a poet* is not a sufficient authority for the question in hand, and that the charm of the ode is derived from its being based, at least in appearance, upon a genuine *prophecy*. But whilst it is certain that Virgil refers to the Cumaean Sibyl, it is just as certain, on the other hand, that he does not allude to the ancient and genuine Sibylline prophecies. The latter had been consumed long before, when the capitol itself was burned (see Voss, p. 182 sqq.). But there were *forged* Sibylline prophecies in circulation even at this period, by means of which the Jews attempted to give validity to their national hopes among the heathen, and thus to secure respect for themselves. The proof of this has been furnished by Bleek in the *Theologische Zeitschrift von Schleiermacher*, etc., i. p. 148 sqq. A prophecy of this description, in

which the glory of the Messianic age is depicted, chiefly in accordance with Isa. 11, and which embraces the greater portion of the third of the Sibylline books, has been referred by Bleek (p. 236) to the years 170-168 before Christ, and in all essential points he is supported by Friedlieb (*Oracula Sib.*), and Hilgenfeld (*Die Jüdische Apocalypitik*, p. 57 sqq.). Now there is a most striking resemblance between this prophecy and the eclogue of Virgil. In the prophecy, just as in the eclogue, there is a combination of the Grecian doctrine of the ages of the world with other things that are unmistakably an echo of the Jewish anticipations (see Bleek, p. 167 sqq.). Pollio's son and Pollio himself, in connection with other god-befriended heroes, are described by Virgil as occupying just the same position which the pretended prophecy assigns to the Messiah and the chosen race. Compare, for example, the words of Virgil in ver. 7, —

“Jam nova progenies coelo demittitur alto,” and in vers. 48, 49:

“Aggredere o magnos (aderit jam tempus) honores,  
Cara deum soboles, magnum Jovis incrementum,”

with the following verses from the third of the Sibylline books (Gallaeus, p. 356):

“καὶ τότε ἔθνος μέγαλοιο Θεοῦ πάλι καρτερὸν ἔσται  
οἱ πάντεσσι βροτοῖσι βίου καθοδηγοὶ ἔσονται;”

and again

“καὶ τότε δὴ Θεὸς οὐρανόθεν πέμψει βασιλῆα;”

also (Gallaeus, p. 460):

“καὶ τότε ἀπ’ ἡελίοιο Θεὸς πέμψει βασιλῆα  
ὅς πᾶσαν γαῖαν πάνσαι πολέμοιο κακοῖ;”

and lastly (Gallaeus, p. 366):

“ἔστι δὲ τις φυλὴ βασιλῆιος, ἧς γένος ἔσται  
απατιστον καὶ τοῦτο χρόνοις περιτελλομένοισι  
ἀρξει καὶ καινὸν σηκὸν Θεοῦ ἀρξει ἐγείρειν.”

There are also many very striking points in the description given of the prosperous character of the future. For example, that lions will lose their savage nature (Virgil: nec magnos metuent armenta leones. Sib.: σαρκοβόρος τε λέον ἄχυρον φάγεται ἐπὶ φάτνης ὡς βοῦς, Gallaeus, p. 478), and that snakes will cease to hurt (Virgil: occidet et serpens. Sib.: καὶ βρεφέεσσι δράκοντες ἅμα σφίσι κοιμήσοντι). Constantine and Augustine were to a certain extent right. They were correct in the feeling that we have here a close analogy to the predictions of the Bible. But they failed to trace the genesis of this analogy. Virgil read the Sibyllines, which had been forged by a Jew, simply as a poet. Whether genuine or false, they furnished him with materials for a pleasant *jeu d'esprit*. That he actually employed them in this way, and applied to Pollio and his unborn son what is there affirmed in evidently a very different sense, is a proof that in his estimation these views were anything but an object of faith. We might even fancy that there was irony in the background, directed against the Messianic hopes of the Jews.

But those who maintain the existence of an independent Messianic anticipation in the heathen world, which is traceable to the primeval revelation, appeal with the greatest confidence to certain facts connected with the religion of the Persians; and it cannot be denied that at first sight there is something very plausible in the argument. In a brief summary of these facts, Spiegel (*Die Neueren Forschungen über das Avesta, Ausland* 56, p. 725) writes to the following effect: "The existence of the soul after death was appealed to, even in the earliest writings, as an established fact. The end of the world, the coming of a new prophet, who helps to overcome the Angra-mainyus and restores the happiness of the world which he has destroyed, is at least hinted at in the *Avesta*." A passage of great importance occurs in *Plutarch de Iside et Osiride*, c. 47. "Ormuzd, sprung from the purest light, and Ahriman, from the darkness, make war upon each other. — But there comes a previously determined time, when Ahriman, after having brought hunger and pestilence upon the world, will be destroyed and utterly annihilated. The earth will then be all one plain, and all its inhabitants, being perfectly happy and speaking one language, will be one in their mode of life, and united in one constitution. But Theopompus says that, according to the teaching of the Magi, each of these gods will be alternately victorious and defeated for three thousand years; after this, the two will contend together for three thousand years more, when the one will defeat the other, and destroy all the works that he has brought to completion. But the god of the lower world will eventually be utterly deprived of his power; and then men will be happy, and will no longer stand in need of nourishment, or throw a shadow." A similar picture of the happiness of men after the renewal of the earth is to be found in the books of the Zend and the Bundeshesh, in which the entire period of the world's duration up to that time is fixed at twelve thousand years. "There will then be neither night, nor cold nor hot winds, nor decay, nor fear of death, nor evils caused by dews; and the enemy, this ambitious prince, will never rise again" (*vid.* Anquetil du Perron in Kleuker's *Zendavesta, Anhang* 1, p. 138). These hopes are associated in the minds of the Persians with the appearance of one who is endowed with superhuman power and dignity. In the *Vendidat*, xix. (according to Spiegel's translation: *Avesta*, vol. i., *Der Vendidat*, p. 244) we read, "I will smite the Pari, whom men worship, until Caoshyanc (*i.e.* the useful one) the victor is born from the water of Kancavya. From the eastern country; from the eastern countries."<sup>105</sup> Spiegel remarks on this passage, "Caoshyanc: the useful one, the helper. This is the title of the Saviour King, whom the Persians expected at the consummation of all things to bring to pass the resurrection, and then establish a dominion full of undisturbed prosperity." An elaborate description of this Saviour we find in the Bundeshesh. It is stated there, among other things, that "Sosiosh will then bring the dead to life. The dead will be brought to life by that which passes from the bull and from the white horn. Sosiosh will give to all men to drink of these liquids; and they will be great and incorruptible as long as beings last. All the dead who have ever died, whether great or small, will drink thereof and come to life. At length Sosiosh, by command of the just judge Ormuzd, from an exalted place, will render to all men as their works deserve. The dwelling-place of the pure will be the splendid Gorotmaun. Ormuzd himself will take up their bodies to himself on high." To this deliverer two others are subsequently added, Oshedarbami and Oshedarmah. "The earliest reference," says Spiegel, p. 32, "is in a Huzvareh gloss to the Yaçna, chap. xxviii. But in this case the first is simply called Hoshedar, the second Hoshedarmah." Shahistani says (*Hyde de rel. vet. Pers.* p. 388, ed. 2) "Zoroaster (Zaradusht) teaches in his book, *Zendavesta*, that in the last days a man will appear, named Oshanderberga, *i.e.* man of the world, who will adorn the world with religion and righteousness. Pentiareh will then appear, and oppress his kingdom and his affairs for twenty years. After this Osirderberga will appear to the inhabitants of the world, and will give new life to

righteousness, put to death unrighteousness, and reinstate the order of things which has been destroyed. Kings will obey him, and everything prosper in his hands. He will make true religion victorious; rest and peace will reign in his day, all contentions will cease, and all grievances disappear.”<sup>106</sup> Tavernier reports the same thing, as heard from a Persian priest (*Reisebeschreibung*, iv. 8, vol. i. p. 181, also given in an appendix to Hyde). In this case the restoration is attributed to three persons, begotten in a miraculous manner, the last of whom is the most glorious, and will effect the conversion of all men. He will bring about a general resurrection, and the judgment will immediately follow. The kingdom of darkness is then to be entirely destroyed, the mountains to be levelled, and so forth.

Formerly, this striking agreement between the Persian hopes of the future and those entertained by the Jews was explained on the simple hypothesis that the Persians borrowed from the Jews. Thus Hyde, for example, says, “The so-called prophecy of Zerdusht evidently points to the Messiah, the announcement of whose coming he had learned from the Old Testament, with which he was well acquainted.” The blind enthusiasm in favour of the religious books of the Persians, which prevailed after their publication by Anquetil du Perron, along with the depreciation of the Old Testament by the rationalists, caused this explanation to be given up, and led to the hypothesis that the Messianic anticipations of the Persians were traceable to the same source as those of the Jews. But there is-at present a manifest disposition to return to the earlier view.

Stuhr says in his *Religionssysteme des Orientes*, p. 371 seq., “The doctrine of the fire-worship recognises most distinctly the belief in an ultimate healing of the strife and discord which prevail in this life, in a complete annihilation of evil and misery at the end of time, and in a resurrection of the body to take place immediately afterwards. Sosiosh, the heroic conqueror, the restorer of holiness, who will render the whole world both great and happy, and purify all the bodies in the world, will then appear. He will abolish every kind of pain, and utterly destroy the germ of every sin and the tormentor of the pure. ... If we bear in mind, now, the historical connection in which the Persians stood to the Jews, and contrast the friendly bearing of Cyrus and Darius towards the latter, with the intolerance of the fire-worshippers towards those forms of heathenism which differed from their own, we cannot but feel inclined to resort to the conclusion that Jewish opinions, which were connected with the worship of Jehovah, exerted a considerable influence upon the development of the views referred to here, as forming part of the religious consciousness of the Persians. The similarity between the two names Sosiosh and Joshua is of no slight importance as bearing upon this opinion, seeing that Joshua, who led the Israelites into the promised land, most decidedly pointed to Jesus.” To this we may also add, that Zechariah, who prophesied at the time when the intercourse was closest between the Persians and the Jews, introduces Joshua the high priest as a type of Christ. Spiegel (*Avesta*, 1, p. 37), also points to the intimate connection between the Persian doctrines and those of the Jews. The dependence of the former upon the Jewish christology will be rendered still more obvious by the remarks which we shall make in the following chapter, upon the period of Zoroaster’s life, the recent date of the Zend books, the inclination of the Persians for synkretism, their readiness to adopt from foreigners, and most especially their dependence upon the Jews. Even for the doctrine of a plurality of saviours there are points of connection to be found in revelation. Think, for example, simply of Elias the prophet and Christ who appears in humiliation and sways the sceptre of the universe.

According to Abulfaraj (in the *Historia Dynastiarum*, p. 54), Zoroaster taught that in the last times a virgin would conceive without intercourse with a man, and at the period of the birth of her child a bright star would appear by day, with the sign of the virgin in the centre, and that on its appearance his disciples would arise to worship the child and bring him their presents. This is the word which founded the heaven. It is possible that the subject is carried out rather clumsily here. But it is just as possible that some of the pupils of Zoroaster did actually go as far as this in the appropriation of the doctrines which they obtained from revelation. That the Indian Krishnu, which is adduced by Stirn (*Apologie des Christenthums*, p. 181, ed. 2), as a heathen analogy to the Messianic anticipations, may probably be traced to Christian influence, so far as there is actually an agreement, has been pointed out by Wuttke (*Geschichte des Heidenthums*, ii. p. 339).

### APPENDIX III—THE DIVINITY OF THE MESSIAH IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

No one will venture to deny that the Messiah was announced by the prophets as one who was to be a partaker of human nature. He was not to manifest himself in a merely transient form like Jehovah and his angel under the Old Testament, but to be born (Isa. 7:14; Mic. 5:2), and to grow up by degrees to greatness and glory (Isa. 11:1, 53:2). With reference to his human nature and descent, he is called a sprout of David (Jer. 23:5, 33:15), the shoot from the root of Jesse (Isa. 11:1), the fruit of the land (Isa. 4:2). In the primary prophecy in Gen. 49, he is referred to as the descendant of Judah, and on the ground of 2 Sam. 7, he is described in prophecy universally as a descendant of David.

There is less agreement as to the question whether the doctrine of the *divinity* of the Messiah is contained in the Old Testament, particularly in the writings of the prophets. The early church answered this question most decidedly in the affirmative; rationalism, on the other hand, has given in many ways a negative reply.

But it must be admitted at the very outset that this doctrine was found in the writings of the Old Testament by Christ himself. In Matt. 22:41-45 (Mark 12:35-37; Luke 20:41-44), he opposes the Pharisees, who expected merely a human Messiah, and adduces Ps. 110 to prove his divinity.

We are brought to the same result by an impartial examination of the Old Testament passages themselves. No doubt the early collection of materials requires to be sifted; but of the large number of passages brought forward as bearing upon the divinity of the Messiah, there are not a few which will stand even the most rigid test.

We have already proved, in vol. i. p. 48, that there is a *hint* at the superhuman nature of the Messiah even in the primary passage in Gen. 49.

More distinct allusions occur in the Psalms, and, what is not accidental,<sup>107</sup> there are some to be met with in *all* the Messianic Psalms. The crowning point is found in Ps. 110. The Messiah is represented there as the Lord of the Church and of David himself, who appears here as the mouthpiece of the whole congregation (see my commentary *in loc.*), and also as one who is seated at the right hand of Omnipotence, and fully participates in the power of God over both heaven and earth. In Ps. 2:12, the Messiah is introduced as the Son of God absolutely, as that Being in whom to trust is salvation, and whose wrath is destruction. In Ps. 45:7, 8, he is called *God*, Elohim. In Ps. 72:5, 7, 17, everlasting dominion is attributed to him.



The central *prophetic* passage is Isa. 9:6, “For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulders: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, Divine Hero, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace.” What is said here directly of the Messiah as *Counsellor*, that he is a wonder, unconditionally exalted above everything ordinary, earthly, and human, on which account all the counsels of the heathen in opposition to him are of no avail, is applicable to everything connected with his person. The Messiah, moreover, is a *Divine Hero*; in his appearance there is an unconditional pledge of victory over the whole world, since he is infinitely superior to all human heroes from the simple fact that he is God. The name Everlasting Father also points to his divine supremacy.

In connection with this passage, we must understand by the name Immanuel in chap. 7:14, something more than a king who is blessed of God.

In chap. 11:4, divine omnipotence is attributed to the Messiah in the administration of punitive righteousness. Like God himself he inflicts punishment by the mere utterance of his almighty word.

The words of Mic. 5:2, “His goings forth are the olden time, the days of eternity,” give prominence to the majesty of his divine origin, in contrast with the humility of his human birth. In ver. 4, “And he shall stand and feed in the strength of the Lord, in the majesty of the name of the Lord,” he is represented as so intimately connected with God, that the whole fulness of the divine strength and majesty is his, a description which rises far above any merely human level. Hand in hand with this passage goes Isa. 40:4 where the glory of the Lord is represented as revealed in the coming of Christ.

Daniel also recognises the union of a human and superhuman nature in the Messiah (chap. 7:13, 14). The Messiah appears with the clouds of heaven, as Lord of nature, and omnipotent judge. The fact that he is *compared* to the Son of man indicates that along with his humanity there is another side, which reaches far beyond his merely human nature.

In Zechariah, we find various intimations that the Messiah is partaker of the divine nature. According to chap. 12:10, Jehovah himself is pierced in the Messiah. In chap. 11:13, Jehovah calls the miserable wages paid to the good shepherd or Messiah, the goodly price at which he the Lord is prized. In chap. 13:7, Jehovah calls the good shepherd the man, his neighbour, and thus points to the fact that he is connected with him by a secret unity of nature.

A distinct testimony to the participation of the Messiah in the divine nature is to be found in the last prophecy, that of Malachi. In chap. 3:1, Jehovah says that he will send a messenger to prepare the way before *him*; and immediately afterwards it is declared that, when this has been effected, the Messiah will come. Hence the coming of Jehovah and that of the Messiah are represented as identical. The Messiah, like the supreme God, is called יהוה, the Lord. The temple, which is spoken of everywhere else as belonging to the supreme God, is referred to here as belonging to the Messiah. In ver. 2 sqq., a divine work is attributed to the Messiah, namely, the execution of judgment upon the ungodly, which is ordinarily imputed to Jehovah.

The unity of God is one of the fundamental doctrines of the Old Testament, Deut. 6:4. Since, then, it cannot possibly be admitted that this doctrine is in any way contradicted,

every passage in which the names, attributes, and works of God are imputed to the Messiah, contains a distinct declaration of his essential oneness with Jehovah. To this we must add the passages of Zechariah and Malachi, which have been already quoted, and in which this unity is expressly declared. If, however, we would enter into a deeper investigation of the relation in which Jehovah is represented as standing to the Messiah in the Old Testament Scriptures, we cannot do this without discussing the Old Testament doctrine of the Angel of God, מַיְהוּאֵל הַיְהוָה, מִיְהוּאֵל הַיְהוָה, הוּוֹי הַיְהוּאֵל.

We have already (in vol. i. p. 108) pointed to the fact that this doctrine is not only most intimately connected with Christology, but contains its theological basis and fundamental condition. We have also collected together the most important materials to be found in the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua in relation to this doctrine. Our first task *now* is to complete the collection from the matters of fact contained in the remaining books. But before doing this, we shall enter into a brief philological discussion.

What is the primary meaning of the word הַיְהוּאֵל? Ewald (§ 160, p. 357) says: “הַיְהוּאֵל, a messenger, literally a sending, the occupation itself and the end to be accomplished being generally considered rather than the man.” But it cannot be proved that הַיְהוּאֵל means *to send*. In Arabic this meaning only occurs in the fourth conjugation. And here it may readily be traced to the meaning “to labour,” “to work,” hence “to make a person work.” The meaning *to work* is established by the derivative הַיְהוּאֵל (work, *opus*, *artificium*), from which it is evidently not allowable to separate הַיְהוּאֵל. According to Ewald, forms with הַיְהוּאֵל denote “that *with which* anything is done, the instrument employed in the work, *e.g.* מַיְהוּאֵל (*quo aperitur*), a key, מַיְהוּאֵל, a vintage-knife.” הַיְהוּאֵל, therefore, is the person through whom anything is effected, *quo opus efficitur*. The restriction to one who is sent is not attributable to the derivation, but to the usages of speech.<sup>108</sup>

It cannot but be pronounced a hasty assertion on the part of Hofmann,<sup>109</sup> that it necessarily follows from the word הַיְהוּאֵל itself that reference is made to an inferior angel, and cannot possibly be made to one who is connected with God by unity of nature. “What can be more obvious,” he says, “than that הַיְהוּאֵל cannot be הַיְהוּאֵל himself, nor הַיְהוּאֵל הַיְהוּאֵל himself, but a being distinct from him, and therefore not God the son, but a created being, a finite spirit, through whom and in whom the eternal God makes himself known?” A distinction is undoubtedly involved in the name הַיְהוּאֵל; but it is not correct that it must necessarily be the distinction between finite and infinite. The messenger may be of the same nature as the sender. The king may certainly send his son as a messenger (Matt. 31:37). According to Hofmann’s premises, Christ himself must be “a created being, a finite spirit,” on account of the numerous passages in the Gospel of John in which he is spoken of as *sent* by God.

Must הַיְהוּאֵל הַיְהוּאֵל, necessarily mean *the* angel of God, *the* angel of the Lord; or may they also mean *an* angel of God, *an* angel of the Lord? To this we reply, that the former alone is correct. הַיְהוּאֵל might certainly mean *an* angel of God, הַיְהוּאֵל may mean a camp of God, and הַיְהוּאֵל a house of as God. For it is evident that הַיְהוּאֵל had originally an appellative character, from the frequency with which it takes the article. At the same time, according to ordinary usage, the word Elohim has generally the force of a proper noun, whilst הַיְהוּאֵל is a proper noun in the fullest sense of the word. So far as הַיְהוּאֵל is concerned, the rule is applicable in this case, that “when two nouns are each of them definite, the article is merely prefixed to the second” (Ewald, § 290 a); to הַיְהוּאֵל the rule applies, that” when a proper name or pronoun stands as the second noun, it has the same force as a noun with the article; *e.g.* in הַיְהוּאֵל הַיְהוּאֵל the son of Jesse, the first noun is

rendered definite through the influence of the second, quite as much as in בְּנֵי אָדָם the son of the man” (Ewald, 290 b). Ewald asserts (§ 290 a) that *under certain circumstances* an individual member of a species may be connected, in the construct state, with a noun with the article prefixed, or with a proper noun. “If the first noun,” he says, “is to be regarded as indefinite, whilst the second is necessarily definite, the first may stand even before the article in the construct state, *provided no ambiguity can arise*; . . . but if this would be the case, seeing that in the first word the individual would of necessity be described in the species, the first word must *not* be written in the construct state.” (According to § 292 the genitive is indicated by ל, “whenever the second noun is definite, and requires to be separated from the first, in order that the latter may retain its indefinite character.”) We have some doubts as to the possibility of establishing this limitation. The facts which appear to speak in its favour admit of a different explanation. But we have no interest in entering into any further proofs of this; for the one case, which Ewald singles out as an exception, is not the one with which we have to do here. In the present instance, ambiguity would certainly arise. The passages brought forward by Hofmann (*Weissagung und Erfüllung*, i. 129), and others, for the purpose of upsetting the rule altogether, will not bear a closer examination. In Mal. 2:7, the priest is not described as *a* messenger of Jehovah; but Hitzig has quite correctly translated and explained it as meaning “for he is *the* messenger, etc.—As the expounder of the law, the revealer of the will of God, he is the constant and ordinary messenger of Jehovah.” In Hag. 1:13, it is not *an* angel of the Lord that is intended, but Haggai is called *the* angel of the Lord, as distinguished from others of the same name but different vocation. In 1 Sam. 17:58, David replies to the question put to him by Saul, “whose son art thou?” not *a* son, but *the* son of thy servant Jesse. The son of Jesse is opposed to the sons of other fathers. Whether he had any brothers or not was not a point in consideration at the time. In 1 Sam. 19:9, the proper rendering is not “an evil spirit of the Lord,” but “the spirit of the Lord as an evil one.” That הוֹדֵי יְהוָה is *the* angel of the Lord, is very obvious from 1 Kings 19:5, “and behold an angel, יְהוָה, touched him;” compare ver. 7, “and the angel of the Lord touched him a second time,”—first *an* angel, then *the* angel who is already known from what has been mentioned before. In 1 Chron. 31:15, we find, first of all, “And God sent an angel to Jerusalem, to destroy it;” and then in vers. 15, 16, הוֹדֵי יְהוָה, the angel of the Lord is mentioned.—There is no force in Steudel’s objection (*Bibl. Theol.* p. 259): “In the very passage to which Hengstenberg refers, as speaking of the angel κατ’ ἐξοχήν, viz. Ex. 32:20, יְהוָה is written without the article, just as in chap. 33:2, where he supposes a different angel from the angel of Jehovah to be intended.” *The* angel is certainly also *an* angel. We have first of all a general term, and then a more particular description, from which we may see that it is not an ordinary angel that is spoken of, but one of exalted dignity and a superior nature.

But, however certain it is that הוֹדֵי יְהוָה can only mean *the* angel of the Lord, it would be to assert that the grammatical reason is sufficient to prove that in every case in which the הוֹדֵי יְהוָה is mentioned, without *an* angel being spoken of before as in 1 Kings 19:5-7, the *Logos* must necessarily be intended. The angel might also be an ideal person, and denote an actual plurality. In this sense *the* priest occurs in the passage quoted from Malachi, where the priests are addressed immediately afterwards in the plural (ver. 8); and so again the fugitive is mentioned in Gen. 14:13 whilst it is left uncertain, whether one individual is intended or several. It is probably in the same sense, viz. as an ideal person, that the angel is spoken of in Gen. 24:7, “he will send his angel before thy face,” the actual meaning being “his angel,” or “an angel.” Among the passages in which the הוֹדֵי יְהוָה is mentioned, there are in fact some in which this explanation is a very obvious one, e.g. Ps.

34:8; 2 Sam. 24:16; and 2 Kings 19:35. But to explain in this manner all the passages which speak of the angel of the Lord is by no means admissible, altogether apart from the fact that, in the great majority of cases, there is a distinct allusion made to a personal angel, and on the general ground that the figure of speech is of so singular and extraordinary a nature that it would be entirely opposed to every analogy to imagine its ramifications to be as extensive as this. Moreover, even this would fail to explain the fact, that in the passages in which the names of God alternate with יהוהי ךאלמ, and also in those in which divine attributes are imputed to the יהוהי ךאלמ, he is usually called *the* angel of the Lord from the very first; whereas, on the other hand, in passages in which unmistakable reference is made to ordinary angels, *an* angel is spoken of first, and it is only after he is known to the reader that he is called *the* angel at all.

We will now proceed, in continuation of our discussion in the first volume, to examine the various passages in which the angel of the Lord is mentioned. In addition to those already noticed in the books of Moses, there is a passage in Ex. 3 which deserves especial consideration. In ver. 2, the angel of Jehovah is said to have appeared to Moses in the fiery flame of a thorn-bush. In ver. 4, we read, "*Jehovah* saw that he drew near to look, and *Elohim* called to him out of the thorn-bush." In vers. 6 and 14-16, the angel of Jehovah assumes to himself all the attributes of the true God, calls himself the Eternal One, the God of the fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and promises to deliver the children of Israel out of Egypt, and inflict severe punishment upon the Egyptians. In ver. 5, Moses is commanded to take off his shoes from off his feet, because the place where he stands is holy ground. And in ver. 6, he is said to have hidden his face, because he was afraid to look upon God.

Those who maintain that by the angel of the Lord we are always to understand an inferior and ordinary angel, dispose of this and similar passages by the simple remark, that the messenger represents the person of the sender, the angels speaking and acting in the name of God, and being addressed and treated as God. We cannot pronounce this supposition absolutely untenable, as many do.<sup>110</sup> There is one unquestionable instance in the Old Testament of ordinary angels appearing in the name of the Lord; and in this case the Lord is also addressed in them. In Gen. 19:18, Lot addresses the two angels by the name יְיָ אֱלֹהֵי, which belongs to God alone; and from the words which follow, "Thy servant hath found grace *thy* sight, and thou hast magnified *thy* mercy, which *thou* hast showed in saving my life," etc., it is evident that, whilst addressing the messengers, he has the sender in his mind. The angels, again, in the same manner, reply in Jehovah's name, not in their own, "See, I have accepted thee concerning this thing also," etc.<sup>111</sup> The notion expressed by Justin Martyr in the dialogue with Trypho, that Jehovah suddenly returned after the two angels had been engaged for some time in conversation with Lot, is evidently nothing but a loop-hole; for there is not the slightest ground for any such supposition in the text itself; but, on the contrary, it is overthrown by the fact that in ver. 18 it is stated that "Lot spake to *them*," evidently to the same persons who are represented in ver. 17 as having conducted him out of the city, and instructed him to flee to the mountains. At the same time, neither this passage nor Rev. 22:7, which is generally classed along with it, is fitted to counteract the blow inflicted upon the hypothesis, respecting the ordinary angel, by Ex. 3 and the parallel passages. If these passages prove, on the one hand, that the personation of the sender by the messenger sent is not absolutely inadmissible, yet, on the other hand, their very isolation<sup>112</sup> proves that it was anything but *customary* to employ such a mode of address as this. The fact requiring explanation is, not that in one particular instance in which the angel of the Lord is mentioned the Lord himself is spoken of immediately

afterwards, but that as *a rule there is an immediate transition from the angel of the Lord to Jehovah or Elohim, and vice versa*. That there is something altogether peculiar in Gen. 19, and therefore that no general conclusion can be drawn from this example alone, we have already fully shown in vol. i. p. 112. The apparent analogy in the case of the prophets, to which appeal has been made, also loses its force on closer inspection. The passages referred to are those in which it is asserted of the prophets, that they themselves will do what they foretell. Thus, for example, in Gen. 49 Jacob says with reference to Simeon and Levi, "I will divide them in Jacob, and scatter them in Israel." In Jer. 1:10, God says to the prophet, "Behold I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant" (compare Gen. 27:37; Ex. 13:19, 32:18, 43:3). Undoubtedly in these passages the limit which separates the instrument from the actual performer of the work is broken through; the prophets are transported, as it were, into God, and invested with his omnipotence, in order that they may most emphatically disarm the objection that their word has but little force, as being simply the word of feeble men. But these passages, from their very isolation, only make it the more conspicuous that the co-ordination of Jehovah and the angel of Jehovah, which is so *universal* a thing, does not admit of the same explanation. What is in the one case but a rare exception becomes in the other a rule.

Let us now turn first of all to the book of Judges. In Judg. 2:1-5, the angel of Jehovah is said to have appeared to the assembled Israelites, in the place which was afterwards called Bochim. He speaks of himself as having made them to go up out of Egypt, and brought them into the land which he swore unto their fathers; and then declares that, on account of their disobedience, he will not drive the heathen nations out of the land. "He speaks in his own words as one who has authority" (Matt. 7:29). The expression, "thus saith the Lord," which is customary in other cases, is not added here, nor is there anything said to indicate that the angel is speaking in the name of another."<sup>113</sup> In ver. 1, the angel of the Lord says: "And I said, I will never break *my* covenant with you." But the covenant had been concluded between Israel and *Jehovah*. According to ver. 5, the reply which the children of Israel made to the appearance of the angel of the Lord was to sacrifice at the place where he had appeared. Now the very fact of their sacrificing at Bochim presupposed that the Lord himself had appeared there (we know nothing as to the form of his appearance, but so much is certain, that the people were convinced that God had drawn near to them in an extraordinary manner). In the book of Judges, there is not a single sacrifice mentioned as being offered by the Israelites in any other place than by the ark of the covenant, with which the offering of sacrifice was associated in the law of Moses, except in the case of an extraordinary appearance on the part of God. For the proofs of this, see the *Dissertation on the Pentateuch*.<sup>114</sup>

In Judg. 6:11, *the* angel of the Lord is said to come to Gideon. This is the title given to the person who appears, 'without an angel having been mentioned before. In ver. 14 we read, "*The Lord*, יהוה turned to him and said, Go in this thy might and thou shalt save Israel . . . *have not I sent thee?*" On this Studer remarks, "The angel of Jehovah becomes all at once Jehovah himself;" and in his opinion the whole phenomenon is traceable to the speculative and mythical notions which characterized the early Jewish theology, and according to which the angel of Jehovah was simply a manifestation of the deity himself, who from his very nature and essence is not only invisible to men, but inconceivable and unapproachable by them.—The Septuagint substitutes for Jehovah ὁ ἄγγελος κυρίου both here and in ver. 16. Bertheau, on the other hand, observes that it was only fitting that

Jehovah should appear with more and more distinctness. In the words, "I have sent thee," the person who appears attributes to himself a divine work; and it is by these words that Gideon recognises them. "And he said unto him," it is stated immediately afterwards, "Ah, Lord, יהוה, wherewith shall I save Israel?" "The Masorettes," says Studer, "altered the pointing (in ver. 13, Gideon addresses the person who appears to him as יהוה, *my Lord*), for the purpose of indicating that Gideon by this time had recognised Jehovah." That they were correct in this opinion is evident from the words in ver. 17, "that it is thou who talkest with me." Vitranga opposes the Septuagint rendering, κύριε μου, on the following ground: "quod יהוה cum kametz angelo heic non tribuatur nisi postquam Angelus quid divini de se praedicasset. . . . Etiamsi Gideon hactenus certo non esset persuasus hanc personam esse divinam, advertens tamen hanc personam sibi adscribere divina et aliquid forte de ipsius divinitate subodoratus, illam vocat יהוה."— When Gideon appeals to his weakness, the Lord says to him in ver. 16, "for I will be with thee." These words alone reach beyond the sphere of an inferior angel. "To promise his grace and assistance for the accomplishment of such a work as Gideon had to perform, was not in the power of any but the true God." (Vitranga) But a still stronger proof that God is here intended, may be found in the fact that the verbal agreement between this passage and Ex. 3:11, is so close as to be really equivalent to a direct reference. In this earlier passage, upon which the one before us is based, and which was so full of encouragement for Gideon, Ha-Elohim is speaking to Moses. And in ver. 17 Gideon says, "If now I have found grace in thy sight, then show me a sign that it is thou who talkest with me." The words would have no meaning unless Gideon had previously come to the conclusion, that it was the Lord himself who was speaking to him, and not an inferior angel. Bertheau has even constrained himself to acknowledge this. "It is evident," he says, that the angel who was speaking to Gideon wished to be regarded as Jehovah." The offering presented by Gideon does not prove anything to the contrary. Gideon places his offering before the angel of the Lord, that he may do what he pleases with it; at the same time, he hopes that the angel of the Lord will manifest his divine character by some such sign as that which is actually given. But his humility will not suffer him to present a direct request to that effect—In ver. 21 the angel is said to have touched the offering with the end of his staff; whereupon there rose up fire out of the rock and consumed the offering. In the meantime, the angel of Jehovah suddenly disappears. "As the bursting out of the flame, which consumed the food, and the disappearance of the angel are represented as contemporaneous occurrences, we may assume that in this case, as well as in chap. 13:20, the angel is to be regarded as ascending to heaven in the flame." (Bertheau) Fire does not bear any close affinity to the nature of inferior angels, but to the nature of God himself. It is an image of the intensity of the divine action. The *earnest* God, of whose assistance Gideon stood in need for the accomplishment of the work which lay before him, here manifested himself under the symbol of fire. In ver. 22, it is stated that "Gideon perceived that it was the angel of the Lord." His conviction of the real divinity of the person addressing him was confirmed by this miraculous occurrence (chap. 13:19). "The extraordinary manner in which the offering was consumed was a proof of higher power, and therefore afforded to Gideon the sign which he desired, that it was Jehovah who was talking with him." Gideon is now afraid that he will *die*, because he has "seen the angel of the Lord face to face." The fear of death we invariably find resulting from close contact with the Lord himself, but not from contact with an inferior angel (vol. i. p. 110). When the fear is taken away from him, Gideon builds an altar and calls it "Jehovah peace." He is assured that Jehovah himself has appeared to him, and by Jehovah he has been spared.

In chap. 13:3, “the angel of Jehovah “appears to the wife of Manoah. According to ver. 6, “The woman came and said to her husband, the man of God (the ideal impersonation of God, p. 255, in 1 Sam. 2:27, a man of God) came to me, and his appearance was as the angel of God, very terrible; and I asked him not whence he was, neither told he me his name.” The woman did not recognise him with absolute certainty, but his majestic appearance led her to suspect his divine nature, hence she did not venture to inquire whence he was, but the question died upon her lips. Even on the occasion of his second appearance, the angel of the Lord was not recognised at first with certainty by Manoah and his wife, as is expressly stated in ver. 16. Studer has followed Abarbanel in adducing this verse as a proof that the angel of the Lord must have been an ordinary angel. It is then stated that “the angel of the Lord said unto Manoah, though thou press me, I will not eat of thy food; and if thou wilt offer a burnt-offering, offer it unto the Lord. For Manoah knew not that he was the angel of the Lord.” To the words “offer it to Jehovah,” Studer adds, “not to me, who am merely his messenger and servant;” and to the words, “Manoah knew not that he was the angel of the Lord,” he adds, “hence neither a man, who would partake of earthly food, nor a God, to whom alone the divine honour of sacrifice is due.” But this explanation has long since been overthrown by Vitringa in his treatise *De Angela Sacerdote*, Obs. 6:14. It would be at variance with the attitude invariably assumed by the angel of the Lord for him absolutely to prohibit the offering of sacrifice. Vitringa has also overthrown another explanation, according to which the angel of the Lord makes an express declaration here as to his divine nature, and intends to say, “If thou wilt offer a burnt-offering, offer it to the Lord, *who reveals himself in me.*” According to this interpretation, because Manoah did not know that it was the angel of the Lord, the latter had first of all to make this known, and to draw him away from his human ideas. But as Vitringa observes, “The simple explanation of the words is this, if thou wilt prepare a holocaust, then it will be lawful for thee to offer it to God, or offer it to God if thou please.” The words, “for Manoah knew not” *do not refer to the context immediately preceding, but are intended to offer an apology for Manoah, who had made preparations for a simple meal.* The angel of the Lord makes himself known in ver. 18, by his refusal to tell his name, because it is wonderful. “In the same manner,” says Studer, “*Jehovah* refused to tell his name to Jacob who was wrestling with him (Gen. 32:29), either because it was too holy to be uttered, or out of consideration for mortal man, who is afraid of death, whenever he comes into personal contact with the divine being. A name of infinite glory, wonderful, surpassing the powers of human conception, would not befit a created being. What is stated here of the angel of the Lord is also affirmed of Christ in Rev. 19:12, “He has a name written, which no man knows, but only he himself.” The connection, on the one hand, with this passage, which points back to the one before us, and on the other hand with Gen. 32:29, upon which the latter rests, shows that something more than an inferior angel must certainly be intended. Compare also the word אֱלֹהִים, which is applied to Christ in Isa. 9:5. The angel of the Lord furnished a proof of his miraculous nature by the miraculous burning of the sacrifice. The words הוֹשַׁעַל אֵילָפָה in ver. 19 point back to אֱלֹהִים in the previous verse, “And Manoah took the kid and the meat-offering, and placed it upon the rock for the Lord, and he (the Lord) *did wondrously*, and Manoah and his wife looked on.” The wondrous deed would not befit a creature. In every analogous case in the Old Testament it is God himself who performs the miracle. He acted, as Vitringa observes, “just as *God* was accustomed to act in similar circumstances during the Old Testament economy.”

*It is perfectly obvious that there is nothing whatever in the three narratives contained in the book of Judges which points to a created angel. On the contrary, we find on every hand conclusive evidence of the divine nature of the angel of Jehovah.*

*The prophecies of Zechariah* are of peculiar importance in connection with the doctrine of the angel of the Lord. They contain in themselves materials amply sufficient for a correct settlement of the question. In the very first vision, “the angel of Jehovah” appears surrounded by a company of inferior angels. He is represented there as absolutely exalted far above them all. They bring their reports to him, as to their king and Lord, and give him an account of their proceedings.<sup>115</sup> The hypothesis of an ordinary angel completely breaks down here.—The supposition again, that the angel of Jehovah is nothing but a form of manifestation of Jehovah himself, founders on ver. 12, “O Lord of hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem and on the cities of Judah,” The personal distinction between Jehovah and his angel is very apparent here. The angel of the Lord addresses the Lord and intercedes with him.—The angel of the Lord appears in this first vision as the protector of the covenant people, the mediator between them and Jehovah of hosts, their intercessor at the throne of grace. This is a dignity far too exalted for an ordinary angel. It would be a deep humiliation to the Church to bestow it upon such a being as this. In the New Testament, *Christ* is represented as invested with it. He prays for his own (John 17:9), appears in the presence of God for us (Heb. 9:24), and is the mediator between God and men (1 Tim. 2:5). The assumption that the angel of the Lord is an ordinary angel leads to the inadmissible conclusion that the angels and Christ are equal.

In the vision in chap. 2, the surpassing dignity of the angel of God is manifest in ver. 4, where he speaks to an inferior angel, as the Lord to his servant. But vers. 8-11 are of peculiar importance. We there read as follows: “For thus saith the Lord of hosts” (equivalent to “thus I say, as the representative of the Lord of hosts;” Michaelis, “God the son, who commands the angelic hosts”), “after the glory” (in other words, “after ye have been brought to glory”), hath he sent me to the heathen, who spoil you; for whoso toucheth you, toucheth the apple of his eye.” And in ver. 9, “For behold I shake my hand against them (according to ver. 8, I, the angel of the Lord), and they become a spoil to those who serve them, and ye perceive that the Lord of hosts hath sent me. (From what I shall do, ye will discern the truth of the joyful message, which I bring you then.) In ver. 10, again, “Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion; for behold I come, and dwell in the midst of thee, *saith the Lord;*” and in ver. 11, “And many nations shall be joined *to the Lord* in that day, and shall be my people, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, and thou shalt know that Jehovah hath sent me unto thee.” The angel of the Lord attributes to himself in vers. 8 and 9, the judgment of the heathen. In vers. 10 and 11, he foretells his future appearance in the midst of the nation; the verbal agreement between this passage and the prophecy in chap. 9:9, respecting the future king of Zion, is evidently intentional. The essential unity between the angel of Jehovah and Jehovah himself is pointed out in vers. 8, 10, and 11.—In the opinion of Ewald, Hofmann (*Schriftbeweis*, i. p. 90), and others, the words in the 8th verse from “after the glory,” to “toucheth the apple of his eye,” are to be regarded as a parenthetical address of the angel’s; and the words of Jehovah himself follow in ver. 9. “Between the address of Jehovah in ver. 9, which is introduced with ‘thus saith the Lord,’ and that in ver. 10, which is introduced with אָנֹכִי הוֹדִיךָ, the angel steps in. The object aimed at, namely, to dispose of inconvenient facts, is attained at too great a cost.” The number of the parenthesis which the passage contains, according to this explanation, is very suspicious. כִּי in ver. 9 cannot mean “yea,” nor can it



form the commencement of a fresh address. If we assume that the words in vers. 9-11, with the exception of the supposed parenthesis, belong to the Lord, as *contrasted* with the angel, the latter is restricted to the sphere of simple prediction, in opposition to ver. 8, where he speaks of himself as acting independently, and executing judgment upon the heathen. Moreover, to change the angel of the Lord into a mere herald is at variance with the exalted position which he assumes in ver. 4. By this hypothesis the link between vers. 10 and 11 is broken. But in that case Jehovah alone is referred to in the latter, and the King of Zion alone in the former. Lastly, it is just in the case of Zechariah that we have the least ground for attempting by forced assumptions to explain away such statements as point to a unity of nature between Jehovah and his angel. For this is expressly maintained by him in very many of the clearest passages.

In chap. 3:1, Joshua stands before the angel of the Lord, to offer his services and await his commands. Such a servile position the high priest would never assume in relation to an inferior angel. Like the latter, he is a servant of the Lord (Mal. 2:7). In ver. 4, the angel of the Lord appears attended by a company of angels who are his *servants*. According to the same verse, he grants to Joshua, and in him to the nation, forgiveness of sins, as one who has absolute authority (“and he said to Joshua, I take away from thee thine iniquity”), and in this respect exercises a divine prerogative, just as Christ himself does in Matt. 9:2-6. The seraph in Isa. 6:6 merely announces the forgiveness of sins, he does not grant it. Lastly, the angel of the Lord also exercises judicial authority in the contest between the high priest and Satan (“he sits as judge in an affair of the greatest moment, affecting the salvation of his people,” *Ode*). Satan is obliged to yield unconditionally to his decision. In this judicial authority the angel of the Lord is a type of Christ, who says in John 5:22, “The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son.”

In chap. 11, the angel of the Lord appears on the one hand as personally distinct from the Lord. The Lord addresses him in ver. 13, and the casting away of the thirty pieces of silver could not apply to the invisible God. On the other hand, however, there must be the most intimate connection between Jehovah and his angel. For in the same verse Jehovah speaks of the miserable wages, paid to the angel of the Lord for his services as shepherd, as the goodly price at which he, the Lord, was prized. The position here assigned to the angel of the Lord is far superior to that of an ordinary angel. He is represented as having the fate of the covenant nation completely in his control. It is by him, and not by any other, that it is said to be defended from outward foes and inward strife (ver. 7); and according to ver. 10 the effect of his rejection is, that the nation once more falls a prey to these two destructive powers. According to ver. 8, he cuts off the shepherds in one month, deals with the three classes of shepherds or rulers existing in the theocracy as “one having authority” (Matt. 7:29, compare 28:18), and deposes them from their pastoral office, which has its roots in him, and which they fill merely by virtue of a *potestas delegate*. Every idea of an inferior angel is excluded by the announcement of a personal appearance of the angel of the Lord in the midst of the nation, to undertake the office of shepherd himself. The angel of the Lord exhibits himself here as Christ, with whom an ordinary angel has nothing to do. In the history of Christ, the thirty pieces of silver are mentioned again. And in John 21:15-17, Christ represents himself as the subject of this description.

That the angel of the Lord is highly exalted above the ordinary angels is evident from the gradation in chap. 12:8, “And the house of David shall be as God, as the angel of the Lord before them.” Here we have something more than Elohim; the ordinary angels on the other hand are only sons of God. Again, according to this passage, the angel of the Lord is

to appear in the Messiah, and to enter into the closest connection with the house of David, an announcement which could not apply to an ordinary angel. Reference is here made to such a union of the divine and human natures, as actually took place in Christ.

In chap. 12:10, it is said, "They shall look upon me, whom they have pierced." Jehovah is speaking here, and represents himself as pierced by Israel, and afterwards mourned for with bitter lamentation. It cannot, however, be the invisible God as such who is pierced. And the fact that, notwithstanding this, he does refer the piercing to himself, points to an essential unity as existing between the pierced one, the angel of the Lord in his capacity of the good shepherd, and the supreme God.

In chap. 13:7, the Lord of Sabaoth describes the shepherd, who is slain by the nation according to his counsel, as the "man his fellow," and thus exalts him far above the rank of angels, even to that of God; whilst, at the same time, he represents him as personally distinct from himself.

In the two prophets of the captivity also, *Ezekiel* and *Daniel*, the angel of the Lord is described as personally distinct from the invisible God, essentially different from the inferior angels, and identical with the Logos of John.

In Ezek. 9, the prophet Ezekiel sees six men come to execute judgment upon apostate Jerusalem, each man with an instrument of destruction in his hand. In the midst of them there is one clothed with linen, and with writing materials at his side. And they come and stand beside the brazen altar, which has been polluted (see the remarks on Amos 9:1). The man clothed in linen, the angel of the Lord (see the proofs in vol. i. p. 358), sets a mark upon the foreheads of the men that sigh and that cry for all the abominations that are done in the midst of the city. His peculiar task is to take care of the elect. At the same time, he also superintends the infliction of punishment, and the six inferior angels act as his servants (see vol. i. p. 359, and the commentary on the Rev. 7:3). Thus the angel of the Lord manifests himself as at once the fountain of salvation and of punishment to the covenant nation. The dress worn by the angel of the Lord points back to the sacred clothing worn by the earthly mediator between God and the nation (Lev. 16:4, 23). By this attire the angel of the Lord represents himself as the heavenly high priest, just as in Zech. 1:12, the angel of the Lord appears as the heavenly Mediator, Intercessor, and High Priest. In the appearance of the angel of the Lord as high priest, there was a prophetic manifestation of the high-priestly office of Christ (compare Zech. 6:9, 10). In Rev. 7:2, 3, the sealing is superintended by Christ.

In *Daniel* the angel of the Lord is introduced under the name of Michael. (For proof of the identity of Michael and the angel of the Lord, see the *Dissertation on Daniel*, p. 135.)

Two different views are entertained with reference to Michael. In the opinion of some, Michael is no other than Christ, or, to speak more correctly, the Word which was in the beginning with God, and which from the very first has been the medium of all his communications to the Church on earth. There are others, again, who regard him as a created angel, to whom is entrusted the care of the Church of the Old and New Testaments; or, according to Hofmann's view (*Schriftbeweis*, i. p. 295, 296), "the angel who conducted the affairs of Israel," "the angel-prince who ruled in Israel as a nation." That the former is the correct view, we have proved in the commentary on Rev. 12:7 sqq. But we will strengthen our assertion still further by entering into a thorough examination of the passages in Daniel which bear upon this subject.

Michael is mentioned first in Dan. 10:13, “And the prince of the kingdom of Persia stood before me one and twenty days, and behold Michael, one of the first princes, came to help me, and I remained there with the kings of Persia.” The reason is here assigned for Gabriel remaining away so long. In ver. 12, Gabriel says that he would gladly have come on the very first day on which Daniel humbled himself before God. Daniel continued mourning for twenty-one days; and it was not till after this that Gabriel came. That Michael must be the possessor of superior power, and exalted far above the ordinary angels, is very obvious from this. Gabriel by himself is powerless. Michael must first come to his help and set him free, before he can bring the joyful tidings to Daniel.

On the other hand, however, it appears as though Michael were called “one of the great princes,” to show that he is not endowed with unequalled nature, dignity, or power. According to this passage, it appears impossible that Michael should be specifically different from the highest angels. But it is merely an appearance, though many have been deceived by it; and among others Stier, in his commentary on the Epistle of Jude. The “first princes” are not angels, but, as ver. 20 and also the previous mention of the prince of Persia in the present verse clearly show, the ideal representatives of the imperial powers, “the prince of Persia,” “the prince of Greece,” etc. We must not attempt, as Hävernick has done (to whom Hitzig has given a very correct reply), to expound away the guardian angels from these passages; at the same time, they have purely an ideal, not a real signification. In point of fact, the imperial powers themselves are intended. The actually existing guardian of the covenant nation suggested this purely poetical description. Nowhere do we find, either in the Old or New Testaments, any intimation of the existence of guardian angels of heathen empires. Such an idea as this is one which does not admit of being carried out, and is diametrically opposed to the fundamental doctrines of the Scriptures respecting the relation in which God stands to the powers of the world. In the passage itself, however, we have all but an express declaration of the purely ideal character of the “princes.” In the end the *kings* of Persia take the place of “the princes of the kingdom of Persia.” *Here we have the real import of the ideal representation.* Until the kingdom of God shall have reached the goal set before it at the very outset, namely, world-wide dominion, Michael its prince will be merely “one of the chief princes.” In the time of Daniel it was a very great thing to talk even of equality with the powers of the world. But in due time Michael will set his foot upon the necks of the other “chief princes,” and will be a king of kings and a lord of lords (Rev. 19:16). Just as Michael is ranked among the chief princes here, so is the Messianic kingdom ranked among the other monarchies of the world in chap. 2; but “it will break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it will stand for ever.” The absolute superiority of Michael to all the other powers, which is expressly indicated by the *name* itself (“who is as God,” equivalent to “as surely as I am *God*, no one can contend with me”), is just as little affected by Dan. 10:13 as the absolute superiority of Christ by Isa. 53:12, “therefore will I give him a share of the many, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong,” where Christ is first of all ranked, in just the same manner, along with the powers of the world, by which the kingdom of God was deeply oppressed at the time when the prophecy was uttered. We have already given the following explanation of this announcement, “Through Christ and his sacrificial death, the kingdom of God first enters into the rank of world-conquering powers.”

In vers. 20 and 21, Gabriel says, “And now will I return to fight with the prince of Persia, and when I go away (have finished with the Persians), the prince of Greece cometh, . . . and no one helps me against these but Michael your prince.” In Hitzig’s opinion “there is

a discrepancy between ver. 13 and ver. 21, since Michael is represented in the latter as on an equality with Gabriel.” By no means. The expression, “your prince,” clearly shows that Gabriel is only a subaltern. “Unde simul efficitur,” says Michaelis, “ut populus Judaicus huic Michaeli tanquam unico suo patrono summopere sit obstrictus.” To be the prince of the covenant nation is a dignity which could not be possessed by a created angel, but one by which Michael was exalted, in harmony with his name, into the sphere of divinity, and by which he is also identified with Christ, who, when he appeared in the midst of Israel, came to “his own possession.”

As an argument against the absolute superiority of Michael, Hofmann (*Schriftbeweis*, i. p. 289) adduces chap. 11:1: “There is none to help him in this contest except Michael, *to whom on the other hand he had also been a helper and a protector in the first year of Darius the Mede.*” Chap. 11:1 relates to the transfer of the government from the Chaldeans to the Persians, which led to the return of Israel. “As at that time (this is in general the explanation which Hävernick has correctly given) the Lord caused the change in the monarchy to conduce to the good of the covenant nation, so will he also continue to prove himself the faithful and merciful God, whatever may occur in the heathen monarchies to disturb the peace of Israel.” Luther, it is true, has adopted this rendering, “For I also stood by him in the first year of Darius the Mede, to help and to strengthen him.” But it would be much more correct to render it thus: “And I (under the auspices of Michael your prince) also stood in the first year of the Mede, that I might assist and strengthen him, Darius.” To refer מַיְכָאֵל to Michael is opposed to all that is said elsewhere with reference to him, and more particularly at variance with the context immediately preceding (compare, on the other hand, Hitzig’s commentary).

Michael is not mentioned again after chap. 10:21 until chap. 12:1, where it is said, “At that time shall Michael stand, *the great prince*, which standeth for the children of thy people.” “The great prince” (equivalent to the King of kings in the Revelation) serves as the complement to “one of the chief princes.” The rescue of Israel is here ascribed to Michael alone, and the subordinate task of Gabriel entirely vanishes. Bertholdt supplies, in an arbitrary manner, “against the guardian spirit of the Graeco-Syrian kingdom.” Michael has to deal directly with the imperial power. The personification is dropped, as a proof that it has no reality.

The two passages in the New Testament in which Michael is mentioned serve to confirm the result already arrived at. That the Michael referred to in Rev. 12:7 is no other than the Logos, has already been proved in my commentary upon that passage. Hofmann (*Schriftbeweis*, i. p. 296) objects to this explanation, and says, “In this case it is impossible to imagine why the Archangel should be mentioned as fighting with the dragon, and not the child that was caught up to the throne of God.” But we have already replied to this in the commentary, where we said, “If Michael be Christ, the question arises why Michael is mentioned here instead of Christ. The answer to this is, that the name Michael contains in itself an intimation that the work referred to here, the decisive victory over Satan, belongs to Christ, not as human, but rather as divine (compare 1 John 3:8). *Moreover*, this name forms a connecting link between the Old Testament and the New. Even in the Old Testament, Michael is represented as the great prince, who fights on behalf of the Church (Dan. 12:1).” The conflict there alluded to was a prediction and prelude of the one mentioned here. The further objections offered by Hofmann rest upon his very remarkable interpretation of chap. 12, which is not likely to be adopted by any who are capable of examining for themselves.<sup>116</sup>

The second of the New Testament passages is Jude, ver. 9, “Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil, he disputed about the body of Moses,” etc. The attitude of opposition in which Michael here stands to Satan, and which answers so exactly to the relation in which Christ stands to Satan throughout the whole of the New Testament, is a positive proof of this (see our commentary on Rev. 12). It might be objected, on the other hand, that Michael is here described as “the archangel,” and that the passage contained in 1 Thess. 4:16, “The Lord himself shall descend ἐν κελεύσματι, ἐν φωνῇ ἀρχαγγέλου καὶ ἐν σάλπιγγι θεοῦ,” appears to imply that there is a *plurality* of such angels. And if this be the case, Michael the archangel can only be a created being. But the passage rather tends to prove the opposite, namely, that there is only *one* archangel, and that he possesses a divine nature. The ἀρχαγγέλος can hardly be personally different from the κύριος and θεός. The ἐν which recurs three times must have the same sense throughout. “The κέλευσμα,” as Olshausen observes, “is God’s command, and therefore the voice must also be his voice.” To this we add, that if the trumpet of God be the trumpet which God himself blows (compare the original passage in Zech. 9:14, “the Lord Jehovah will blow the trumpet”), the voice must also belong to God himself. It is called the voice of an archangel (equivalent to “the voice of God in his capacity of an archangel,” *i.e.* as the prince of the heavenly hosts, Josh. 5), with direct allusion to Dan. 10:6, where it is said of Michael, “and the voice of his words like the voice of a multitude.” What is said of Michael in the book of Daniel, and of the archangel in the Epistle to the Thessalonians, is applied to Jehovah in Ezek. 43:2; “and his (the Lord’s) voice was as the voice of many waters.” And what is applied to Michael in Daniel, and to Jehovah in Ezekiel, is used with reference to Christ in Rev. 1:15, “and his voice as the voice of many waters.” It is objected by A. Koch in his commentary on 1 Thess. 4:16, that “the absence of the article apparently precludes any reference to one particular archangel.” But to this we reply, that the absence of the article may be explained from the fact that the apostle is speaking of the voice of the Lord, in his capacity of archangel, with direct allusion to Daniel. Moreover, a plurality of archangels is *a priori* inconceivable, for the Old Testament never speaks of more than one “prince of the army of Jehovah” (Josh. 5), and the New Testament also speaks of only one, to whom angels and principalities and powers are subject (1 Pet. 3:22).

*After this description of the actual facts, the decision to be arrived at respecting the different views that have been entertained as to the angel of the Lord, cannot long be doubtful.*

The views referred to are the following:

1. According to a very widely spread opinion, whenever the angel of the Lord is mentioned we are to understand, not a person connected with God by unity of essence, but an inferior angel, through whom God issues and executes his commands, and who speaks and acts in his name, or, as Delitzsch expresses it (*Commentary on Gen.*, ed. 2, p. 331), “It is an angel, whom God employs as the organ of his own self-attestation.” The fact that divine names, operations, and attributes are ascribed to these inferior angels, and that divine honours are paid to them, is explained on the ground that the angels themselves lost sight altogether of their own personality, and, because they were engaged in the service of God, spoke and acted in the person of God; and, on the other hand, that those to whom they were sent, and the sacred writers themselves rose from the secondary agents to the great first cause. This view, which appears to have been favoured by Origen,<sup>117</sup> was defended by Augustine with peculiar zeal and skill.<sup>118</sup> Jerome also

expresses himself in favour of the same view.<sup>119</sup> Gregory the Great has given it briefly and forcibly in his *Mor. B.* xxviii. 1.<sup>120</sup> It was afterwards defended by several Jewish commentators, *e.g.* Abenezra, who observes on Ex. 3:2, “רַבְדֵי הַלְשֵׁי וְהַלּוּשׁ וְלִשְׁבֹּ” (the messenger speaks in the name of the sender). It was then adopted by many Roman Catholic expositors, as well as by the Socinians and Arminians.<sup>121</sup> And in modern days also it has not lacked defenders. . . Many rationalistic writers declared themselves in its favour, *e.g.* Vater on Gen. 16:7; Gesenius on Isa. 63:9; Bretschneider, *Dogm.* i. p. 429,—all of whom, however, waver between this hypothesis and the one to be mentioned under No. 3,—and also Baumgarten Crusius, *Bibl. Dogm.* p. 307. Hofmann, and those who adopt his views, have modified this hypothesis, by assuming that it is always one and the same spirit who speaks and acts in the name of God.<sup>122</sup>

The reasons which led to the adoption of this hypothesis were very various. The Fathers already mentioned believed that it was rendered necessary by certain passages of the New Testament. The Roman Catholic writers were actuated by the wish to secure a biblical foundation for the worship of angels. The Socinians, like the Jewish commentators before them, were impelled by their dread of the doctrine of the Trinity. The Arminians were influenced partly by their low estimate of the worth of the Old Testament, and partly by their secret Socinian tendencies; and the rationalists by their dislike of everything deep, and their antipathy to the doctrine of the Trinity, which *could not* be true, unless the way had been prepared for it from the very first commencement of revelation, and the truth of which would be rendered *à priori* more probable, if this could be proved to have been the case.

2. The view expressed by Herder (*Heber, Poesie*, ii. 47), that by the angel of the Lord we are to understand some natural phenomenon or visible sign, by which Jehovah made his presence known, may at once be pronounced untenable. He refers to the fiery bush in Ex. 3, and the pillar of cloud in the march through the desert, as cases in point. But it is very obvious that, in the majority of passages in which the angel of the Lord is mentioned, this hypothesis is utterly unsuitable. In Gen. 31 and 32, for example, the voice of the angel of God is heard from heaven without any visible sign. In the only two cases in which there is a visible sign, the angel of God is expressly distinguished from the “natural phenomenon.” Thus in Ex. 3:2 it is said, “The angel of Jehovah appeared to him in a flame of fire out of the thorn-bush,” and in ver. 4, “the angel of Jehovah called to him out of the thorn-bush;” whereas, according to Herder’s hypothesis, it should read, “*Jehovah* appeared to him, and Jehovah called to him.” In chap. 14:19, it is first of all stated that the angel of God went behind the Israelites, and then that the pillar of cloud did the same.

3. Others imagine the angel of Jehovah to have been, not a person distinct from Jehovah, but merely a form in which Jehovah himself appeared. This opinion is expressed by Sack (*Commentationes Theol.* Bonn, xxi. p. 19), who would render מַלְאָךְ a mission, rather than one sent (see, on the other hand, his own *Apologetik*, p. 307); and also by Pustkuchen (*Untersuchung der Bibl. Urgeschichte*, Halle, xxiii. p. 61), who maintains that the angel of the Lord corresponds, in every instance, to the Greek *Theophania*, Rosenmüller also speaks to the same effect in his commentary on Gen. 16:7; “that visible symbol,” he calls it, “by which God showed himself to men.” At the same time, he is not consistent with himself. In his remarks on Zech. 3:2, for instance, he says, “the messenger is called by the name of his principal.” Gesenius, who is equally wavering, says in the *Thesaurus*, p. 736, “The angel of God is nothing else than that secret and invisible deity, which now became manifested to the eyes of mortals.” De Wette, again, in his *Dogmatik*, i. § 108, says, “the

angels are personifications of natural forces, or of the extraordinary works and ordinances of God; hence ‘*the angel of Jehovah] as having nothing personal in himself,*’ is interchanged with Jehovah or Elohim.” We have already brought forward the passages which overthrow this hypothesis. Josh. 5:13 and Zech. 1 are amply sufficient to set it aside. It founders on the declarations of Zechariah and Daniel, who expressly affirm the personal identity of the angel of the Lord and the Messiah. What seems to favour it at the first glance may be explained by the simple remark, that under the Old Testament economy the strong pressure of polytheism rendered it necessary that the emphasis should, first of all, be laid chiefly upon the unity of the divine nature, and that in the wisdom of God the distinction between the sender and the sent was kept in greater obscurity, and the truth respecting the different persons in the Godhead only exhibited in the germ.

4. That the angel of the Lord is the Logos of John, who is connected with the supreme God by unity of nature, but personally distinct from him, was, if we except the Fathers mentioned above, the *universal doctrine of the early Church*. The Fathers of the first Synod in Antioch, in a letter sent to Paul of Samosata before his deposition (*Colet. Cone. Coll. Venet.* i. p. 866. 70), affirm that “the angel of the Father, being himself Lord and God, *μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος*, appeared to Abraham and to Jacob, and to Moses in the burning bush.” Justin Martyr, in his *Dialogue with Tryphon*, § 59-61, proves that Christ spoke to Moses out of the thorn-bush, and says that he is called the angel of the Lord, *ἐκ τοῦ διαγγέλλειν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὰ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ ποιητοῦ τῶν ἀπάντων*.<sup>123</sup> See, further, *Constitut. Apost.* v. 20 b, *Coteler.* i. p. 325; *Irenaeus, c. hoeres.* iv. 7, § 4; *Theophilus*, ii. 31; *Clemens Alex. Poed.* i. 7; *Tertullian, c. Prax.* c. 16; *Cyprian, c. Jud.* ii. 6; *Hilary, De. Trin.* iv. § 32; *Eusebius, Demonstr. Evang.* v. 10 sqq.; *Cyril, Hieros.* p. 322, ed. Ox.; *Chrysostom, hom 48 in Gen.*; *Ambrosius de fide ad Grat. opp.* t. ii. p. 460. *Theodoret says* (interr. 5 in *Ex. opp.* t. i. ed. Hal. p. 121, on *Ex. 3:2*), καὶ ὅλον δὲ τὸ ξωρίον δείκνυσι θεὸν ὄντα τὸν ὀφθέντα κέκληκε δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ ἄγγελον· ἵνα γνῶμεν ὡς ὁ ὀφθεὶς οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ, ἀλλὰ ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς, ὁ μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελος.<sup>124</sup>

We will now proceed to point out certain general grounds, which favour the conclusion that the angel of the Lord is the Logos, in addition to the argument which we have already drawn from the separate passages of the Old Testament; and to reply to all those who adopt a different hypothesis.

1. The testimony of the New Testament is of the utmost importance. This is given in many different ways. The most direct is Heb. 3:1, “Wherefore, holy brethren, partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the apostle and high priest of our profession (Christ) Jesus.” “There is something very remarkable,” says Bleek, “in the application of the term *ἀπόστολος* to Christ.” It is the more striking, from the fact that, when the author wrote, the word apostle had already acquired the force of a proper name. The most natural course, therefore, would have been to avoid the appearance of placing Christ upon a par with the apostles. There can be no doubt, however, that the expression is used for the purpose of pointing out the identity of Christ with the angel of Jehovah under the Old Testament (Bengel: “*legatum dei patris*”), and is thus a kind of proper noun. It is only on this supposition that it has any bearing upon the exalted dignity which the context necessarily requires. *Ἀπόστολον* is followed by *ἀρχιερέα*. And so also there are passages of the Old Testament (*Ezek. 9* and *Zech. 1:12*<sup>125</sup>) in which the angel of the Lord is represented as “high priest.”

This passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews is closely connected with other passages in the New Testament, in which Christ is spoken of as *sent* by God (*ἀποστέλλω* is the word commonly employed, and on some occasions *πέμπω*). These passages are too numerous to be regarded as accidental. There is the less room for such a supposition, from the fact that the frequent use of the expression is apparent solely in the discourses of Christ and in the writings of John, who has moulded his style, far more than the others, after the model of his Master, and in whose writings the *independent* use of these terms goes hand in hand with the fact that he inserts them more frequently than the other evangelists in the *sayings of Christ*. The explanation of the latter circumstance is, that he paid peculiar attention to the deeper significance of these terms; and the same reason necessarily led to *his own* frequent use of them. As the expression “*Son of man*” which the Saviour applied to himself, always points to Daniel, so do these expressions invariably contain an allusion to the personal identity of Christ and the Old Testament angel or messenger (*Gesandte*, one sent) of the Lord. This is all the more obvious from the fact that it is a customary thing with John to introduce nice and obscure allusions to the Old Testament, and that in this respect he differs widely from Matthew, who prefers what is obvious and lies upon the surface. Compare Matt. 10:40, “He that receiveth me receiveth him that *sent* me” (τοῦ ἀποστέλαντά με): *i.e.* “He that receiveth *you, my apostles*, receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, the *לַמְּלָאכֵי הַיְהוָה*, receiveth the *Lord* himself.” Again, chap. 15:24, οὐκ ἀπεστέλην) “I am not *sent*;” and chap. 21:37. Also, Luke 4:43, “I must preach the kingdom of God to other cities also, for therefore am I *sent*” (ἀπεστάλην). And in addition to the passages already quoted from John in vol. i. p. 42, compare chap. 3:17, “For God *sent* not (οὐ γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν) his Son into the world to condemn the world;” ver. 34, “For he whom God hath *sent* (ἀπέστειλεν) speaketh the words of God;” chap. 5:36, 37, “The works that I do bear witness of me that the Father hath *sent* me (ἀπέσταλκεν), and the Father himself which hath *sent* me (ὁ πέμψας με) hath borne witness of me;” ver. 38, “And ye have not his word abiding in you; for whom he hath *sent* (ἀπέστειλεν), him ye believe not;” chap. 6:29, 57, and 7:28, “He hath *sent* me (ὁ πέμψας με) is true, whom ye know not;” ver. 29, “I know him, for I am from him, and he hath *sent* me” (ἀπέστειλε); chap. 8:42, “If God were your father, ye would love me, for I proceeded forth and came from God; neither came I of myself, but he *sent* me” (ἀπέστειλε); chap. 10:36, 11:42, 17:3, 8, 18, 21, 23, 25, 20:21: “Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you; as my Father hath *sent* me (ἀπέστειλκε), even *so send* (πέμπω) I you;” 1 John 4:9, 10, “In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God *sent* (ἀπέστειλε) his only-begotten Son into the world that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and *sent* (ἀπέστειλε) his Son to be the propitiation for our sins;” ver. 14, “The Father (ἀπέσταλκε) *hath sent* the Son to be the Saviour of the world.”

In John 12:41, again, we read, “These things said Esaias, when he saw his (Christ’s) glory, and spake of him.” According to Isa. 6, Isaiah saw the glory of Jehovah. But if it be maintained that the angel of Jehovah is an ordinary angel, and is not in any way connected with Christ, the link between Jehovah and Christ is broken. It is perfectly obvious, however, that John does not assert the identity of Jehovah and Christ on his own authority, but stands upon such firm and clear scriptural ground that he is under no necessity of entering into discussions. Delitzsch objects (p. 355) that Isaiah did not see the glory of the angel of Jehovah, but the glory of Jehovah himself, and that, notwithstanding this, John speaks of him as seeing the glory of Jesus. But we have already observed (vol. i. pp. 111, 114) that the passages in which the angel of Jehovah is mentioned prove that, in every case in which appearances of Jehovah are referred to, these appearances are to be



understood as occurring through the medium of his angel, even where this is not expressly stated.

John speaks of himself as the disciple whom Jesus loved (chap. 13:23, 19:26, 20:2, 21:7, 20). That this expression takes the place of a proper name is evident, not only from the frequency with which it is employed, but also from the fact that it is used in cases in which there is no immediate reference to the love of Jesus to the apostle. It is obviously a paraphrase of the name John. The actual meaning of this name is “whom Jehovah loves;” and in the love of Jesus, John beheld a fulfilment of the pious wish which dictated the name.

In chap. 1:11, John sets out with the view that Christ was the angel of the Lord who had come in the flesh. He says, Christ came εἰς τὸ ῥῆμα, and the ῥῆτοι did not receive him. If we suppose the angel of the Lord to have been an ordinary angel, there is no foundation for this expression. The Israelites are described in the Old Testament as the people and inheritance of Jehovah (Ex. 4:22, 23, and 2 Sam. 7:24, “And thou preparedst for thyself thine Israel as a people for ever. and thou didst become their God”), and of his angel, through whom all his intercourse with his people was carried on. Compare Ex. 3:2 (“And the angel of the Lord appeared to him in a flame of fire”) and ver. 7 (“And the Lord said, I have surely seen the affliction of *my people* which are in Egypt”). In Mal. 3:1, again, the temple is spoken of as belonging to the Lord and his covenant angel.

Not John alone, but the other “pillars” in the apostolic office start with the assumption that Christ is the self-revealing Jehovah of the Old Testament, and thus confirm the view that has been maintained by the Church respecting the angel of the Lord. According to 1 Pet. 1:11, “The prophets searched what, or what manner of time, the spirit of *Christ* which was in them did signify.” But the prophets ascribe their revelations to the spirit of *Jehovah*. Wow, then, came Peter to substitute Christ so directly for Jehovah, unless he found a warrant for this in the Old Testament doctrine of the angel of the Lord? That the latter is always implied when the prophets speak of Jehovah, is apparent from Judg. 5:23, where Deborah expressly refers to the angel of Jehovah a prophetic revelation which she had received in a purely internal manner. In 1 Cor. 10:4, Paul says: “And did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of the spiritual rock that followed them; and the rock was Christ.” Here, then, we have what Delitzsch felt to be wanting in John 12:41. The preservation of the people during their march through the wilderness, and their admission into Canaan, is expressly ascribed in the Old Testament to the *angel of the Lord*. Compare Ex. 23:20, 21, “Behold I send an angel before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Take heed to him, and obey his voice; rebel not against him, for he will not pardon your transgressions, *for my name is in him*” (vol. i. p. 118); also Isa. 63:8, 9, “the angel of his presence saved them.” According to 1 Cor. 10:9 (“neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted and were destroyed of serpents”), Christ was the leader of Israel through the desert, and was tempted by them. In Num. 21:5-7 they are said to have tempted *Jehovah*, who is represented in Exodus as leading them in the person of his angel. The reading κύριον, which Lachmann has adopted, is evidently traceable to shortsightedness. According to Heb. 11:26, Moses esteemed the reproach which he endured for *Christ’s* sake (τὸν ὀνειδισμόν τοῦ Χριστοῦ) greater riches than the treasures of Egypt. But according to the Mosiac account, he made all his sacrifices in the service of *Jehovah* and his angel.

In John 5:37, when Christ is telling the Jews that they will lose God if they reject him, he says, “Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape.” It is inconceivable that Christ should have spoken in this manner with the giving of the law at Sinai before him, as well as Isa. 6 and other passages in which Jehovah appears and speaks, except on the assumption that whenever manifestations of Jehovah are mentioned in the Old Testament, they always take place through the medium of his angel, who is connected with him by unity of nature, and who came in the flesh in Christ. That the remarks of Ode are correct, to the effect that “it was he himself who had formerly spoken to the patriarchs, and had appeared in the form of the angel,” cannot for a moment be doubted, especially as there is an allusion both before and afterwards to the personal identity of Christ and the angel of the Lord in the manner already indicated, viz. ver. 36, “The Father hath *sent* me;” ver. 38, “for, whom he hath *sent*, him ye believe not.” The same may also be said of the expression in John 1:18, “No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.” That no one has ever seen God, must be an assertion entirely without foundation, and altogether at variance with history, unless we recognise a *divine* mediator in the angel of the Lord. For otherwise, such passages as speak of appearances and utterances on the part of Jehovah have no connection whatever with those which mention the angel of the Lord. And so again, when Christ tells the Jews, in John 7:28, that from not knowing him they do not know God, and by rejecting him they cut themselves off from any participation in God, light is thrown upon his words by the distinction already made in the Old Testament, between the unseen God and his revealer, who is the medium of all approach to him.

That the words of Christ in John 8:56 assume the identity of Christ and the angel of the Lord, has already been pointed out in vol. i. p. 40.

In Col. 1:15, Christ is described as “The image of the invisible God,” and in Heb. 1:3, as ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως τοῦ θεοῦ (“the brightness of his glory and the express image of his person”). Further investigation will show that in these passages expressions which were current among the Jews in connection with the *Metatron* or angel of the Lord are transferred to Christ. There is something strange in the passages themselves. One cannot but feel throughout that they do not enunciate the doctrine in question for the first time, but point to something already in existence, and ultimately to the Old Testament, which alone could possibly afford a pledge of certainty. It is only so far as the expressions themselves are concerned that they are in any way connected with the Jewish theology of the time. Bahr has correctly remarked that “the idea of a revealer of the deity was to them one of the primary truths of religion, which they expressed in language current at the time.” The same remarks apply to the doctrine of John respecting the Logos. The manner in which John treats of the Logos shows very clearly that his intention is not to make known this doctrine for the first time, but simply to show the relation in which Christ stands to the doctrine alluded to. The very name *Logos* was not originally a term peculiar to John, and does not occur at all among the terms which he ordinarily employs. That there must be some connection between the Logos of Philo and the Logos of John, is a thought which immediately suggests itself, and the attempt to do away with this connection has been altogether futile. And beside this, the correspondence between the Logos and the angel of the Lord, which strikes any one at the first glance, would be very remarkable if it were merely elicited by exegesis.—Whenever Jesus speaks of having lived before man or before the world, he assumes the existence of the doctrine of the angel of the Lord, in the form maintained by the Church. There would, otherwise, have been no link of connection whatever between these

doctrines and the minds of the hearers. What was new was simply the personal application.

Lastly, the angel of the Lord, whom we meet with constantly throughout the whole of the Old Testament, disappears entirely from the New.—We will not confine ourselves to the name, but look also at the facts of the case. An angel, who usually speaks in the name of Jehovah, and is represented as the guardian of the Church, has completely disappeared (the passage in Rev. 22:7, where an angel speaks in the name of Christ, stands quite alone in the whole of the New Testament), unless he is to be found in Christ. With the Church's view of the *Maleach Jehovah* the enigma is solved, and the connection between the two Testaments, as well as their perfect harmony, brought into the clearest light.

With these distinct and manifold confirmations, which the orthodox view receives from the New Testament, the few plausible arguments by which the attempt has been made to prove that the New Testament regards the "Angel of Jehovah," referred to in the Old as merely an ordinary angel, are deprived of all their force.

Delitzsch observes (p. 334), "Wherever ἄγγελος κυρίου (the Greek rendering of מַלְאָךְ הַיהוָה) is mentioned in the New Testament, whether he be called ἄγγελος κυρίου or ὁ ἄγγελος κυρίου, confessedly a created angel is intended." But, as we have already shown, ὁ ἄγγελος κυρίου (*the* angel of the Lord) and not ἄγγελος κυρίου (*an* angel of the Lord) corresponds to מַלְאָךְ הַיהוָה; and the former is never found, except in cases in which the angel has been mentioned before. Matt. 1:24, for example, "He did as the angel of the Lord (ὁ ἄγγελος κυρίου) had bidden him," is very instructive in this respect, when compared with ver. 20, "Behold *an* angel of the Lord ἄγγελος κυρίου) appeared unto him in a dream;" also Luke 1:11: "There appeared unto him *an* angel of the Lord" (ἄγγελος κυρίου when compared with ver. 13, "but *the* angel (ὁ ἄγγελος) said unto him." Compare also Matt. 2:28 with ver. 5, and Acts 12:7 with ver. 8. But if the case had been different, if ὁ ἄγγελος κυρίου (*the* angel of the Lord) were used in any instance entirely by itself with reference to an ordinary angel, this would prove nothing. We have already admitted that מַלְאָךְ הַיהוָה does not of necessity denote the Logos, but that there are passages in which the angel may possibly be regarded as an ideal person. And ὁ ἄγγελος κυρίου would in such cases have to be explained in the same way. The proof that in a considerable number of passages in the Old Testament the angel of the Lord can only be the Logos, we have already found in the fact that this term, which points to a person exalted infinitely above the angels, is applied to the angel who speaks and acts in the name and person of God. It would be necessary therefore to point out the same fact in connection with those passages (if any existed) in which ὁ ἄγγελος κυρίου occurred.

"But," continues Delitzsch, "the New Testament furnishes still more direct testimony against the divine nature of the Old Testament מַלְאָךְ הַיהוָה. In Acts 7:30, Stephen calls the angel of Jehovah, who appeared to Moses in the burning bush, ἄγγελος κυρίου."—In the original passage, Ex. 3:2, it is stated that "the angel of the Lord appeared to him in a flame of fire out of the thorn-bush." In Acts 7:30, "There appeared to him in the wilderness of Mount Sinai ἄγγελος κυρίου in a flame of fire in a bush." Thus in the Acts of the Apostles we find first of all a general term. But this proves nothing. *The* angel is also *an* angel. And it is evident from what follows immediately afterwards that it is *not* an ordinary angel that is intended. In ver. 31, we read of "the voice of *the* Lord," and in ver. 32, "I am the God of thy fathers," etc. On ver. 30, Bengel observes, "The Son of God (see

following verses): at first Moses did not know who it was, but immediately afterwards he recognised him from the voice.”

“Again,” says Delitzsch, p. 335, “the angel, of whom he says in ver. 38 that he spake to Moses in Sinai, cannot have been regarded by him as a divine being, for in ver. 53 he says ‘who have received the law by the disposition of angels (εἰς διαταγὰς ἁγγέλων);’ and with this Paul agrees in Gal. 3:19 and Heb. 2:2.”—In Acts 7:38 we read, “This is he that was in the church in the wilderness with the angel which spake to him in the Mount Sinai, and spake with our fathers, who received the lively oracles to give unto us.” Moses is placed between the angel and the congregation, in connection with the giving of the law, Bengel correctly observes that “Stephen does not say with the angels, but with the angel of the covenant;” compare Mal. 3:1. In the original account there is no allusion to an angel at all. Moses converses with Jehovah. But the angel is understood as a matter of course, since all the revelations of Jehovah are made through him. Moreover, there is in Mal. 3:1 a distinct scriptural authority for the intervention of a mediator on this occasion. And, on the other hand, Stephen would never have ventured to supply the mediation of *an* angel on his own authority merely. Let any one read Ex. 19 and see for himself whether the scene is one befitting an ordinary angel. And even ver. 53 (“who received the law by the disposition of angels”) does not favour such a hypothesis (compare Gal. 3:19, where the law is called διαταγὴς δι’ ἁγγέλων). Again, if an ordinary angel were intended in ver. 38, the expression in ver. 53 would be directly contradictory. In the one case we have *an* angel (only one can be regarded as *speaking* τοῦ λαλοῦντος αὐτῷ); in the other, on the contrary, we have a plurality of angels. But the case is entirely different, if *the* angel of the Lord is alluded to there. He is usually attended by a retinue of inferior angels,<sup>126</sup> and, so far as Sinai is concerned, the presence of such a retinue is expressly attested in such passages. Deut. 33:2, “He comes with myriads of holy ones;” ver. 3, “All his holy ones are in thy hand (*i.e.* serve thee, O Israel);” and Ps. 68:17, “The chariots of God are twenty thousand, even thousands of thousands, the Lord is among them, Sinai in the sanctuary.” “The chariots are attended by hosts of angels. In the midst of them is the Lord, as formerly on Sinai. The one thing, which is common to Zion and Sinai, is the presence of the Lord in the midst of the numerous hosts of his angels.” In ver. 38 the angel of the Lord occupies just the same place as Jehovah in Ex. 19. *The* angels in ver. 53 and Gal. 3:19 are taken from Deut. 33. In the latter passage, however, the angels are not mentioned *in the place* of the Lord, but the Lord comes attended by them.

The only passage in the New Testament which presents a difficulty at first sight is Heb. 2:2, 3, where the law is apparently placed below the gospel, on account of the latter being “spoken by the Lord,” whereas the former was merely “spoken by angels.” But it cannot have been the author’s intention to ascribe the giving of the law, the most glorious work of the Old Testament, to merely inferior angels, without any direct participation on the part of the Lord and his revealer, in direct opposition to the Old Testament; for in chap. 12:26 he distinctly affirms that “the voice of the Lord shook the earth at the giving of the law.” The only ground, therefore, upon which he can possibly intend to exalt the gospel above the law, is that the revelation of the Lord as יהוה יהלם was not so perfect as in his incarnation, and for this very reason there is a certain sense in which we must make a distinction between the angel of the Lord and the Son of God, instead of saying directly, as the Fathers and most of the early theologians do, that “the angel of the Lord is identical with the Son.”<sup>127</sup>

There is the less ground for astonishment at finding in the Old Testament the doctrine of a revealer of God, who is equal to God, and yet distinct from him, a mediator between God and the world, and we have the less excuse for attempting to remove the traces of this doctrine in a forcible manner, from the fact that there are echoes of the same doctrine to be found elsewhere. We will confine ourselves to the Persians, since the resemblance to the biblical doctrine is most apparent in their case. The religious books of the Persians make a distinction between Zervane Akerene, the unseen God and source of all things,<sup>128</sup> and Ormuzd the first of the Amshas-pands (“the angel-prince of Jehovah”), who is the creator of all things, possessed of majesty equal to that of God, the mediator of all intercourse between God and the world, and from whom Zoroaster received all his revelations. Compare Rhode, *Die Heilige Sage des Zendvolkes*, p. 317, where he says, “Ormuzd, this first of the Amshaspands, and this Being swallowed up in glory, appears under two aspects in the Zend writings. On the one hand as a creature (?), possessed of a body and nerves, and produced by Zervane Akerene like the rest of the Amshaspands. He belongs to the Amshaspands, and, though the first and greatest, is himself an Amshaspand. But, on the other hand, he is also represented as the almighty creator of the heaven and the earth, as the creator and God of the six other Amshaspands, above whom he is infinitely exalted.” According to Schlottmann (on Job i. p. 88) Zervane Akerene represents “the Deity in his absolute character, as distinguished from the God who reveals himself in time, and who is not created by the former, but contained within him.” How is it possible to overlook the resemblance between the angel of the Lord, or Michael, and Ormuzd as here described.<sup>129</sup> This agreement cannot be traced, as it has been by many (among the last by Schlottmann), to the common dependence of both the Old Testament and Persian doctrines upon some primary revelation. This view, as well as the notion which was current for a long time (see J. A. L. Richter and others), that the religion of the Old Testament was to a considerable extent derived from Parseeism, has become antiquated in consequence of the progress of science in modern times. The birth of Zoroaster himself is now assigned by not a few learned men to a comparatively recent date. Stuhr says (p. 354), “The most distinct historical marks may be discerned, which justify us in maintaining that Zerduscht and his religious teaching belong to the period of Darius.” According to Röth (*Geschichte unserer Abendländischen Philosophie*, i. p. 350 sqq.), Zoroaster lived under the father of Darius: according to Kruger (in the *Geschichte der Assyrier und Iranier*, which deserves but little confidence), eleven years after the destruction of Jerusalem, And even though others, such as Spiegel, for example (*Avesta die Heiligen Schriften der Parsen*, vol. i. p. 44), place Zoroaster in the pre-historical times, *all are agreed that the religious books of the Persians belong to a very recent date.* Stuhr, after having endeavoured to prove that the Zendavesta is a comparatively recent work, says (p. 342), “Even Burnouf (*Le Yaçna*, p. 351) does not manifest any disinclination to assign the composition of the Zendavesta to a period in which the fire-worship had ceased to exist in Iran in its original purity.” Spiegel (*Avesta*, p. 13) says, “In the writings of the *Avesta*, which have been received by us, it is evident that very little is traceable to Zarathustra himself, perhaps nothing at all; the greater part has been composed by various, and generally recent, authors;” and again, in page 54, “The evidence brought to establish the authorship of Zarathustra cannot possibly be sustained.” In addition to the recent date of the Zend books, the evident tendency of the Persians to syncretism and to the adoption of anything foreign must also be taken into consideration. Herodotus (i. 135) speaks of the Persians as being particularly fond of adopting foreign customs, “ξεινικά δε νόμια Πέρσαι προσίενται ἀνδρῶν μάλιστα.” Ammianus Marcellianus (xxiii. 6) represents Zoroaster as transferring many of the mysteries of the Chaldeans into his religion. Arabic writers (quoted in Prideaux) say that he was instructed

by one of the pupils of Jeremiah. Modern investigations have thrown the clearest light upon this eclectic character of the Persian religion. "In former ages," says Studer, p. 344, "a confusing and confused eclecticism had everywhere gained the upper hand." And with reference to the influence of *Jewish* doctrines, he also observes, p. 374, "Among the Persians there was nothing whatever to prevent ethical principles, which had been matured in the historical development of the worship of Jehovah, from being transferred into the forms already prepared in this nature- and spirit-worship." Spiegel (*Avesta*, p. 11) remarks, "In this historical age the Persians certainly borrowed a great deal from their more cultivated Semitic neighbours." In p. 270 he lays down the rule that "if we find any views expressed in the later books, which contradict, in so many words, those of the earlier, we need not hesitate to pronounce them of later origin, and *if they clearly resemble anything foreign, in the majority of cases we may assume that they are borrowed.*" Kruger, who imagines Zoroaster to have been "a younger contemporary of Jeremiah," detects the influence of Judaism in the doctrine respecting the first parents and their fall. And thus, after a long period, during which the connection was inverted and the borrowing was attributed with the greatest confidence to the Jews, the state of the case in all essential points is exactly what it was about two hundred years ago. The learned and sober Prideaux (*Old and New Testament*) supposes Zoroaster to have lived under Darius Hystaspes. He also maintains that he borrowed to a considerable extent from the Old Testament, and draws a parallel between him and Mohammed. "From this," he says, "it is sufficiently obvious that the founder of this doctrine was well versed in the sacred writings of the Jews, from which the whole seems clearly to have been taken, and that the cunning deceiver reduced it into the shape that corresponded best to the ancient religion of the Medes and Persians, upon which he propped it." Hyde, whose researches are of the most thorough description, in his work *Veterum Persarum Religio*, c. 10, affirms that "The religion of the Persians coincided in many respects with that of the Jews, and to a great extent was taken from it," and at p. 176 he writes, "in genere autem innuam, quod ex lege Mosaica eis plurima suggessit eorum propheta Zerduscht, quem in illa satis versatum fuisse constat."

In the case of the doctrine of Zervane Akerene, however, there are very special reasons for supposing it probable that it was borrowed. In the religious books of the Persians it has a somewhat obscure and uncertain character. "It is only, so to speak, through a veil," as De Sacy observes (in Spiegel's *Morgenl. Zeitschrift*, vol. v. p. 20), "that this important doctrine can be discovered either in the books which the Parsees have preserved, or in the teaching of their priests." Moreover, it never assumed any fundamental importance, and occurs in but comparatively few passages. Röth (*Anzeige von Röths Geschichte der Abendl. Philos.* p. 253) says, "Among the invocations contained in that portion of the Yaçna, which has been sufficiently explained by Bürnouf, there is not one which expresses the so-called highest notion of the deity. And it is easy enough to see from the translation of Anquetil that this notion is mentioned very rarely in those portions of the Zend books which are confessedly the earliest. This might have directed the attention of the author to the possibility of the abstraction in question being of a later date. To this we may add, that no Greek or Latin author before the Christian era mentions any such idea (? Aristotle); but, on the contrary, Theodore of Mopsuestia is the first to mention the name of Zaruam. As examples, the author quotes one passage from the recent Pehlewi-book *Bundehesh*, another from a prayer to the sun, and lastly a third from the 19th section of the *Vendidad*, the most complete of the Zend books." Lastly, this doctrine is apparently at variance with the original religious system of the Persians, and hence appears to be merely grafted upon it. Spiegel maintains this most distinctly in the *Avesta*, p. 271, where

he says, “From the Persian mythology I might select with the greatest confidence (as an example of borrowing) the doctrine of Zervana-akarana, or infinite time. This doctrine is but sparingly hinted at in the Parsee books. ... In the whole of the original religious system of the Persians, this doctrine is a complete discord.” He also says (*Morgenl. Zeitschrift*, vol. 5:p. 230), “At all events we repeat that the doctrine of infinite time (a supreme, abstract deity, p. 224), is foreign to the original Parsee system, and was interpolated into it at a comparatively recent period;” and again in vol. vi. p. 79, “Zervana-akarana is a recent interloper and a disturbing element, which was never even fully recognised as belonging to Parseism.”<sup>130</sup>

If this result, then, is obtained, that the doctrine of Zervane Akerene did not exist originally among the Persians, but, on the contrary, was borrowed from the Jews, the argument will assume this unanswerable form: to produce such an impression upon the Persians, the conviction of the divine nature of the Maleach Jehovah must have become a settled national doctrine among the Jews. But such a doctrine could hardly have originated in any other way than as the result of a lively tradition, dating from the period in which the sacred writings were composed. Hand in hand with this argument goes the following, from which it is evident that the doctrine respecting the angel of the Lord, which we have defended, had taken deep root among the Jews.

The testimony of the Jews confirms the Church’s view of the doctrine of the angel of the Lord. In all the passages in which the angel of God is spoken of, the early Jews understood neither an inferior angel, nor a natural cause, nor the invisible God himself, but the one mediator between God and the world, the author of all revelation, to whom they gave the name *Metatron*. This name was originally an appellative, which might therefore be used of different beings,<sup>131</sup> and a careful distinction must be made between the higher and the inferior Metatron. the latter of whom stands in the same relation to the higher as the latter to the supreme God. Examples of this may be found in numerous passages of the Jewish writings themselves.<sup>132</sup> The doctrine concerning the lower Metatron, who is supposed by many to be Enoch, is probably founded upon Ex. 32:34. The higher Metatron is not infrequently identified with the Shechinah. Thus, for example, in the book *Tikkune Sohar* (in Gläsener’s *Theol. Soharica*, p. 37) we read, “Metatron est ipsissima Schechina et Schechina Metatron Jehovahae vocatur, quia corona est decem Sefhirarum.” Compare the elaborate proof in Danz, p. 733 sqq., and *Edzardi Tract. Berach.* p. 232). There are other passages, however, which show that the Metatron and the Shechinah were distinguished in other respects, and that the two were identified only so far as the latter was concentrated and personally manifested in the former. In the book of Eschel Abraham, for example (Danz, p. 735), it is stated that “Columna medietatis est Metatron, *in quo* apparet sanctus ille benedictus in Schechina sua.” And in another passage in Sommer (p. 36): “Deus O. M. ejusque Schechina sunt *intra* Metatronem, quippe qui vocatur Schaddai.” This is expressed still more clearly in a passage of R. Moses Corduero (Danz, p. 734), “Angelus hic vestimentum est Schechinae et Schechina occultat sese in ejus medio, suasque ipsa ostendit operationes per eundem. Non tamen Schechina ipsa—sed si dicere fas esset Schechinae vocarem exilium.” For other passages see Knorr a Rosenroth, *Kabbala denudata*, i. p. 528; also Sommer, p. 37, where R. Moses Corduero says, שכינה התומה בתוך מטטרון, “the Schechina is enclosed in the Metatron.”—The Metatron is not created, but an emanation. Compare R. Mose ben Hoshke, in Danz, p. 737, “Manifestum hinc est, quod sit Metatron emanationis et Metatron creationis, qui est nuntius. Metatron autem emanationis est ille, qui Mosi apparuit in rubo.” He is connected with the supreme God by unity of nature. R. Bechai (in *Edzardi Tract. Talm.*

*Berachoth*, p. 231) says, “Rabini p. m. verba וּבְרַמְתָּ לֵעֲרֹמֶת explicarunt: ne permutes me in illo (ut alium me, alium illum esse putes) dicitque hoc ideo deus ad Mosem, ut intelligeret, utrumque unum esse et arctissime unitum, absque separatione. . . . Est ille dominus ipse et legatus domini.” In the Talmud (see the passages in Sommer, *l.c.* p. 45) he is called מְלֹכֵה עוֹלָם, “the prince of the world.” He is the visible revealer of God. *Vid.* Sohar in Sommer, p. 38, “Indumentum τῷ שׂיֵדֵשׁ est Metatron.” He is designated the angel, “cujus nomen sicut nomen domini sui.” *Talm. Tract. Sanliedrin* in Sommer, *l.c.*). He rules over every created thing: “Metatron servus Jehovae, senior domus ejus, qui est principium creaturarum ejus, dominium exercens super omnia, quae ipsi sunt tradita. Tradidit vero ipsi dominium deus O. M. super omnes exercitus suos.” (Sohar in Sommer, *l.c.* p. 35). Othioth Rabbi Akkiva, in Eisenmenger, ii. p. 396, says, “The Metatron is the angel the prince of the countenance, the angel the prince of the law, the angel the prince of wisdom, the prince of strength, the prince of glory, the prince of the temple, the prince of kings, the prince of governors, the prince of the high and lofty, the many and glorious princes, who are in heaven and on earth.” All the glorious titles which are given to him singly in other passages are collected together in a remarkable passage of the cabalistic book Rasiel in Edzard, p. 234. That this doctrine was originally of Jewish origin, and not borrowed from the Persians, is evident from the fact that, in all the passages in which it occurs, its connection with the Old Testament is very obvious. On every hand we either find the passages of the Old Testament, in which the מְלֹכֵה יְהוָה is mentioned, distinctly quoted, or an evident allusion to them. Many proofs might be adduced of its great antiquity. That the doctrine was in existence when the Septuagint version was made, is apparent from Isa. 9:5, where פְּלֵא יוֹעֵץ אֱלֹהִים is rendered μεγάλῃς βουλήῃς ἄγγελος,—probably, as Gesenius observes, on theological grounds, to show that it would not be the Supreme Deity himself who would appear in the Messiah, but his revealer. R. Alschech on Gen. 18:2 (Danz, p. 734), speaks of this doctrine as traditional, “omnis angelus absolute dictus in Scriptura est princeps facierum Metator, cujus nomen est sicut nomen domini ejus, *secundum sermonem doctorum nostrorum* p. m. ad textum biblicum: ecce ego missurus sum angelum ante facies tuas, etc., et ecce angelus meus ibit, etc.” If this doctrine had been one of recent origin, it would be difficult to account for the extent to which it had spread; for it occurs not only in the Cabalistic writings,<sup>133</sup> but in works of the most diverse tendencies. And there are not a few passages in the New Testament, particularly in Paul’s epistles, which favour its antiquity—passages in which it is impossible to resist the conclusion that expressions which the Jews were in the habit of applying to the Metatron are transferred to Christ.<sup>134</sup> The similarity between these passages from the New Testament and those from the Rabbinical writings is too great to be accidental. Lastly, the antiquity of this doctrine may be inferred from its occurring in Philo τῷ δὲ ἀρχαγγέλῳ καὶ πρεσβυτάτῳ λόγῳ δι’ ὀρετὴν ἐξαιρέτων ἔδωκεν ὁ τὰ ὅλα γεννήσας πατήρ, ἵνα μεθόριον στας τὸ γενόμενον διακρίνη τοῦ πεποιηκότος; ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς ἰκέτης μὲν ἐστὶ τοῦ θνητοῦ κηραίνοντος αἰεὶ πρὸς τὸ ἀφθαρτον, πρεσβευτῆς δὲ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος πρὸς τὸ ὑπήκοον. At the same time, in maintaining the antiquity of the doctrine, we do not intend to maintain the antiquity of the *name* Metatron as an exclusive title of the archangel. On the contrary, it is evident from the remarkable passage of R. Menachem von Rekanat (in Eisenmenger, p. 374), that the angel was already called by a number of different appellatives, until at length one of them, namely Metatron, became a standing title and a kind of proper name. In Jonathan on Ex. 3 the angel of Jehovah is called Segansagel; in Jalkut Schimoni (Eisenmenger, p. 375) and many other passages (see Danz, pp. 733, 734), Michael.

We believe that we have now adduced sufficient reasons to prove that by the angel of God we are to understand the revealer of God, who shares in his divinity, is associated



with him by unity of essence, and was the medium of all his communications, first of all to the patriarchs, and afterwards to the Mosaic economy. We have also shown that this revealer of Jehovah was expected to appear as a Redeemer. This is implied in such passages of the Old Testament as ascribed to the Messiah divine names, attributes, and operations. For if the Messiah was to be divine according to the Old Testament system of religion, he must necessarily stand in the same relation to God in which the angel of the Lord is said to have stood. Distinct declarations are first made by the prophets after the captivity, namely, in the passages already quoted, and also by Malachi, who calls the Messiah the angel of the covenant (chap. 3:1), applying this term, the angel of the Lord, on account of his being employed as a messenger in the interest of the covenant, and because his coming to punish and to bless would be the necessary consequence of the covenant.

This identity of the angel of Jehovah or Metatron with the Messiah was also admitted by the later Jews, as the passage cited from the Septuagint version sufficiently proves. The New Testament writers, as we may learn from the passages already quoted, assume it as a generally admitted fact. We will simply add a remarkable passage from the Sohar (Sommer, *l.c.* p. 35), “Cum dicitur servus ejus, intelligitur semis Jehovah, senior domus ejus, paratus ad ministerium ejus. Quis vero ille est? Metatron hic est, sicuti diximus, futurus ut conjungatur corpori (*i.e.* corpus humanum adsumat) in utero materno.” For other passages see *Edzardi Cod. Talm. Berachoth*, p. 230.

Let us sum up briefly the result of the whole inquiry. In the writings of the prophets there is ascribed to the Messiah a divine as well as a human nature. At the same time every polytheistic idea is precluded by the fact, that his essential unity with the supreme God is always assumed. It was expected that the angel or revealer of Jehovah, who had previously appeared in a transient manner, and who had been the medium of all communications from Jehovah to the Israelitish nation, would at some future period assume human nature, and appear as the Saviour of Israel and the heathen world.

But the question arises here, if the distinction between the revealed and the unseen God was already known, even under the Old Testament economy, wherein consists the superiority, in this respect, of the New Testament above the Old? In the fact, we reply, that under the Old Testament the distinction between the revealing one and the Unseen necessarily retreated more into the background, and therefore might appear to be founded less upon a relation existing in the Godhead itself, than on a relation between the Deity and those to whom the revelation was made. Under the Old Testament the Mediator generally spoke and acted in the name of the God whom he revealed,—it could not be otherwise, so long as the *Logos* had not yet been made flesh,—and hence, the revealing one and the being whom he revealed were lost, as it were, the one in the other, and such ideas as those of Sabellius might easily arise. Under the New Testament, on the other hand, the distinction between the revealer and the revealed assumed the form of the distinction between the Father and the Son. This was an advance in two directions. On the one hand religion became more spiritualized, whilst, on the other, it was brought more completely within the range of the senses. It was spiritualized, inasmuch as the contracted notions of the spirituality, omniscience, and omnipresence of God which had arisen out of the failure to distinguish between the revealing one and the revealed, now fell away; and it was brought within the range of the senses, since the Son of God, by his life, suffering, and death, brought the divine being nearer to the human race, than the occasional appearances of the angel of God under the Old Testament would ever have permitted. But

this perfect condescension on the part of God to fallen man was the indispensable condition of the deification of the latter; and this alone could render possible the perfect fulfilment of the Old Testament command, “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy strength.”

#### **APPENDIX IV—THE SUFFERING AND ATONING CHRIST IN THE OLD TESTAMENT**

The question, whether there is any reference in the prophecies of the Old Testament to a suffering and dying Messiah in general, or to his vicarious suffering and death in particular, has received from rationalism a most decided and negative reply.<sup>135</sup> The Israelites are represented as having expected simply a glorious king, who would bring all the enemies of the covenant nation into subjection to it, and exalt it to universal dominion. The actuating motive in this case has been a wish to represent the idea of a Messiah, as being purely the product of natural inclination and of the national spirit of the Jews. It also served to remove the difficulties which lay in the way of the rationalists, arising out of the miraculous agreement between prophecy and its fulfilment.

There can be no doubt whatever that such a view as this is opposed to the authority of the Lord and his apostles. There are numerous passages in which they at once assume that the Old Testament foretells a suffering Christ. In Matt. 26:24, the Lord says: “The Son of man goeth as it is written of him;” that is to say, there is no cause for astonishment in the fact that the Messiah suffers and dies, for you may see from the circumstance that the Old Testament prophecies predicted this long ago, that it forms a necessary part of his mission. In Matt. 26:54, the Lord points out to Peter the folly of his conduct; on the ground that, if he chose to employ them, he had forces at command of a very different kind, and that the reason for his not employing them was simply that the Scriptures, which could not be broken, predicted his suffering and death: “How then shall the Scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?” And again, in ver. 56, he anticipates the conclusion which his enemies might draw to his prejudice from his utter humiliation, by the repeated declaration that he is not without sufficient power to withstand them, but gives himself willingly into their hands, that the predictions of the Scriptures concerning his sufferings and death may be fulfilled.<sup>136</sup> In Luke 18:31, during his last journey to Jerusalem, Christ announces to the apostles that everything which the prophets have foretold respecting his suffering and death is now about to be fulfilled. According to Luke 22:22, “The Son of man goeth as it was determined,” *i.e.* in accordance with the predetermination of God, as declared in the prophecies of the Old Testament. In Luke 22:37, the Saviour says that the prophecies relating to his sufferings are about to be fulfilled, and that, in direct agreement with prophecy, he must be reckoned among the transgressors (compare Mark 15:28). In Luke 24:25-27, where Christ is addressing the two disciples, who are on their way to Emmaus, overwhelmed with grief and amazement at his death, he says to them, “O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?” He then expounds to them the principal prophecies of the Old Testament relating to himself, and especially those in which his sufferings are foretold. In Luke 24:44-46, he

says to the apostles, after his resurrection, that what he told them before his death, namely, that all the prophecies of the Old Testament concerning himself must be fulfilled, has now taken place. Upon this he opens their understanding that they may understand the Scriptures, makes known to them, as he had also done before his death,<sup>137</sup> the meaning of those passages in which the suffering and death of the Messiah are foretold, and says to them, "Thus it is written and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day." In Acts 3:18, Peter says, "Those things, which God before had showed by the mouth of all his prophets that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled." Precisely the same sentiment is expressed in 1 Pet. 1:11, the spirit of Christ in the prophets foretold the sufferings which would be endured by Christ, and the glory that would follow. In Acts 17:3, Paul is said to have reasoned in the synagogue at Thessalonica, adducing from the Scriptures of the Old Testament the proofs that Christ must suffer and rise from the dead; and it is very evident from Acts 26:22, 23, that this was his usual method of instruction, that he was accustomed to draw from the writings of the prophets the proof that the Messiah was παθητὸς, capable of suffering, and that instead of suffering being opposed to his nature, as the Jews maintained, it was rather a necessity of his nature. In 1 Cor. 15:3, Paul distinctly affirms that one of the leading points in which he had instructed the Corinthians was, that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures. And according to Acts 8:35, Philip interpreted the 53d chapter of Isaiah as a prophecy of the sufferings and atonement of Christ.

At the same time it is possible to deny, with a certain plausibility, that any of these passages have the force of proof. In general it must be admitted that Tholuck is correct, when he says,<sup>138</sup> "The typical view of the Old Testament has far greater predominance in the discourses of the Redeemer than is generally admitted. He regards the Old Testament, with its institutions and history, and in certain of its utterances, as pre-eminently typical." A characteristic specimen of this typical mode of treatment we find in Mark 9:13: "But I say unto you that Elias is indeed come, and they have done unto him whatsoever they listed, as it is written of him," where the history of Elias is regarded simply as prophetic of John the Baptist. In addition to this, among the single passages which are referred to the suffering Christ, there are several in which indisputably there is not a direct and exclusive allusion to the Messiah. Compare, for example, the reference to Ps. 69:22, in Matt. 27:34, Mark 15:23, and John 19:28, where the Lord is represented as saying, "I thirst," in order that this passage from the Psalms might be fulfilled, although it does not refer directly to him, but to the righteous sufferer in general. See, also, John 13:18, where the Lord treats the 41st Psalm, the subject of which is also the righteous sufferer, as a prophecy of the treachery of Judas, because the general idea embodied in the Psalm necessarily embraced this particular fact.<sup>139</sup> Such an admission, however, appears to take away the right to maintain that the Lord and his apostles regarded the passages quoted as containing direct Messianic utterances. Moreover, we find Moses mentioned along with the prophets in Luke 24:27 and Acts 26:22, 23, and it is universally admitted that in the former there is no direct announcement of a suffering Christ, Lastly, not only the sufferings and death, but the resurrection of Christ, is also traced to the writings of the prophets, in which no direct allusion to that event can be found.

But these reasons are not conclusive. If it must be admitted that, according to the representations of Jesus, all the types point to his sufferings, the same feature must have characterized the *direct* Messianic prophecies, in which the figure is so fully carried out, and the Lord and his apostles must therefore have found certain distinct passages in which the announcement was made.

At the same time, such is the confidence and emphasis with which the Old Testament is appealed to as asserting the sufferings of Christ, that we must not stop at the types alone; but, on the contrary, there must be the germ of a direct prediction of a suffering Messiah, around which the rest are simply grouped.

The result already obtained is confirmed by an examination of the particular passages, which are cited in the New Testament as pointing to a suffering Messiah. Among these there are several, such as Isa. 53, Zech. 9, 11, 13, and 13, which, judging from internal evidence, refer directly and exclusively to Christ.

As a question of fact, the resurrection is positively predicted in all the passages which speak of the glory of Christ subsequently to his sufferings, such, for example, as Isa. 53 and others. In Acts 26:23, Paul points expressly to the resurrection as necessarily following from the prediction of Isaiah (13:6, 7), that he was to be a light to Israel and the Gentiles.

At all events, the impression made by the declarations of the Lord and his apostles ought to be of such a nature as to deter any one from denying at the outset the existence of any predictions of the suffering Christ in the Old Testament, to produce a readiness and willingness to admit their existence wherever they present themselves to an unprejudiced mind, and to lead to a complete renunciation of the thought that they are *à priori* impossible, or even at all improbable.

The rationalistic view, however, is not only at variance with the authority of the Lord and his apostles, but may be quite as strongly resisted on internal grounds.

In the first place, it is impossible to overlook the fact that *the Old Testament throughout is based upon the supposition of a suffering and atoning Christ.*

And here the first thing which presents itself is the teaching of the Old Testament with reference to the innate depravity of man. If “every imagination and disposition of the heart of men is only evil continually” (Gen. 6:5; compare 8:21),—if the prevalence of sin upon the earth is such as we find described in Ps. 14 and 58:3-5, where it is expressly intimated that the corruption of man is of so fearful a character, because it rests upon original sin, “the wicked are estranged from the womb, they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies. They have poison like the poison of a serpent, like a deaf adder he stops his ear. She hearkeneth not to the voice of the charmer, charming never so wisely;”—then it is impossible to imagine anything else than that, if the Messiah came as the perfectly righteous man, as the pure manifestation of the divine upon earth, he would inevitably experience a powerful opposition from human wickedness, and pass through the midst of conflict and suffering. It is a fact of permanent importance in this respect that, at the very threshold of the sacred history, we are met by the opposition between Cain and Abel, which issues in the death of the latter. From Cain and Abel we ascend the more directly to the fall, on account of the evident connection in which the two are placed in the book of Genesis. The doctrine of the fall would not be treated in so serious a manner, as an unprejudiced examination of Gen. 2 and 3 shows it to be, if the career of the Messiah had been regarded as without exception a joyful one. Moreover, the sufferings which the men of God had to endure in the earliest times from human wickedness, led to a very different conclusion. And if Moses describes the result of his own personal experience, in such terms as these, “ye have been rebellious against the Lord from the day that I knew you” (Deut. 9:24), and again in Deut. 31:21 sqq., “I know

their mind which they have even this day, . . . Behold, while I am yet alive with you, ye rebel against the Lord, and how much more after my death?" what must be the opposition endured by the Messiah at the hands of sinners!

It is also a point of peculiar importance that the wickedness of man does not stand *alone*, but that, according to the representation contained in the very first chapters of the sacred Scriptures, it rests upon a Satanic background. Is it conceivable that he who bears the name of Satan, the adversary, from his opposition to the righteous, should leave *the* righteous one, in the strict sense of the word, unopposed? The book of Job constitutes an indirect prophecy of the suffering Christ. "The history of Job," as I have already stated in my discourse on the book of Job, p. 36, "contains a typical representation of the Messiah in his sufferings, and the glory that follows. The ardent desire of Satan to destroy the 'much opposed one,'<sup>140</sup> against whom he raises up enemies on every side, should be particularly noticed. For if the faulty and meagre righteousness of Job excited such hatred on the part of Satan, how must he burn with malignity against the truly righteous one."

The *righteous sufferer* is a standing figure in the Old Testament. In a long series of Psalms, in particular, righteousness and the deepest suffering, arising out of the hostility of the ungodly world, are described as inseparably connected (*e.g.* Ps. 6, 16, 22, 35, 38, 102, 109). The righteous man is represented in the Old Testament as *the* distressed one, נַיִן. A Messiah, regarded as not παθητὸς (Acts 26:23), would be violently separated from those with whom he is most intimately connected. If the righteous man has to utter such lamentations as these, "My soul is among lions, and I lie even among them that are set on fire, even the sons of men whose teeth are spears and arrows, and their tongue a sharp sword," a Messiah, to whom the whole nation should surrender itself with readiness and good-will, is an inconceivable idea.

With every century that passed away, it became more and more impossible to think of the Messiah in any other light than as a sufferer. All the experience obtained from the whole course of the Old Testament history, from the journey through the desert, and the time of the Judges downwards, showed the impossibility of any other anticipation than that the coming of Christ would be the signal for a severe conflict with the corrupt spirit of the nation. And in Stephen's address, the crime committed by the nation in the rejection of Christ is clearly shown to be merely the termination of a long historical process.

The office of the Messiah was to be a comprehensive one. He was to combine in his own person the three leading offices in the economy of the Old Testament, those of the prophet, priest, and king. And the contemplation of either of these offices could not fail to excite the anticipation of a suffering Messiah.

The type of the Messiah in his *regal capacity* is always David, whose name is even transferred to him. "But who," to borrow the words of Eichhorn, "who suffered more, in a greater variety of ways, or more undeservedly, than David? From a shepherd he rose to be a king. Through what envious and hostile crowds had he to force his way, till he had reached the throne! He had more than once to fly from the javelin of Saul. How often had he to wander through the desert, either alone or with his attendants, pursued by the man who ought to have loved and protected him, as a member of his house and his destined successor! Ishbosheth opposed him as a rival, and he never knew the enjoyment of peace, till the royal house was thoroughly exterminated. After this he was engaged in successive wars with all the neighbouring states, from Egypt to the Euphrates, and after his many victories was doomed eventually to discover his most dangerous foe in his own son, the

rebellious Absalom.” The intensity of David’s sufferings is apparent from the motto, which we find at the head of Ps. 57-59, *לֹא תַחַשֵׁת לָא*, “do not destroy.” What could be more natural than that David, who recognised in himself the type of his great successor, should be disposed from the very first to regard his own experience as the type of that of his Lord (Ps. 110:1), and that subsequent prophets should merely wait for a higher sanction to their presentiment that the great king of the future, for whom they longed, would pass like the celebrated king of past times, whose life and sufferings were depicted in his own Psalms, and who took pleasure, even when seated upon the throne, in describing himself as “the afflicted one,” through suffering to joy, through humiliation to glory, and through reproach to honour? It is also of importance to notice, that in a series of Psalms in which David treats of the future history of his race, such, for example, as Ps. 138-145, he infers from his own personal experience that they will have to pass through severe sufferings, and seeks to fortify them against the strong inward temptations to which such a cross would be sure to expose them. How then could it possibly be imagined that he, in whom the family was to *culminate*, would be spared the endurance of their sufferings?

As *the Prophet*, again, in the full sense of the word, the idea of suffering would still be associated with the Messiah. The lives of suffering which the prophets led are vividly depicted in Heb. 11:37, 38: “They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword, they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins, being destitute, afflicted, tormented; of whom the world was not worthy; they wandered in deserts, and in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth.” Compare with this 2 Chron. 24:17 sqq., 2 Kings 21:16 seq., ver. 10 sqq., Neh. 9:26, and the words of Christ in Matt. 23:29 sqq. The most complete picture of the conflicts and sufferings of the prophets is found in the life of Elias, whom Jezebel swore to put to death (1 Kings 19:2), who prayed that his soul might die, and said, “It is enough; now, O Lord, take my soul” (ver. 4), and who complained to the Lord, “The children of Israel have forsaken thy covenant, thrown down thine altars, and slain thy prophets with the sword; and I, even I only, am left, and they seek my life to take it away.” The suffering prophet is also very strikingly depicted in the prophecies of Jeremiah. “Your sword,” he says in chap. 2:30, “hath devoured your prophets, like a destroying lion.” “I was like a lamb,” he says in chap. 11:19, “or an ox that is brought to the slaughter, and I knew not that they had devised devices against me, and said, Let us destroy the tree with the fruit thereof, and let us cut him off from the land of the living, that his name may be no more remembered.” “Woe is me,” he complains in chap. 15:10, “my mother, that thou hast borne me a man of strife and a man of contention to the whole earth! . . . O Lord, thou knowest, remember me, and visit me, and revenge me of my persecutors; take me not away in thy longsuffering; know that for thy sake I have suffered rebuke. . . . Why is my pain perpetual, and my wound incurable, which refuseth to be healed? Thou art become unto me as a fountain that will no more flow.” And again in chap. 20:7 sqq., “O Lord, thou hast deceived me, and I was deceived: thou art stronger than I, and hast prevailed: I am in derision daily, every one mocketh me. . . . I heard the defaming of many, fear on every side. Accuse him, they cry, yea we will accuse him. All my familiars watched for my halting, saying, Peradventure he will be enticed, and we shall prevail against him, and we shall take our revenge on him.” In vers. 14-18, his agony increases to such an extent that he curses the day of his birth. Truly a terrible omen for the Messiah!—But, notwithstanding all these sufferings, the opportunity was very often afforded to the prophets to discover that the Lord their helper was mightier than the men their foes. The Lord acknowledged them, bore witness to them by the fulfilment of their prophecies, and not infrequently proved that they were his messengers, and avenged them of their adversaries by the exercise of his miraculous

power.—If, then, the prophets lived in this manner (especially in the periods which immediately preceded the outpouring of the judgments of God, and which called forth, in a peculiar manner, the reaction of prophecy through the intensity of the prevailing corruption), in the midst of a constant alternation of the extreme wickedness of man on the one hand, and the power of God, which is infinitely greater than that of the wicked one, on the other; how could they fail to anticipate that their great successor, in whom the idea of their office was to be fully realized, and who was but imperfectly represented by them, would pass in a similar way through reproach and suffering to glory? For he was to appear in the midst of the very same nation, whose corruption was the source of their sufferings.—There are several passages in which the Saviour points out the inseparable connection between the sufferings to be endured by himself and his followers, and those of the prophets of the Old Testament. “It cannot be,” he says in Luke 13:33, “that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem.” Jerusalem, the destroyer of the prophets, *must* also take the life of the Lord (compare ver. 34, Matt. 23, and 5:12).—In Acts 7:51, 52, Stephen declares to the Jews, the “stiff-necked and uncircumcized in heart and ears,” that what they have done to Christ is only the last link in a long chain of injuries inflicted upon the *prophets*, that they have merely shown their consistency, “which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted? and they have slain them which showed before of the coming of the Just One, of whom ye have been now the betrayers and murderers.”

In the first passage, in which the Messiah is called *High Priest* (Ps. 110:4), the ground of this is the forgiveness of sins and reconciliation to be obtained by him. In Matt. 1:21, “Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins,” this is represented as the leading work of the Saviour, and even from an Old Testament point of view this was indispensable, since the forgiveness of sins is regarded as the condition and foundation of all the other blessings of salvation (compare Ps. 32:1), and therefore the Messiah would be no true Saviour if he were unable to grant *this* first of all. All the rest may be regarded as simply additional. The forgiveness of sins is, strictly speaking, the fundamental benefit, of which the poor human family stands in need. David, who was merely a king, might very well bring the judgment of God upon the nation by his sin (2 Sam. 24:17), but he could never atone for the nation. He therefore looks forward with longing eyes for the king, who is also high priest. A nation of sinners could only be sure of the victory, spoken of in Ps. 110, when the king was also high priest. “That the mediation of the high priest consisted chiefly in his presenting an atonement and procuring forgiveness, is especially evident from Lev. 16, where we have a description of the ceremonies to be performed on the great day of atonement, the crowning point of the work of the high priest.” But how was the Messiah to present an atonement and procure the forgiveness of sins? The fact that *without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins*, was deeply impressed upon the minds of the Israelites through the Mosaic law. “There is something very remarkable,” says Hirscher in his *Moral*, “in the thought, which runs through the Jewish ceremonial, that no sin can remain by itself, but every one demands its own particular (bloody) expiation.” In Heb. 9:22, we read, “And almost all things are by the law purged with blood, and without shedding of blood is no remission;” on which Bengel observes, “This axiom is found in so many words in the Talmud in the book Joma.” We are not even left to deduce the general principle from the particular cases, but it is expressly declared in the law itself, “For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls, for *it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul.*” If then, according to this, the Messiah can only procure the forgiveness of sins by means of blood, this blood cannot possibly be the blood of bulls and goats. For if this were fitted to effect a true expiation, the latter would

not have been associated, first of all, with the coming of the Messiah, since such means of expiation as these were always at command. "The sin-offering is vicarious,"—as I have stated in my work on *Die Opfer der Heiligen Schrift*, p. 14,—“but what kind of representation are we to think of? It is very obvious that the sacrifice *in itself* was thoroughly unfitted to effect the object, “for it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sin” (Heb. 10:4). In the place of the blood of the guilty there is required as a ransom the blood of an innocent, sinless, righteous, and holy one. The sacrificial animal might serve as a *symbol* of moral perfection, in consequence of its external faultlessness, but it stood altogether outside the circle, within which the contrasts of sin and holiness are found. True representation again, which has regard to sin that has originated within the limits of the representation, must necessarily be *voluntary* in its character; whereas in the sacrifice of animals it was compulsory. Lastly, there must be a vital connection between the representative and those whom he represents; but there is no such link of connection between man and beasts. That the representative character was not dependent upon anything in the sin-offering itself, was pointed out distinctly enough in the provision made, that under certain circumstances something else might be *substituted*, an arrangement which would have been perfectly inconceivable if the expiatory worth had resided in the blood. According to Lev. 5:11-13, a poor man was allowed to offer meat instead of an animal, and the effect was precisely the same. Hence the sacrifice was accepted by God as an expiation for sin, solely by virtue of an arrangement, which gave to this particular act a worth it would not otherwise have possessed. This could only take place from regard to the true sin-offering, which the typical sin-offering merely foreshadowed.” What could the true sin-offering be, but the self-sacrifice of the high priest?

There were *many points of contact*, therefore, for the doctrine of a suffering and atoning Messiah. At the same time, if this doctrine was to be announced by the prophets, there was still a necessity for *an express revelation from God*. For the system of divine instruction, contained in the sacred Scriptures, does not rest upon inferences and probabilities, but, on the contrary, is derived in every case directly from God, and the instruments employed by him were very careful not to confound human probabilities with divine certainties. That such a revelation was actually made, is attested by all the passages in which allusion is made to the humiliation, sufferings, and death of the Messiah.

These passages are divisible into four classes.

1. Passages in which the Messiah is represented as coming at a time when his nation and family, viz. that of David, had fallen into deep poverty and wretchedness, a condition with which at the outset his own lowliness must of necessity be inseparably connected. That this is a fundamental view in the prophetic books was pointed out in our remarks on Isa. 11:1, where the Messiah is described as a sprout of the family of David, which is sunk into the deepest depression, and as a shoot from the stem of Jesse, just as in chap. 53:2, he is called a root, or sprout from the root, out of a dry ground. With this the announcement of Micah, respecting the birth of Christ in Bethlehem, goes hand in hand. For Bethlehem is introduced here as the seat of the family of David in its prostrate condition (see vol. i. p. 508). In Ezekiel (chap. 17:22), the Messiah appears as a slender twig from the summit of a great cedar. And according to Zech. 9:10, chariots and horses are to be all exterminated from Israel, that is to say, it is to be brought down to the very lowest condition before the coining of Christ.



2. Passages in which the humiliation and sufferings of the Messiah himself are directly alluded to. In connection with Isa. 11:1, the image of the lowly and suffering Messiah is especially elaborated in the second part of Isaiah. In chap. 42, the gentleness and humility of the Saviour, and his inward sympathy with the suffering (compare vers. 2, 3, "He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flay shall he not quench"), point to the fact that he will come, not with pomp and show, but with unassuming quiet and even in the midst of suffering, not only as an *יניע* but also as an *יניע*. Compare Heb. 2:18, "For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted." In Isa. 42:4, "He will not be weary or hasten away," there is an express allusion to the great hindrances and difficulties which will lie in his way. These oppositions are pointed out still more distinctly in chap. 50. The people of the covenant manifest such ingratitude in their remuneration of the servant of God for his faithful work, that he is obliged to exclaim, "I have laboured in vain, and spent my strength for nought!" In ver. 7, the Messiah is represented as despised of every one, the abhorrence of the people, the servant of rulers. In chap. 50:4-11, the sufferings which the servant of God has to endure in the fulfilment of the duties of his vocation form the leading theme. In Zech. 9:9, the whole of the lowly, wretched, suffering condition of the Messiah is called by the most expressive of all the words that could be employed, *יניע*.<sup>142</sup> The expression, "riding upon an ass," which is used to describe the utter lowliness of the king, goes hand in hand with this. In chap. 11, Zechariah depicts the hard and severe conflict which the good shepherd has to sustain with the wicked, and which ends in the offer of the contemptible wages of thirty pieces of silver. In Mal. 3:1-6 (in harmony with Zech. 13:8), the prophet announces that the Messianic era will be attended by a severe judgment upon the covenant nation, the occasion of which, as a comparison of his immediate predecessor clearly shows, is their contempt of the salvation offered, their opposition to the Messiah, and the sufferings endured by him.

3. Passages in which the *death* of the Messiah is predicted. In addition to the passages to be examined presently, viz. Isa. 53 and Dan. 9:26, distinct allusions to this may be found in Zech. 12:10, where the Jews are represented as looking upon the Messiah, whom they have previously pierced; and 13:7, where the sword is drawn against the shepherd of Jehovah, and he is torn away from his flock by a violent death.

4. Passages in which stress is laid upon the atoning efficacy of the sufferings and death of the Messiah. The leading passage in this case is Isa. 53, where the vicarious satisfaction to be rendered by the servant of God is distinctly mentioned, and he is described as the true offering for sin. The atoning efficacy of the death of Christ is also taught in Dan. 9:24, in combination with ver. 26. Making reconciliation for iniquity, and bringing in everlasting righteousness, are associated with the cutting off of the Messiah.

According to Zechariah, the Messiah is invested with the office of high priest (chap. 6:9-15); in his day the sin of the land is wiped off in one day (chap. 3:9); a fountain is opened for sin and for uncleanness (chap. 13:1); the source of this is his death and the shedding of his blood, and it possesses healing virtue for such as appropriate it by faith (chap. 12:10).

The theory of the rationalists is thus proved to be thoroughly untenable, whether we base our arguments upon the New Testament or the Old. It is impossible even to maintain the assertion, that "a suffering, or at least a dying and atoning Messiah, was first set before the Israelites in the period succeeding the captivity, when their minds had been prepared for the reception of such a doctrine by the sufferings which they had endured

themselves.”<sup>142</sup> This assertion rests upon the erroneous assumption that there was nothing very serious in the declaration of the prophets, “thus saith the Lord,” and that prophecy was of a purely human, and therefore temporal origin. It starts with a denial of the authenticity of the second part of Isaiah, the germ of which, so far as its descriptions of the suffering Messiah are concerned, is contained in chap. 11:1. It utterly ignores the fact that the *righteous sufferer* is more adapted to serve as a type of the suffering Messiah than the suffering people, and that this righteous sufferer is everywhere met with in David’s time. It also ignores the fact that the *atoning* Messiah was not in any way typified by the nation, when suffering in captivity on account of its sins. And lastly, it overlooks the fact that it is precisely in the prophets of the captivity, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, that we find the *faintest* traces of the doctrine of a suffering Messiah. The greater the misery of the nation, the more glorious were their descriptions of the coming Messiah.

So much, however, is correct, that the prophets speak less frequently of a suffering and atoning, than of a glorified Messiah. This may be explained from the fact, that as a rule the character of prophecy was determined by existing circumstances, and was dependent upon the historical events to which it owed its origin; though the second part of Isaiah formed a striking exception. By far the greater number of the Messianic predictions (as well as nearly all the Psalms of a later age than that of David) arose out of the conflicts between Israel and the imperial power, and the destruction which appeared to await the people of God at the hands of the powers of the world. They are chiefly grouped around the Assyrian or the Chaldean catastrophe. The mental eye was then directed to the, so to speak, political Messiah. The prophets held up before the view of the people, who were trembling on account of Assyria or Babylon, the future conqueror and ruler of the whole heathen world. This will serve to explain the reason why Jeremiah and Ezekiel speak so much of the Messiah in glory. But deeper wants were not left unsatisfied. Whoever first read the second part of Isaiah, especially chap. 53, with a mind prepared by the study of the Psalms, and then turned to the prophecies of Zechariah, would possess, in reality, everything that could be given before the period of fulfilment arrived.

We must now enter upon the inquiry, *whether the Jews in the time of Christ held the doctrine of a suffering and atoning Messiah*. For if we are correct in asserting that this doctrine is contained in the Old Testament, it is impossible to come to any other conclusion than that it must have been discovered by the more studious and intelligent. If, on the other hand, this cannot be proved, as De Wette (who has devoted the whole of the first part of his work, *De Morte Expiatoria*, to this subject), Bretschneider (*Dogm.* i. p. 134 sqq.), Baumgarten-Crusius (*Bibl. Theol.* p. 133), and others maintain, there would be good ground for suspecting the correctness of our conclusion. But we must bear in mind at the outset, that the camp of the rationalistic theologians is not at one on this matter, and that the existence of the doctrine of a suffering Messiah among the Jews is not only maintained by all the earlier Christian theologians, but by a considerable number of rationalistic authorities, such, for example, as Corrodi, Schmidt, Hartmann, Bertholdt, and others.<sup>143</sup>

There can be no doubt whatever that the great mass of the Jews not only knew nothing, but did not wish to know anything, of a suffering, dying, and atoning Messiah, and merely expected a Messiah in glory. The doctrine of the cross was to the Jews a stumbling-block (1 Cor. 1:23). The Pharisees and scribes looked upon the sufferings and death of Jesus as a proof that he could not be the Messiah; “let him save himself if he be

the Christ,” they exclaim in Luke 23:35. According to John 12:34, the opinion was widely spread among the people that the Messiah would not die.

This fact need not astonish, or lead to inferences at variance with the existence of the doctrine of a suffering Messiah in the New Testament. We may learn from daily experience, how great an influence *inclination* exerts upon opinion. Even in our own day, the most obvious doctrines of the sacred Scriptures are either ignored or openly contested by the great majority of the educated members of the Church. How many educated men there are who are only half acquainted with the teaching of the New Testament respecting the wrath of God, his inexorable justice, and the inevitable condemnation of all who are not reconciled in Christ! The righteousness of works, in which the Jews believed at the time of Christ’s coming, could not fail to close their eyes against the announcements of a suffering Messiah—announcements which are by no means prominent, but rather kept in the background, and were therefore discovered and regarded by the earnest and inquiring alone. The example of the apostles themselves is sufficient to show us how great is the disinclination of the natural man to receive the doctrine of the suffering Christ, the direct and evident consequence of which is the suffering of the Church and its individual members,—how difficult it is for him to reconcile himself to such a doctrine,—and therefore how little warrant we have for maintaining the non-existence of the doctrine in the writings of the Old Testament, on the ground that it was not apprehended by the great mass of the Jews. When the Lord spake of his sufferings and death, Peter would not hear of them: “Be it far from thee, Lord,” he says in Matt. 16:22, “this shall not be unto thee.” The actual ground of his fear is laid bare by the Lord in ver. 24 sqq. It is the dread of the cross which is so deeply rooted in the faint-hearted saint. Peter shrinks back when the cross of Christ is announced, from a presentiment of the cross which awaits himself. After the most distinct and repeated announcements on the part of the Lord of the sufferings which awaited him, it was still true of the apostles, “They understood none of these things, and this saying was hid from them, neither knew they the things that were spoken” (Luke 18:34; compare chap. 9:44, 45, and Mark 9:32). With the sufferings of Christ their own were in part immediately connected, and in part foreshadowed. Thus they at once shook off whatever would lead to such a result. Now it cannot be doubted that the Jews did just the same with the declarations of the Old Testament concerning the suffering Messiah, as the disciples did with the words of the Lord in relation to his own sufferings. At the same time, it must be borne in mind that the sayings of the Lord did remain fixed in the minds of the apostles, though it was nothing more than dead knowledge. In fact, it is through them that we have received it. The point in question has respect simply to a living knowledge, and that more thorough comprehension by which the inner life is influenced. This remark is adapted to teach us prudence, and to put us on our guard as to the conclusions which we draw from such passages as John 12:34. They merely show that the mass of the people had no effective knowledge of a suffering Christ, and not that such a doctrine was altogether strange and unknown. Fragmentary notions of a suffering Messiah, upon which they could base no conclusions, and with which they did not know how to deal when the circumstances occurred, may nevertheless have been widely spread throughout the nation.

So much, however, we should certainly expect, that if the doctrine of a suffering Messiah really existed in the Old Testament, there would be some men among the Jews, of more profound minds, who would attain to a living acquaintance with it. And there are not wanting solid proofs that it actually was the case.

In this inquiry our attention must be directed chiefly to the New Testament. The apocryphal writings of the Old Testament are for the most part occupied with descriptions of the Messianic times; the hopes of a personal Messiah, as in the case of Josephus, are expressed in a brief and enigmatical way, for reasons which I have explained in my work *Für Beibehaltung der Apokr.*, Berlin 1853, p. 39 sqq.; and they make no allusion whatever to a suffering and atoning Messiah, the subject of the books themselves furnishing but little occasion for the introduction of such a topic. At the same time, what is affirmed in the 2d chapter of the book of Wisdom concerning the righteous sufferer, points indirectly to a suffering Messiah. For no one, who entertained such views as these respecting the position of the righteous man in the world, could possibly be altogether ignorant of the doctrine of a suffering Messiah; that is, if he believed in a Messiah at all. The description presents such striking points of resemblance to the history of Christ, that not only Tertullian, Ambrose, and Augustine, but even Grotius and Stier (*Psalmen*, i. p. 240) believed that it must be understood as relating to the sufferings of Christ.<sup>144</sup>

In the New Testament there are two passages which bear particularly upon the subject. In Luke 2:35, the aged Simeon, “a just and devout man, waiting for the consolation of Israel,” foretells to Mary that a sword, will pass through her own soul also (καὶ σοῦ δὲ αὐτῆς τὴν ψυχὴν διελεύσεται ῥομφαία). The assumption is, that the sword would first of all be drawn against the son (thine *own* soul *also*), who, from what goes immediately before, would meet with powerful opposition at the hands of sinners (οὗτος κείται εἰς πῶσιν καὶ ἀνάστασιν πολλῶν). The severest and bitterest sufferings are here clearly represented as awaiting Christ. Simeon was not a prophet in the strict sense of the word, though the Holy Ghost was upon him (ver. 25);—the stronger the ground, therefore, for concluding that this extremely peculiar expression is based upon a passage of the Old Testament, in which he found the proof of his words; just as vers. 29-32 point back to Isa. 49 (compare vol. ii. p. 226), and the words, “he is set for a snare to many in Israel,” to Isa. 8:14. The passages quoted by Bengel from Ps. 42:11 and 63:21 are somewhat far-fetched. There appears to be no doubt that Simeon had Zech. 13:7 in his mind, “Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, . . . smite the shepherd” (Sept. ῥομφαία, ἐξεγέρθητι), in which case Simeon, and John the Baptist, who refers to Isa. 53, share between them the two leading passages relating to the death of Christ. The sword passes through the soul of Mary, because it passes through the body of her son. The death of her son, which, according to ver. 34, is occasioned by the wicked among the covenant people, will be the cause of mortal agony to her.

If the knowledge of a suffering and dying Messiah is apparent here, it is evident from John 1:29-36 that the enlightened Israelites in the time of Christ also learned from the Old Testament the doctrine of an *atoning* Christ. John there exclaims, when he looks at Christ, “Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world.” The Socinian explanation, according to which the Lamb is not a sacrificial lamb, but merely an image of gentleness and innocence, is now almost universally given up. The notion of a sacrifice is involved in the very expression ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. It points first of all to Isa. 53:7 (it arose from a combination of this verse with chap. 52:13, “*my* servant”), and secondly to Ex. 12:7,<sup>145</sup> and represents Christ as the pure paschal lamb. It has been maintained, but without the least foundation, that the figure cannot be borrowed from the paschal lamb, since this was not a real sacrifice, at any rate not a sacrifice for sin. But I have already proved in my work on *The Sacrifices of the Bible* that the paschal lamb was the actual root of all the sin-offerings. The name itself, which signifies first redemption and then a redeeming and atoning sacrifice, implies this, and it is most decidedly hinted at in

connection with the original institution. The blood of the innocent lamb was an equivalent for the blood of the sinners, who made confession of their sins. The distinction between the paschal lamb and the rest of the sacrifices for sin was not an essential one, and may be explained on the ground that a “communion” was connected with it, that it was not merely a sacrifice, but a sacrament also. It was only *inform* that it belonged to the  $\text{מִיְהוָה}$  (Ex. 12:27, 23:18); but even Paul affirms that it was essentially a sacrifice for sin, when he speaks of Christ, who has been sacrificed for us, as the true paschal lamb (“for even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us”).—That the lamb is not merely an emblem of submissiveness and patience, but that its bleeding and dying are also taken into consideration, in other words, that it is regarded as a paschal lamb, is evident from John 19:36, where the apostle applies to the dying Saviour what is written in the Old Testament of the paschal lamb; and also from those passages of the book of Revelation, in which Christ is called “the lamb slain,” or where “the blood of the lamb” is spoken of (chap. 5:6, 12, 7:14, 12:11, 13:8). Also in 1 Pet. 1:19, Christ is represented as a lamb without blemish and without spot, by whose blood we are redeemed. —But if the expression “the lamb of God” is sufficient in itself to suggest the thought of vicarious suffering and death, still more thoroughly is all doubt removed by the clause which follows, “that taketh away the sin of the world.” If the lamb be regarded as an image of patience and gentleness, this clause has no connection whatever with the figure. Moreover, there can be no doubt whatever that John had the 53d chapter of Isaiah in his mind. But the servant of God, who is compared to a lamb in ver. 7, is described as an offering for sin,  $\text{זֶבֶחַ}$ , who bears in a representative capacity the sins of the world, and takes the punishment of them upon himself (compare ver. 4,  $\text{τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει}$ ; ver. 5,  $\text{ἐτραυματίσθη διὰ τὰς ἀνομίας ἡμῶν}$ ; ver. 11,  $\text{καὶ τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν αὐτὸς ἀνοίσει}$ ; ver. 12,  $\text{καὶ αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκε}$ , etc.); and therefore the expression  $\text{ὁ αἰρῶν}$ , etc., must also be understood as denoting representation and atonement,<sup>146</sup> from which it necessarily follows, that unless the whole passage is to be broken to pieces in a most unnatural manner, the lamb mentioned here must be a sacrificial lamb.

We have already observed that the correct interpretation of the Baptist’s words is pretty generally adopted now. On the other hand, however, an attack is made upon the historical credibility of the account. The message sent by the Baptist to Christ, as recorded in Matt. 11, is said to furnish conclusive evidence to the contrary. “If the Baptist had formerly spoken in the manner described by John,” says Strauss in his *Leben Jesu*, “he could not afterwards have put such a question as this. And if such a question was really put by him, his previous testimonies with regard to Jesus are impossible.”

But it shows a very narrow mind to draw conclusions in such a way as this. The events of actual life do not take so direct and simple a course as mere logicians seem to imagine. The human heart is much more complex than they suppose. And if these logicians had but their eyes open, they might learn as much from themselves. The knowledge of the Messiah, previous to his coming, like our own knowledge of the kingdom of glory, was of a very fragmentary character. It was as strictly true of the one as of the other, “we know in part, and we prophecy in part” (1 Cor. 13:9). This gave a certain warrant, or at any rate furnished a powerful motive to bring into one-sided prominence certain passages, which appeared to have peculiar importance under existing circumstances. In the present instance, John had his mind fixed upon the words of Mal. 3:1; for we have already proved (p. 211), that the Baptist’s inquiry,  $\text{σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἢ ἕτερον προσδοκῶμεν}$ , has reference to this passage. In Malachi the coming of Elijah the prophet is connected immediately with that of the angel of the covenant, who proceeds to punish and destroy

the enemies of the kingdom of God. John might imagine that it was not his place to reconcile this passage with such passages as Isa. 53; but that he was warranted in desiring that Christ would at once furnish proofs of his Messiahship, founded upon this particular passage, which spoke in his favour. At the same time, we must not overlook the fact that the Baptist on the one hand did not attach any decisive importance to his doubts, for if he had he would not have sent to Christ himself to have them removed; and from this we may also infer that he found other announcements in the Scriptures concerning the Messiah, which presented a counterpoise to his scruples, and kept him from at once renouncing Christ; and that Christ, on the other hand, detected in the doubting inquiry of John a weakness and a sin, as we may clearly see from ver. 6, "Blessed is he, whosoever shall not be offended in me," and also from ver. 11, where his weakness is explained, "He that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he." The Lord could not have looked upon the conduct of John in such a light as this, if the Scriptures had not put within his reach the means of attaining to a higher knowledge, and if he had not, in the heat of temptation, forgotten the more correct views at which he had formerly arrived. There are some who adduce the fact that the apostles could not reconcile themselves to the sufferings of Christ, as a proof that the Baptist could not possibly have been possessed of any such knowledge as this. But in this case the conclusion is erroneously drawn from Matt. 11:11, that previous to the ascension of Christ and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit the apostles stood upon a higher eminence than the Baptist, whereas the words of Christ imply the very opposite; and with just as little correctness, it is also assumed that the apostles had no knowledge whatever of a suffering Christ, whereas it was merely a living knowledge of which they were destitute. We have already observed, that after the distinct declarations made by Christ, they could not fail to possess a theoretical knowledge;<sup>147</sup> but this was so overgrown by their inclinations that it could not attain to any vigour.

It may be regarded as proved, therefore, that the doctrine of a suffering and atoning Messiah was not unknown to the more enlightened Jews in the time of Christ. For it is evident that John the Baptist did not receive it first of all through direct revelation from God, as we may infer from the fact that he traces it to Isa. 53, and assumes as undeniable that this passage relates to the Messiah. And the result, which we have thus obtained from the New Testament, receives a most important confirmation from another quarter, namely, from the early Jewish writings. A suffering and atoning Messiah was not unknown either to the authors of the Talmud, or to those of the Cabalistic and other writings, although they differed widely from one another as to the manner in which the Messiah would atone for sin. There is the less necessity for quoting particular passages here, since we have already quoted several of the most important in our remarks on Isa. 53. We shall merely refer, therefore, to the collections in Schöppen, *Hor. Hebr.* t. ii. on Isa. 53 and Ps. 22, and p. 551; to Hulsius, *Theol. Judaica*, p. 309; Corrodi, *Chiliasmus*, i. p. 284 sqq.; Schmidt, *Christol. Fragmente*, p. 18 sqq, and p. 43 sqq.; De Wette, p. 61, and the works which are mentioned there.

But we must now proceed to examine the arguments by which De Wette has attempted to weaken the force of these passages. He relies upon one fact, which must certainly be granted, viz. that all the Jewish writings in which the doctrine of a suffering and atoning Messiah occurs were composed after the time of Christ, and endeavours to prove (p. 41 sqq.) that this doctrine, which was unknown to the earlier Jews, was first introduced into the Jewish scheme from Christianity itself, and that after this had taken place, it was foisted by the Jews upon certain passages of the Old Testament, either of their own accord, because these passages, though they did not strictly relate to the Messiah, from

their very nature invited to this false interpretation, when once the idea of a suffering Messiah had been entertained, or else because the Christians had already set the example (see p. 70).

But this assertion of De Wette is proved to be untenable by the simple fact that the testimony already obtained from the New Testament establishes the existence of the doctrine of a suffering and atoning Messiah in the time of Christ. And in addition to this, the following reasons may be adduced, which suffice to demonstrate its fallacy:—

1. From the attitude which the Jews assumed towards the Christians from the very outset, it is *à priori* scarcely conceivable that they should have borrowed from the latter the doctrine of a suffering and atoning Messiah. De Wette appeals, it is true, to other things, which are also said to have been adopted from the Christians, namely, the baptism of proselytes, certain petitions in the Lord's prayer, and a few parables from the New Testament, to which something very similar is to be found in the Talmud. But apart from the fact that the borrowing attributed to the Jews is very doubtful and a contested point, it is evidently one thing to borrow a single custom,—which might have been done almost insensibly, since all that was needed was to give a more precise and limited character to the custom in existence already,—or a single sentence, which bore an Old Testament character, and therefore might easily be regarded as common property, and a very different thing to adopt a doctrine which was altogether foreign to those they had hitherto held, and presented no attractions to a carnal mind, and which formed, in addition to this, the very centre of the system of doctrines held by the opponents. This is certainly a case, if ever there be one, in which we may apply the rule laid down by Schmidt in his *Christol. Fragm.* p. 6, for testing the antiquity of Jewish dogmas: "Messianic modes of thought, which are as remote from those of the Jews, in which the Messiah is represented as a political monarch, as they approximate to those of Christians, and which it is evidently a very difficult matter for modern Jews to bring into harmony with the rest of their notions, are ancient, and were already current in the time of Christ."

2. It is impossible to adduce any analogy from the Christology of the Jews in support of this assertion; on the contrary, it is in every respect at variance with it. The whole of the Christology of the Jews rests upon an Old Testament basis, though very frequently it is founded upon a thoroughly erroneous interpretation of the prophecies. We refer here simply to the doctrine of "The pangs of the Messiah," חִישְׁמָה לִיבָח, which, as De Wette himself observes (p. 61), is connected with the doctrine of a suffering and atoning Messiah, and the Old Testament origin of which he also acknowledges. Even in the case of the most distinct Messianic ideas, they may be traced to some interpretation, either true or false, of the Old Testament, or at least to the attempt to bring the apparently discrepant statements of the Old Testament into harmony by means of certain intermediate ideas. In this way, for example, the fable of the leprosy of the Messiah arose out of a false interpretation of Isa. 53:4, as we may see from the passage of the Talmud quoted in vol. ii. p. 311.

3. If the Jews derived the doctrine of a suffering, atoning, and dying Messiah from the Christians, it is difficult to see why they should not at the same time have adopted what the Christian religion also offered them, the readiest means of reconciling this doctrine with that of a Messiah in glory. The apparent discrepancy between the passages in the Old Testament, in which these two doctrines are found, is removed in the easiest and most natural manner in the Christian system by the doctrine of a twofold coming of the Messiah, first in poverty and then in glory, and a twofold condition, viz. that of

humiliation and that of exaltation. The Jews, on the contrary, resort to the most remarkable and unfounded hypotheses, for the purpose of removing the apparent discrepancy, and prove thereby that they have elaborated the doctrine of a suffering, atoning, and dying Messiah from the prophecies of the Old Testament, without the slightest influence on the part of Christianity, whilst at the same time, for want of the light which is shed upon these prophecies by the fulfilment, they were necessarily involved in great obscurity. The principal hypotheses of this description are the following:—

(1.) The doctrine of the Messiah ben Joseph, and the Messiah ben David. The former of these is to be slain in the war with Gog and Magog, whilst the latter is to complete the deliverance of the covenant nation, and to live and reign for ever.<sup>148</sup> The origin of this fiction was evidently the inability to remove the discrepancy,— which is so easily overcome in our case by the doctrine of the two natures of Christ, and by his resurrection from the dead,—and the consequent inference that such passages as spoke of the death of the Messiah necessitated the belief in a twofold Messiah. Of this the following proofs may be adduced. That the origin of this doctrine is to be found in Zech. 12:10 will be very apparent, if we compare a passage from the Gemara of Jerusalem (probably compiled about the year a.d. 230 or 270) with the Gemara of Babylon (probably belonging to the sixth century). In the former, the following words occur with reference to Zech. 12:10: “There are two different opinions as to the meaning of this passage; some suppose it to refer to the lamentation of the Messiah, others to lamentation on account of the existence of innate sinful desires.” In the second passage (in the tractate *Succoth*, fol. 52, col. 1, copied into Gläsener’s *De Gem. Jud. Messia*, p. 46), we find these remarks on Zech. 12:12, “And the land will mourn, every family apart. . . Why will this mourning take place? R. Dusa and the Doctors are not agreed on this point. According to one opinion, on account of Messiah ben Joseph, who is to be put to death. Peace be with him, who supposes the passage to refer to the death of Messiah ben Joseph. To him does Zech. 12:10 refer, and they will mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son.” In the first passage, Zech. 12:10 is interpreted without reserve, as relating to the dying Messiah; and yet there is a sign of perplexity and uncertainty in the opinion that the lamentation has reference not to the Messiah himself, but to the sin which has caused his death. (For the meaning of the passage in the Talmud, compare the remarks on Zech. 12:10.) In the second the knot is cut by the fiction of a Messiah ben Joseph. That the origin of this doctrine is to be traced to the passage which we have quoted from Zechariah, is still further apparent from the fact that the Jewish writers constantly base it upon this, and mention it in connection with words taken from the verse in question. (Compare the passages in Gläsener, *l.c.* p. 56, 57, 147, *App.* p. 9.) Lastly, the doctrine of the Messiah ben Joseph has completely the character of a doctrine invented for the simple purpose of getting rid of a difficult passage in the Bible, which is afterwards laid on one side, as being no longer needed. All that is done with the Messiah ben Joseph is that he is made to die, after the help of another prophecy (Ezek. 37) has been called in, and a possible occasion for his death discovered. Beyond that no further questions are asked, as Gläsener has correctly observed (p. 91): “Altum nunc est in scriptis Judaeorum de Messia ben Joseph silentium. Postquam enim cum reliquis a Messia ben David et Elia a mortuis excitatus fuerit, nihil de eo ulterius deprehenditur. Nulla ei praerogativa prae reliquis Israelitis in regno Messiae ben David conceditur, nullumque praemium proclade perpassa imoque ipsa morte pro illis suscepta propositum.”<sup>149</sup> We must now turn to the objections brought by De Wette (p. 79) against this explanation of the origin of the doctrine. “If this fable,” he says, “was merely invented with a view to get rid of the idea that the Messiah ben David would endure suffering, how is it that we find the doctrine of the Messiah ben Joseph referred to by writers, who have no hesitation in speaking of the Messiah ben



David as suffering and atoning, such for example as the author of the book *Sohar* and the Babylonian Gemarists?" This objection only applies to such as Schmidt, Staudlin, and many earlier writers, who maintain that the doctrine of the Messiah ben Joseph was invented simply for the purpose of having some one to whom it would be possible to transfer all the passages which speak of a suffering and atoning Messiah; but it does not affect us who merely trace the doctrine to the difficulty which was felt, of believing in the *death* of the Messiah ben David. The former assertion is certainly incorrect. There is not a single instance in which suffering and deep humiliation are spoken of in connection with the Messiah ben Joseph previous to his dying, and, so far as we know, except in one passage which is quoted by Eisenmenger, i. p. 720, and De Wette, p. 76, atoning efficacy is never attributed to his death. But this passage is taken from the book *Shne Luchoth Haberit*, a work of R. Jeshaiia Horwitz, who died 1610 (*vid. Wolf*, Bibl. 1, p. 703). It cannot, therefore, be taken into consideration here, on account of its recent date. On the other hand, in the earliest writings, such as the *Sohar* and Talmud, suffering and atonement are always attributed to the Messiah ben David, most probably because the possibility of representation was supposed to be founded exclusively upon his higher, superhuman nature. But that it was just with this higher superhuman nature of the Messiah that his death was regarded as irreconcilable, and that it was this which led to the doctrine of a second Messiah of an inferior nature, is evident from a passage of the *Sohar*, in *Sommer Theol, Sohar*, p. 91, "Illo ipso die proveniet Messias, proprietatibus *vitalibus*, perfectionibus et praerogativis convenientibus instructus. Quae tamen natura non relinquetur sola, sed adjungetur ipsi Messias alter, filius Josephi. . . Quia vero iste erit collis inferior, *destitutus proprietatibus vitalibus*, morietur hic Messias et occisus in statu mortis permanebit ad tempus, donec recolliget iterum vitam hic collis et resurget." "On this assumption," continues De Wette, "it is impossible to explain why the lower Messiah is called Messiah ben Joseph or ben Ephraim, and yet the name cannot have been given without any reason." But we must make a distinction here between the source of the doctrine of a Messiah ben Joseph generally, and the origin of the name. When the doctrine of a second Messiah had been once invented for a totally different reason, the attempt was made to secure another end by the name which was given him. The opportunity was embraced of paying a compliment to the ten tribes by allotting to them at least the lower Messiah, whilst the higher, being a descendant of David, was to spring from the tribe of Judah. That this is the correct explanation of the origin of the name is evident from the fact that the lower Messiah is called ben Joseph and ben Ephraim interchangeably, not merely in later writings, but also in numerous passages of the *Sohar* (see, for example, Schöttgen, *l.c.* p. 551), and that there is a passage in Schöttgen, p. 360, in which he is assigned to the tribe of Manasseh, whilst the Messiah ben David is also called Messiah ben Judah. (See Gläsener, p. 53)<sup>150</sup> At the same time, that the wish to do honour to the ten tribes was not the principal motive for the selection of the name, but merely a subordinate one, is apparent from the fact that, as we have already shown after the history of the Messiah ben Joseph has been continued to his death, and even his resurrection has been mentioned, he is forgotten altogether.

De Wette (p. 81), who follows Gläsener, accounts for the origin of the doctrine of a Messiah ben Joseph, on the ground that the Jews desired thereby to indicate the fact that the ten tribes would be gathered together out of all the countries of the earth by the Messiah, and introduced by him into the land of Canaan. But even apart from the positive grounds which may be adduced in favour of the explanation given by us, the improbability of this hypothesis is at once apparent. And with the exception of two passages from the book *Mikveh Israel*, written by R. Manasseh ben Israel, which cannot

be taken into account at all, both on account of its recent date (it appeared for the first time in 1650, Wolf, *Bibl.* i. p. 783), and also because of the untraditional character of its contents, in not one of the passages quoted by Gläserer (p. 202. sqq.) and De Wette (p. 81) is the task assigned to the Messiah ben Joseph of gathering the Israelites together out of the different countries of the earth, and bringing them to the Holy Land. On the contrary, the Israelites themselves assemble together out of the different lands, and come to him after his resurrection. But what inducement could this hold out to the invention of such a doctrine, seeing that they might just as well have come together at the very first to the Messiah ben David, under whom, even according to the doctrine of the Jews, the most important gathering together would first take place (*vid.* Gläserer, p. 69). We have already seen that the death of the Messiah ben Joseph forms the central point of the whole doctrine. But if we adopt De Wette's explanation, it is impossible to see what reason there was for making him die at all. It is very evident that the reasons assigned by De Wette (p. 82) are not satisfactory, viz. that "only *one* Messiah could reign, and therefore it seemed advisable to remove the other out of the way." He completely overlooks the fact that the Messiah ben Joseph is to be raised along with the rest of the dead by the Messiah ben David and Elias. If then the difficulty actually existed, which it does not, since it was quite possible to assign to the Messiah ben Joseph a subordinate position in the kingdom of the Messiah, it would not be removed by his death.—"The need of an atonement might furnish an opportunity for inventing the account of his death." But we have already seen that the death of the Messiah ben Joseph was not supposed to possess an atoning efficacy; on the contrary, it was from the vicarious sufferings of the Messiah ben David that an atonement was expected.—"The sin of Jeroboam appeared to demand his death." This is proved by one single passage from the book *Jalkut Chadash*, which is of very recent date, and was not held in much respect by the Jews themselves (see Wolf, *Bibl.* ii. p. 1308). That this was not the inducement in the case of the earlier Jews, is evident from the simple fact that they did not regard the death of the Messiah ben Joseph as possessing any atoning virtue. Moreover, the guilt of Jeroboam is washed away along with all the rest by the vicarious sufferings of the Messiah ben David.

(2.) The second hypothesis, invented for the purpose of reconciling the passages which treat of a suffering Messiah, and those which represent him as coming in glory, was the doctrine that, previous to his appearance upon earth, he atoned in Paradise for the sins of men by indescribable sufferings. This explanation is found in the book *Sohar*, and is very rarely met with elsewhere. (Compare the passages quoted by Eisenmenger, ii. p. 320; Gläserer, p. 28 sqq.; Bertholdt, *Christologia* § 25; and De Wette, p. 65. See also the leading passages from the *Sohar* in vol. ii. p. 313.) How could so romantic an idea have ever entered any one's mind, if the doctrine of a suffering and atoning Messiah had been borrowed from the Christians, who connect together the sufferings and glory of the Messiah in so perfectly natural a way?

(3.) To the same end another opinion, which was quite as widely spread, was first adopted, namely, that the Messiah was already born, but that up to the time of his manifestation he would be engaged in atoning for the sins of the Israelitish nation, an opinion, the antiquity of which is evident from the fact that it occurs in the dialogue with the Jew Trypho. The existence of two hypotheses, so different in their character as these, shows clearly enough how difficult it was to know what to do with a suffering and atoning Messiah. That the latter of the two owes its origin solely to the difficulty caused by the doctrine of a suffering Messiah, is apparent from the fact that the birth of the Messiah, wherever it occurs, is associated with his sufferings and atonement. (Compare

the passages in Gläser, p. 22 sqq.; Corrodi, i. p. 284 seq.; and De Wette, p. 66.) It is true, De Wette asserts (p. 63) that the notion of the Messiah being already born was founded upon certain calculations, which led to the conclusion that the Messiah must have come already. But of all the passages mentioned, the whole of which are taken from Gläser, p. 15 sqq., who quotes them for a different purpose, there is not a single one at all conclusive, or even one which bears upon the subject. The question discussed in all these passages is not why the Messiah must be already born, but why he has not yet appeared. The cause is traced to the want of penitence and good works on the part of the Israelites, and with this explanation every calculation that failed to be verified could be easily disposed of, and therefore there was no necessity to resort to the theory that the Messiah was already born, a loophole, moreover, which is nowhere to be met with. Our explanation of the origin of the hypothesis respecting the birth of the Messiah is also confirmed by the period fixed upon for that event. It is affirmed with tolerable unanimity that it occurred in connection with the conquest of the city, and in fact on the day when the temple was destroyed. (Consult the passages in Gläser, p. 25.) The destruction of the temple prevented the possibility of the sacrifices being continued, and, as the interruption of the means of reconciliation with God which had hitherto existed, was naturally the cause of great lamentation. In order to obtain a substitute, the birth of the Messiah, which it was thought necessary to assume in order to gain time for his sufferings, was transferred to the very time when the former ceased, and it was then that his sufferings and atonement were supposed to commence.

The result, then, which we have obtained is this: the doctrine of a suffering and atoning Messiah existed among the Jews from the very earliest times, and was not the result of Christian influence, but derived from the Old Testament. So much at least may be granted, that this doctrine was more widely spread and met with a more ready reception among the Jews subsequently to the time of Christ. This may possibly be accounted for in part, on the ground that the prominence given to the doctrine of a suffering Messiah among the Christians caused the attention of the Jews to be more particularly directed to this point in their own doctrines concerning the Messiah. But the true cause is certainly to be found in the fact that, after the destruction of the temple had deprived the Jews of their apparent sufficiency, their attention was more closely directed to the Messiah. This is obvious from a passage which is quoted from the *Sohar* in *Sommer's Theol.* p. 94, "While the Israelites were in the Holy Land, they got rid of all these diseases and punishments by means of holy works and sacrifices; but now (the Levitical worship having ceased) the Messiah must take them away from men," a passage from which De Wette, p. 66, rashly attempts to prove that the doctrine of a suffering and atoning Messiah originated with the destruction of the temple. Does it follow, however, from the fact that in later times so much importance was attached to that which had disappeared, that the same importance must have been attached to it while it was still standing? The sacrificial worship, even while it lasted, could never satisfy the longings for redemption which were felt by the more earnest minds; and we have already seen that they were looking with eagerness for the higher satisfaction which the Old Testament promises set before them.

## **APPENDIX V—HISTORY OF THE INTERPRETATION OF THE MESSIANIC PROPHECIES**

The study of the Messianic prophecies was pursued with great interest from the very earliest times. The true principle, that Christ was the central point of the whole of the Old Testament, and especially of prophecy (Origen on Matt., vol. iii. of his works, p. 272),

was falsely applied, and the attempt was frequently made to discover direct allusions to him, where context and the usages of the language were both unfavourable, either by literal or historical interpretation. In adducing proofs from the New Testament, the first glance was frequently thought sufficient, and the fact was entirely overlooked that the treatment of the Old Testament in the New is of a very refined and spiritual character. Very frequently the opinion was openly expressed, that it is better to look for Christ ten times where he is not to be found than to omit to seek him once where he is to be found. In the case of passages which were correctly regarded as Messianic, commentators often allowed themselves to resort to forced interpretations for the purpose of giving to the allusions to Christ a thoroughly individual character, or with a view to increase the number of arguments brought against the non-Messianic expositors. Moreover, justice was not done to the historical interpretation. The historical starting-point of the Messianic announcements was not thoroughly investigated. In the time of the Fathers, this was the prevalent mode of exposition. And even in the churches of the Reformation, in the Reformed no less than the Lutheran, it soon gained the upper hand, although Calvin had made the attempt to pave a new way, and had even frequently gone too far<sup>151</sup> in the opposite direction, by denying a direct Messianic allusion, even where it rests upon the surest foundation. But the Lutheran and Reformed theologians are superior to the Fathers in this respect, that they entirely renounce the allegorical interpretation, or at least keep it within more limited bounds, and that they have not only a great dread of mere caprice, but impose upon themselves the task of thorough demonstration.

Of the works which give the results of the church-theology in a condensed form, the most important is the *Nucleus Prophetiae* of Anton Hulsius (Leiden 1683, 4), in which the Jewish interpretations are diligently collected and carefully refuted. Of much less worth are the two works of the Cocceian Abr. Gulich, *Theologia Prophetica* (Amsterdam 1675, 4 Ed. 2, 1690, 4), and Nicol. Görtler, *Systema Theologiae Proph.* (Amsterdam 1702, Ed. 2, Frankfurt 1724). Professor Oporin, of Göttingen (in his work “*Die Kette der in den Büchern des A. T. Befindlichen Vorherverkündigungen von dem Heiland,*” Göttingen 1745), proposes to trace the connection between the four “solemn predictions” in Gen. 3:15, Gen. 12, Deut. 18, and 2 Sam. 7, and all the other prophecies, and to point out the constancy with which references to the earlier prophecies occur in those of a later date.

It could not possibly be expected that this mode of interpretation would remain without opposition. And it was also a very natural tiling, as one extreme produces another, that it should not make its way without exaggeration. In the early church, Eusebius of Emesa first attempted to sift the passages which were supposed to refer to the Messiah, and to distinguish those which could only be made to apply to him by means of allegorical interpretation from those which literally referred to him (Hieronymus, *Catal. Script. Eccles.* c. 119). Diodorus of Tarsus trode in his footsteps, and set down many passages which were applied by others exclusively to Christ, as only admitting of being so applied in a higher sense. He also maintained that there were very few passages which referred directly to Christ, μόνον καὶ κυρίως, κατὰ ῥῆτόν and καθ' ἱστορίαν. Theodorus of Mopsuestia, the pupil of Diodorus, who wrote a book against those who followed Origen's method of interpretation, went further still. His own method was pronounced heretical, and condemned. It found therefore but few adherents who went so far as he. One of these was Cosmas Indicopleustes, who divested of their meaning even the most obvious of the Messianic prophecies, such, for example, as Zech. 9:9, 10, which he referred primarily to Zerubbabel. Theodoret and Chrysostom attempted to discover a middle way, which should combine all that was true in these two opposite systems.<sup>152</sup>

Grotius went far beyond all his predecessors in the early church. It was not quite honest on his part to state, as he did in his preface to the Old Testament, that he had referred “a few passages” (*locos nonnullos*) which are usually supposed to apply to Christ, to events which were nearer to the prophets’ own times. For there are only six or seven passages, more especially Gen. 49:10, Dan. 9:24, Hag. 2:7, 8, Mal. 3:1, in which he finds any direct and literal allusion to Christ. Not a single passage of Isaiah is regarded by him as, strictly speaking, Messianic. The hostile attitude which he thus assumed to the New Testament he endeavoured to cover by the hypothesis that many declarations, which referred primarily and literally to nearer events and persons, relate in a higher sense to New Testament times; a supposition which, in his case, is obviously merely a loophole, and which by no means does justice to the authority of the New Testament. For example, if Ps. 110 is not to be regarded as directly Messianic, the whole of the argument employed by the Lord himself in Matt. 22 is utterly without foundation. A similar system of interpretation to that of Grotius was also adopted by Hammond, Clericus (particularly in his earlier period), Limborch, and the Socinians, some of whom preceded Grotius.<sup>153</sup> This method of interpretation is evidently not traceable *solely* to the same cause as that which led Calvin in many instances to deviate from the current explanation, even when it rested upon a sure foundation, viz. to a reaction from the opposite extreme. Other causes must have co-operated with this. One of the principal reasons was a strong impulse towards a historical interpretation, and, at the same time, a want of acquaintance with the nature of the prophetic intuition. It was difficult to explain how the anticipations of the Messianic salvation, in the case of the prophets, should be so closely connected in many cases with declarations which indisputably referred to their own times and the immediate future. Grotius himself observes that it was this which chiefly determined his own method of interpretation: “feci autem hoc, quod viderem male cohaerere verborum rerumque apud prophetas seriem, quae caeteroquin pulcherrima est.” His cold, prosaic mind unfitted him for comprehending such intuitions as far transcend the limits of ordinary experience. Moreover, just as love to Christ and firm faith in him had led the adherents of the opposite method to resort to many a forced interpretation, so, on the other hand, is it impossible to overlook the fact, that want of love and weakness of faith were among the determining causes here. The very persons who refer the clearest passages of the Old Testament to any other subject rather than to their Lord and Saviour, when they come to interpret the New Testament, manifest a similar disposition to resort to a superficial, jejune, and spiritless exposition, and we are certainly not wrong in referring both to the same source.

The venerable Leipzig theologian Chr. Aug. Crusius (in his *Hypomnemata ad Theologiam Prophetica*, 3 vols., Leipzig 1764, sqq.) endeavoured to avoid both by-paths. Although in the main he took the side of the orthodox theology, in opposition to Grotius and his supporters, yet he spoke against the “*praecipitania de Christo interpretandi quae et quatenus de isto non agunt, quo fit, ut suspecta etiam reddantur, quae de illo recte intelliguntur.*”<sup>154</sup> There are some general treatises in this work, in which we meet with very striking thoughts.<sup>155</sup> In many respects it furnishes the clue to new and correct ideas, especially with reference to the nature of prophetic intuition.<sup>156</sup> At the same time, it is very evident that Delitzsch<sup>157</sup> has considerably overrated both the man and his work. Whoever passes from Delitzsch to the work itself will very soon be undeceived. The labours of Crusius in connection with the Old Testament cannot by any means be compared with what Bengel has done for the New. (Bengel directed but little attention to the Old Testament, and his merits in this respect, which are so highly celebrated by Delitzsch, viz. in the introduction of chiliasm, etc., are of a very questionable character.)

The very things for which Bengel is so distinguished, his spirit of submission to the Scriptures and his microscopic observation, are those in which Crusius is very deficient. He has spun out for himself a philosophical system, and with this he approaches the Bible. His merits are altogether restricted to general points of view. Whenever he enters into the details of criticism, he is quite unprofitable. For historical interpretation his mind is but little adapted. You may read, for example, through the whole of the long section on Balaam without finding a single remark which really helps you forward.

Hitherto the conviction had been so universally entertained that the Old Testament contained in general a genuine revelation from God, and, in particular, predictions of the Messiah, dictated by His spirit, that the disputes had been restricted to details alone. It is since the last quarter of the eighteenth century that a complete division of opinion has gradually taken place with reference to the fundamental view itself. Starting with the doctrinal premises, that nature forms a complete and independent whole, upon which God will not and cannot operate either by inspiration from within or miracles from without, a totally new attitude was of necessity assumed in relation to the Messianic prophecies. Their very nature was destroyed. C. F. Ammon, who was the first to enter into an elaborate treatment of the subject from this point of view, in his *Entwurf einer Christologie des A. T.* (Erl. 94), describes the purport of his work in these terms: "It seeks to prove that by means of the entire history of the mental culture of the Jews, and even by means of the patriotic desires of the prophets, the way was indisputably prepared by providence for the coming of Jesus; but that there is nothing in the oracles of the Hebrew seers to show that they "had any clear and distinct view of the person and career of the divine founder of our religion."<sup>158</sup> We see here that even in this respect the influence of rationalism is, without exception, of a destructive character, and repudiates all connection with the Christian Church of every age.

The leading points in the rationalistic opinions were the following. The Messianic hopes are nothing more than a patriotic fancy of the so-called prophets, who are all open to the charge brought by Jeremiah against the false prophets, of prophesying "from their own hearts." They arose in a purely natural way, and without any direct intervention on the part of God. Under David and Solomon, the nation had reached the summit of power and prosperity. But shortly afterwards it sank down again. The strength of the nation was first of all broken by the separation of the ten tribes; and the invasions of the Assyrians, and, at a later period, of the Chaldeans, brought it very near to destruction. Hand in hand with outward disaster went inward decay. Idolatry and immorality gained more and more the upper hand. What was more natural under such circumstances as these than that the prophets, raising themselves above the present, should look forward to the return of the times of David and Solomon, and should associate these hopes with some great successor of David, under whose righteous government the nation would again be prosperous in proportion to its godliness, and would, overcome its unjust oppressors?<sup>159</sup>

To *establish* this view, which was hitherto quite unknown in the Christian Church, was not a very difficult thing for rationalism, which is nothing but atheism in the germ, and the whole tendency of which is to shut out God from earthly things and thus prepare the way for a denial of his existence. The rationalists were aware of the sympathies of their contemporaries. We will just collect together the remarks which we find scattered about here and there, and submit them to investigation. (1) "The human form of the Messianic idea is apparent from the fact that it *changed* with the changing circumstances of the nation. But it is impossible that the variable image of different ages should be realized at

one particular period in a certain unchangeable subject.”<sup>160</sup> To this we reply, the Messianic announcement was only so far changeable that those views were always presented which were best adapted, under certain circumstances, to edify the people of God in accordance with the universal custom in the Scriptures, the searching effects of which are due to the fact that they do not teach after the manner of a dogmatic compendium, but in living connection with the necessities of the times. The only thing that would give any force to this argument would be the discovery of actual contradictions. But these no one has ever been able to point out. The apparent discrepancy, for example, between the announcements of a suffering Messiah and those of a Messiah in glory, is removed by the fact that in Isa. 53, which forms the central point of all the announcements of a suffering Messiah, the suffering is represented as the pathway to glory, and its necessary condition. But what is decisive *against* the “human origin of the Messianic idea” is this, that notwithstanding all the variations in the announcement itself, the scattered features do admit of being combined together, so as to form one harmonious portrait, and this portrait tallies exactly with the historical appearance of Christ. The only possible explanation of this is, that behind the human instruments employed, a divine causality lay concealed, which secured the manifold against degenerating into contradiction and disunion, and which completed this image in the course of centuries by constantly adding fresh features, as the necessities of the Church demanded. (2) It is maintained that there is “not even a plain and distinct announcement of Jesus of Nazareth as the sole source of blessedness to both Jews and heathen;” but that we meet on every hand with nothing but “poetical, indefinite, and ambiguous delineations of the future.”<sup>161</sup> But it is the universal plan adopted by God in the Scriptures to afford so much clearness, that faith, for which alone the Scriptures are designed, may find its way, and so much obscurity that unbelief may mistake the road, just as in nature God not only reveals himself, but also hides himself, that he may be found by the seekers alone. Such passages as Isa. 53, and in general all the Messianic prophecies, when taken in connection with these central points, are in their nature perfectly plain and definite, and not poetical or ambiguous; but in the form, which is inaccessible to the common mind, care has been taken that the words of the Lord himself shall be carried out, “I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes.” The Scriptures are not to be understood by all. The apostle speaks of such as are *appointed* or ordained of God not to comprehend the word (1 Pet. 2:8), and if there are such men at all, it must be the men of the world-religion (*Weltreligion*), the *psychikoi* (natural men), who have no spirit.—(3) The Messianic prophecies are said to be of a “purely political character, and to bear the marks of Jewish nationality and selfishness” (v. Ammon). This would inevitably have been their character if they had been of human origin. But we shall by and by adduce the fact that this is not their character, as a proof of their divine origin. It is true that if any one is desirous of finding out that this is a characteristic, care has been taken that the letter of these prophecies shall contain many things which seem to favour such a conclusion. But whoever is qualified by the spirit of Christ for interpreting what the spirit of Christ has foretold, perceives everywhere the spiritual background, and is able to distinguish between the thought itself and the dress in which it is clothed. The necessity for making this distinction is evident, to take a single example from Isa. 19:19, where an altar of the Lord is represented as being erected in the midst of the land of Egypt in the days of the Messiah (see vol. i. pp. 141, 142), as compared with Isa. 2:2 sqq. and 66:23, in which the heathen are described as coming to Jerusalem in the Messianic age.—(4) We are told that there is very much which has not been fulfilled in any way in the New Testament times. But the proofs which are adduced here rest in part upon false

interpretation. This is the case, for example, with the assertion which has been made, that in Ezekiel, Jehovah promises to give to the restored nation his servant David as king<sup>162</sup> instead of a mere Davidic sprout—(according to Ezek. 17:22, the Messiah is a tender twig from the top of a lofty cedar, a sprout and offshoot from the great Davidic stem, not David himself)—and it is also the case when the old error is renewed, that Malachi announces in chap. 3:23 the actual return of the old prophet Elijah as the forerunner of the Messiah, “probably by means of transmigration,”<sup>163</sup> which is entirely foreign to the whole of the Old Testament. There are other proofs, again, which rest upon the blindness of rationalism with regard to the true nature of Christ. For example, when it is affirmed that “the Messiah is represented as king, and Christ has not fulfilled this representation; the Messiah was to reign for ever upon the earth, and Christ left it after a very brief period of labour,” we have here the evidence of a shameful disregard of him who declared himself to be a king (John 18:37), the possessor of a βασιλεία, which is the more thoroughly world-wide in its extent from the fact that it has its origin not in the world, but immediately from heaven (ver. 36), the son of the heavenly king (Matt. 22:2, compare 21:37), and who solemnly declared before his departure from the earth that all power was given to him in heaven and on earth, and that he would be with his people always, even to the end of the world.—(5) On the ground of Christ’s assertion in Luke 7:28 and Matt. 11:11, that, although John the Baptist was the greatest of the prophets under the Old Testament, he was less than the least of the members of the new kingdom of God (according to the correct explanation, he merely stands upon the same level as the *little ones* under the New Testament; vol. iv. p. 214), Ammon and Baumgarten-Crusius maintain that it must be wrong to form any exalted conceptions of the illumination of the prophets. But these words of the Lord had reference simply to the ordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit which John possessed, and to his state of grace. This is apparent from the circumstances under which they were spoken, and from their connection with the declaration, “Blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in me.” The object of Christ was to show that there was nothing surprising in the fact that the faith of John had been shaken. With reference to his personal state of grace, John occupied but a low position when measured by the standard of the New Testament, on account of his not having entered into close association with Christ, and still more because he did not possess the gifts which were only bestowed as the result of Christ’s atoning death, John 7:39. But the greater the imperfection of the ordinary gifts under the Old Testament, the more necessary was it for extraordinary gifts to be conferred upon the servants and instruments of God, and the more miraculous was the form which they inevitably assumed. In the very same passage, Christ defends the prophetic dignity of John in the fullest sense, and at the same time refers to the genuineness of the prophetic character of Malachi, who had spoken in the spirit of this forerunner of the Lord. “This is he,” says the Saviour, “of whom it is written, Behold I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee.” If it had been the Lord’s intention to deny the divine illumination of the prophets, he would have placed himself in opposition to the tenor of the whole of the New Testament.<sup>164</sup> (6) The assertion of L. Bauer<sup>165</sup> rests upon exegetical incapacity. He says, “The hopes of the prophets were not fulfilled. After the captivity, their state never reached this lofty summit of prosperity, and instead of this politico-religious kingdom enduring for ever along with all its rites and ceremonies, it has ceased to exist for more than 1700 years.” We have already proved that the legitimate continuation of Israel is the Church of Christ, against which the gates of hell are not to prevail and have not prevailed, and in which there resides a strong and irresistible force, urging it towards continual extension to the ends of the earth. The destruction of Jerusalem was not the overthrow, but the triumph of Israel, Luke 21:28, 31. The prophets were so far from promising



salvation to the great mass of the Jews in connection with the coming of the Messiah, that they expressly associated their rejection and the destruction of their city, as well as the entire cessation of their rites and ceremonies, with that event.

It is evident, then, that the views of the rationalists are utterly destitute of any tenable foundation. On the other hand, the following positive arguments may be adduced against them.

(1.) The view of prophecy which lies at the foundation of this hypothesis is a thoroughly false one, and is at variance alike with the Old Testament itself and with the testimony of Christ and his apostles. Herder has already observed (*Briefe*, p. 234) that we cannot pronounce the prophets dreamers and fanatics, as this hypothesis does, without at the same time giving up the entire history of the Jewish nation, the economy of God with regard to it, in brief, its whole existence in and with the Old Testament, as a dream, or else condemning it as a delusion. Prophecy formed a necessary part of the economy of the Old Testament. Its position is assigned to it by the founder himself. In Deut. 18, God declares through him that he will raise up a prophet, that he will put words into his mouth, that they shall speak all that he shall command them, that whosoever will not hearken unto their words which they shall speak in his name, he will require it of him. And thus do all the arguments which attest the divine origin and divine superintendence of the Old Testament speak against this hypothesis. Again, this hypothesis falls to the ground with every special prophecy, whether Messianic or not, which can be shown to have been fulfilled. For if God acknowledged the prophets to be his servants in other instances, we have no right to pronounce the Messianic idea the mere offspring of caprice. Whoever subscribes to this hypothesis must also consent to the forcible operations by which rationalism has endeavoured to conceal the remarkable agreement between prophecy and its fulfilment. One single prediction, such as those of Jeremiah, respecting the seventy years' captivity in Babylon and the fall of Babylon (chap. 50 and 51), or such as Zech. 9:1-8, is amply sufficient to show the unfounded character of this view of prophecy, and therefore the unfounded character of the whole hypothesis. It is also opposed by everything which the prophets adduce in attestation of their divine mission; compare, for example, the confidence with which Isaiah promises to give to Ahaz a sign from the height above or from the depth (chap. 7), and the sign which he actually gives to Hezekiah (chap. 38). Again, the prophets themselves are most firmly convinced that they do not speak of their own caprice, but through the inward prompting of the Holy Spirit (compare, in addition to the frequently repeated expression, "Thus saith the Lord," Amos 3:7, "The Lord doeth nothing, he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets;" also ver. 8, Jer. 1:9, 10, 20:7 sqq., and the whole series of extracts from Isaiah given in vol. ii. p. 181); and in this conviction they cheerfully endure all the sufferings which their prophecies bring upon them. The irresistible force of this conviction may be seen in the example of Jeremiah, and also in that of the earlier Micah (Micaiah) in 1 Kings 22. To prophesy out of one's own heart, and on one's own account, was regarded by the prophets as an unmistakable mark of false prophecy (Jer. 14:14, 23:21, 27:14, 15, 29:9). From this they knew that they were separated by a wide gap which rationalism has attempted in vain to fill up. That the conviction of the prophets, that they were the instruments of God, was a well-founded one, is attested by the imposing attitude which they assumed for centuries in connection with the history of the nation. This attitude rationalism is utterly unable to explain. The example of Savonarola shows how quickly the prophets would have been put to shame, especially in so extremely difficult a situation, if they had not been endowed with truly supernatural gifts.

Again, it is impossible to bring forward anything which leads to the conclusion that the prophets gave themselves up to sanguine hopes. On the contrary, when such hopes were indulged by every one else, and when the false prophets were sustaining them by fictitious prophecies, the prophets themselves, without heeding the danger which threatened them in consequence, fearlessly proclaimed the impending calamities (see, for example, Jer. 28). On the other hand, we have not the slightest indication that the false prophets, who endeavoured to make themselves agreeable to the nation by setting before it the brightest prospects, ever prophesied by the Messiah. They rather confined themselves to the immediate future (Jer. 28; 1 Kings 22:11; Mic. 3:5). The province of Messianic salvation, which was *sacred* from the very first, they never ventured to enter. Lastly, whenever Christ and the apostles mention the prophets, they speak of them as extraordinary messengers of God who were moved by the Holy Ghost, and the doctrine, which is expressed with dogmatic emphasis in 2 Pet. 1:21, "Prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," is invariably taken for granted.

(2.) This hypothesis is quite as directly at variance with the express declarations of Christ and his apostles respecting the Messianic prophecies. According to the hypothesis in question, the agreement between prophecy and its fulfilment was merely accidental. But Christ frequently declared that one of the designs of the events of his life was to fulfil the prophecies, and thus to attest his own divine mission. He proclaimed himself to be the Messiah foretold by the prophets; and gave expression to the conviction that everything which happened to him had been previously foretold by them. In Luke 24:25, he reproves the disciples for their weak faith in the prophets, whereas, according to the rationalistic hypothesis, such faith was really a weakness. In Luke 24:44, he explains to the apostles the prophecies in the books of Moses, the prophets, and the Psalms, which refer to him. In numerous passages, the apostles point out the agreement between prophecy and its fulfilment. In Acts 26:6, Paul speaks of the promise made to the fathers *by God*, whom the rationalists shut out altogether from the Messianic predictions. In the same manner Peter, the apostle on whom Christ founds his Church, smites rationalism directly in the face, by tracing the Messianic announcements to *revelation*, (ἀπεκαλύφθη, 1 Pet. 1:12), which he contrasts with their inquiring and searching diligently, and which he ascribes to the Spirit of Christ working in them (τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ, 1 Pet. 1:11), in other words, to an infinite, supernatural source; whereas, according to the rationalistic hypothesis, the source from which they drew was their own minds.<sup>166</sup>

(3.) Our opponents themselves only pretend to be able to explain the natural rise of such hopes as these in the times succeeding the division of the kingdom. But it can be proved that the Messianic hopes were indulged by Israel from its very earliest history. Messianic expectations run all through the Pentateuch. Our opponents, however, have resorted to different expedients, for the purpose of escaping the consequent difficulty. Some attempt, though in vain, to get rid of the Messianic passages by giving to them a different interpretation. Others (*e.g.* Ziegler, p. 61 sqq.) maintain that the anticipations of the Pentateuch cannot be called Messianic hopes, since they are not associated with the person of a king. But in doing so they arbitrarily select the idea of a king, as the sole characteristic of the Messianic prophecies.

In this case, however, we should be forced to the conclusion that such passages as Isa. 42, 49, and 53, where the Messiah is represented as prophet and high priest, could not justly be called Messianic prophecies, even if it could be proved that every other

explanation was inadmissible. But it is not correct that there are no allusions in the Pentateuch to the royal dignity of the Messiah, as we should naturally be led to expect from its fundamental character. It is a point of great importance, that even at the very outset the declaration, "kings shall come forth from thee," is so very prominent in the promises made to the patriarchs. This leads us to expect that the fulfilment of the promises in Gen. 12:1-3 and the parallel passages will be grouped around a kingdom, and that this will be not only the channel through which the blessings intended for the race of Abraham will flow, but also the channel through which the same blessings will now flow from Israel to the Gentiles. Again, the kingdom of the Messiah is very conspicuous in Gen. 49:10, which even Rosenmüller, Winer, and Baumgarten-Crusius regard as Messianic. The dominion of Judah is represented there as culminating in Shiloh, the peaceful one, who will be obeyed by the nations of the earth. In Num. 24:17, Balaam prophesies of the star which comes out of Jacob, and the sceptre which rises out of Israel.—Others, again, like De Wette, appeal to the recent date of the Pentateuch; but even apart from the fact that their theory does not rest upon a sound basis, the Messianic prophecies contain within themselves the proofs of their originality. Their gradual progress from obscurity to distinctness, their germinal character, the unmistakeable difference between the announcements in the Pentateuch and those which were made subsequently to the establishment of a monarchical government, all this can only be explained on the assumption that we have truth and not fiction before us. Moreover, the predominant influence excited by the Messianic hopes upon the spirit of the nation, can only be explained on the supposition that the roots of their hopes reached to the very earliest period of the nation's history.

The hypothesis is also proved to be incorrect by the existence of the Messianic prediction in 2 Sam. 7, and of the Messianic Psalms belonging to the time of David. Our opponents admit that it can neither be reconciled with, nor explained by, the theory in question. Thus, for example, Ziegler says (p. 73): "But in the time of David, and also in that of Solomon, there was nothing whatever to lead to either the desire or anticipation of a greater benefactor to the nation; for they were at that time the most successful rulers that the nation had ever possessed. Hence it is extremely probable that the Psalms in our collection do not contain any expectations of greater things to come, but that the sacred singers found the materials for their psalms in the circumstances of their own or the previous age." L. Bauer (p. 374) also says, "*If this explanation of the gradual rise of the Messiah be correct*, it cannot have originated before the time of the kings, or even before the second period;" and again, in p. 375, "What was there in the time of David and Solomon to lead to the idea of a deliverer of the nation, seeing that the kingdom was powerful, and the nation was extending its borders towards the east and the west, the north and the south." The force applied, for the purpose of eliminating the Messiah from the Psalms of the time of David and Solomon, is a clear proof that existing facts are entirely irreconcilable with the rationalistic hypothesis. Another proof of its fallacy is to be found in the fact, that the Messianic hopes were common to the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, whereas, according to the assertion of our opponents, they originated entirely in Judah, and bear the specific character of that tribe. In this case also it was necessary to employ forcible means in order to get rid of unmanageable facts. Thus Gramberg maintains (in his *Religionsgesch.* i. p. 585) that Hosea intended nothing more in chap. 3:5 than to announce in a perfectly general manner the return of the nation to Jehovah under the guidance of the rightful theocratic royal race, and that he had no particular individual in his mind" (for the contrary view, see vol. i. p. 282). He also says, at p. 590, with regard to Amos: "He had *naturally* no thought of a personal individual Messiah; in fact, as he

spent most of his time in Israel, he had no particular interest in the family of David.” (For the opposite opinion, see vol. i. pp. 385, 386.) All salvation, the glorification of the kingdom of God by its extension far beyond the borders of the Gentiles (ver. 12), and by the communication of the whole fulness of the divine blessings (vers. 13-15), is represented by Amos as dependent upon the restoration of the fallen tabernacle of David, and he points, if not directly, yet indirectly and with sufficient distinctness, to the person of the Messiah.

(4.) Our opponents make no pretensions to anything more than to be able by means of this hypothesis to explain the idea of such a merely human Messiah in glory, a political Messiah, who was to raise the theocracy to greater power and wider dominion. De Wette<sup>167</sup> gives the following explanation of the nature of the Messianic hopes: “What no philosophy, no faith could solve, was to be solved by him in deed and in truth. Such as were to be happy, were to be made happy by him; the pride of the wicked, the ungodly, the barbarians he was to bring down, and the poor, the suffering, the oppressed Israel was to triumph over them. Those who had been so long a byword and ridicule to the nations were to be henceforth their rulers and kings.” But this is the Messianic anticipation of later and carnally-minded Jews, not of the prophets. In the very fact that a necessity is felt for falsifying the idea of the Messiah, a confession is made that the true idea cannot be traced to natural causes. It is absolutely necessary first of all, by means of a forced interpretation, to get rid of all the passages in which the doctrine of the divinity and sufferings, of the death and vicarious atonement of the Messiah, is to be found, in a word, of all the passages which speak of a Messiah in humiliation. Such passages as treat of the regal dignity of the Messiah must be insisted on, in an exclusive and one-sided manner, and the attempt must be made to get rid of all those in which he is represented as prophet and high priest as well. Steudel has justly observed that “The Messianic idea is far too comprehensive and deep for it to be possible that it should have been founded upon the life and times of David the hero.”<sup>168</sup> In contrast with the politico-national character attributed to it, from its first and germinal commencement the Messianic prophecy assumed a religious and universal aspect. The blessing of Shem consists, according to Gen. 9, in the fact that God enters into the most intimate fellowship with him, and reveals himself in the midst of him as Jehovah, whilst Japhet finds Jehovah in the tents of Shem. “In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed,” is the declaration made to Abraham. Salvation is not a low, political thing; it consists in the removal of the curse which has rested on the whole earth from the time of the fall, and it belongs not to one single nation, but to the whole family of man.—Again, if these hopes were merely the offspring of patriotism, how are we to explain the fact that the prophets so unanimously foretell that the Messiah will not come till the family of David has fallen into oblivion, and all the glory not merely of Israel, but also of Judah, has passed away?<sup>169</sup> That the prophets, even those who prophesied in times of comparative prosperity, such, for example, as Isaiah and Micah, gave utterance to this conviction, is a proof that they did not speak according to the mind of the flesh, but were the instruments of God. Patriotic fanatics would not have given up any thing of the existing possessions, but would rather have taken these as the basis of their visionary hopes. And how are we to explain those passages in which the coming of Christ is represented as connected with a heavy and just judgment upon the covenant nation itself, as being associated with unbelief on the part of the greater part of the nation; and followed by its rejection and the destruction of Jerusalem? (Compare, for example, Isa. 49; Dan. 9; Zech. 11 and 13; and Mal. 3) How, again, are we to explain the fact that the prophets not only do not restrict the Messianic salvation to the ancient covenant nation, but without exception extend it to all the nations

of the Gentiles, and that this is precisely the one point in the Messianic prospects upon which they dwell with peculiar delight, and to which they constantly return? If, indeed, these predictions were all of the same nature as Hag. 2:7, where the flocking of the heathen with all their possessions and gifts is regarded as heightening the glory of the kingdom of God, and ministering consolation to the poor, miserable, and despised Israel, which was groaning under the oppression of the heathen world; or if they were all like Isa. 60, where it is foretold that "Strangers will build thy walls, and their kings shall minister unto thee," they might then with some degree of plausibility be traced to natural disposition; though even in this case it would be a very striking thing that the heathen should be admitted to a full participation in salvation, in accordance with the promise constantly repeated in the book of Genesis, that through the seed of Abraham all the nations of the earth would be *blessed*. When Ziegler says (p. 67), "For the rest of the nations on God's earth the period of the Messiah's kingdom would be called an *iron age*, which assumed more and more the character of iron in proportion as the Hebrews had to endure hardship from other nations, and submit to the yoke of the barbarians of the East," he describes most accurately the character which the Messianic predictions would have borne if they had been the mere offspring of patriotism. But by the side of these we find other announcements, in which, as in the declaration of the Lord in Luke 13:28, 29, the introduction of the heathen is represented, not as the means of the glorification of Israel, but, on the contrary, of its rejection. In Isa. 49:5, 6, the Lord gives to the Messiah the heathen for his possession, as a compensation for the rebellious Israelites. In Isa. 66:18, the Lord declares, "And I ... their works and their thoughts (what a contrast! which can only be removed by the judgment, the ban, the removal of the hypocrite's mask), the time cometh to gather all the heathen and witnesses, and they come and behold my glory." (Compare Mal. 1:11.) Again, it does not look much like patriotism when in Isa. 66:21 (see vol. ii. pp. 359, 466), the heathen are represented as not merely entering generally into connection with the nation of God, but also as sharing in the honours of the priesthood. We must not overlook the fact, that according to the rationalistic hypothesis the Messianic anticipations are to be regarded as the product of the poetic spirit of the nation, of which the prophets were but dependent and individual organs. But this is altogether at variance with the circumstance that in history the Messianic hopes of the nation always assume the appearance of an echo only, that they seem to have been introduced from above into the spirit of the nation, and that each particular element was to be found in a prophetic communication before it took possession of the mind of the nation.

(5.) According to the hypothesis of the rationalists, necessity was the mother of the Messianic hopes. But there is something very strange in the fact that it should have been in the case of the Jews alone that necessity produced such an effect as this, and that precisely in their case these subjective nations should have been confirmed in so striking a manner by the result. How many nations have been hurled down from the summit of greatness and renown! How is it that the eyes of the others are turned sorrowfully to the better days that are gone, "and that those of Israel alone look forward in joyful anticipation? It is no valid reply that, even in the case of other nations, we meet with anticipations of a better time for the whole world. For we have already shown, that whenever these anticipations assume anything more than the most general form, they are taken from the Israelites. For this very reason they have never attained to anything like consistency or a complete development, and have never exerted a pervading influence upon the national life. On the other hand, in Israel the Messianic expectations form the very central point of the life of the nation. Simeon spoke the mind of every true Israelite

when he said (Luke 2:29), "Now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, O Lord, according to thy word, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation;" the end of his existence had been attained when he had seen the Saviour. The strength of the hopes of salvation, particularly at the period of Christ's coming, to which Dan. 2 and 7, and still more distinctly Dan. 9, had pointed, is apparent from Luke 2:38, where Anna is said to have spoken "to all them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem." Paul shows us the intensity of the Messianic belief in Israel, and the impossibility of its being merely the offspring of a patriotic delusion, in Acts 26:6, 7, where he says, "And now I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers: unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come." When De Wette says (*Bibl. Dogm.* § 141), "The prophets at one time lose themselves in the lofty soaring of their hopes, and at another come down again into the gloom of present realities," he merely describes the character which the Messianic hopes would assume if they were of human origin. But the Messianic anticipations which are actually to be found in the Old Testament are, on the contrary, always the same throughout the long course of centuries, and are proclaimed and believed with the most unshaken conviction. They were decidedly practical in their tendency, and furnished the nation with a light in its dark road, and an antidote against despair. We may see at once how inconvenient this strong confidence in the case of the Messianic predictions has proved to our opponents, from the fact that they feel impelled to weaken and explain it away as much as they possibly can. Thus, for example, Gramberg (p. 576), speaking of the 11th chapter of Isaiah, says: "The intention of the oracle was to awaken cheerful hopes by the assurance that there *might* one day come a prince of the family of David who would introduce better times."

(6.) On this hypothesis it still remains perfectly inexplicable that the most minute details in the Messianic predictions of the prophets, such, for example, as the birth of the Messiah in Bethlehem of a virgin, and at a time when the royal family of David would have fallen into the deepest obscurity, his labouring chiefly in Galilee, etc., should have been reproduced in his history. And even more than this, in all the leading points prophecy goes hand in hand with the history of Christ, and we find in the former a comprehensive account of the life of Christ. Looked at in this light, the fallacy of the rationalistic hypothesis would strike every unprejudiced mind even if we had nothing more than the 53d chapter of Isaiah. Bonnet, the philosopher, has written on this subject to the following effect (*Paling. Philos.* 10, vol. 16, p. 372), "Je tombe sur un écrit, qui me jette dans le plus profond étonnement. Je crois y lire une histoire anticipée et circonstanciée de l'envoyé; j'y retrouve tous ses traits, son caractère, et les principales particularités de sa vie. Il me semble en un mot, que je lis la déposition même des témoins. Je ne puis détacher mes yeux de ce suprenant tableau; quels traits! quel colorit! quelle expression! quel accord avec les faits! que dis je? ce n'est point une peinture emblématique de l'avenir fort éloigné; c'est une représentation fidèle du présent: et ce, qui n'est point encore, est peint comme ce, qui est." If we were to assume, as some have done, that God had directed the events of history in such a way as to cause these prophecies, which had originally proceeded from human caprice, to be to a certain extent fulfilled; on the one hand, we should gain nothing, for this would be an admission of the interference of God in the affairs of the world, and if justice be done to facts, the interference in this case would be just as immediate and abrupt as that from which there is a desire to escape; on the other hand, in the place of the simple and natural explanation of events, which is supported by the testimony of Christ and his apostles, there would be substituted a forced and unnatural solution. For if the interposition of God in producing the agreement between prophecy and history is not denied, which of the two is the more

natural assumption,—that the spirit of God was at work in the prophets, and testified beforehand of the life and sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow, or that he sanctioned human error by his subsequent direction of events? What would the latter be, but to make the holy God the authpr of a vain show, and to represent him as confirming human presumption, and spreading a dazzling halo over an act of daring which is classed in Deut. 18:20 among capital crimes: “The prophet which shall presume to speak a word in my name, which I have not commanded him to speak, even that prophet shall die.”

The first vigorous *assault* upon the rationalistic views was made by J. Jahn.<sup>170</sup> Then followed the first edition of the present *Chiristology*, against which Hofmann<sup>171</sup> has brought forward the objection that “Hengstenberg shows himself perfectly indifferent to the relation of prophecy to the prophet’s own times, to which, both in its source and ultimate intention, it primarily belonged.” Even Delitzsch<sup>172</sup> has repeated this charge, without observing that in the case of Hofmann it was made in a totally different interest from that of the orthodox theology.

The author has always aimed at a well founded historical interpretation. For example, in the present edition (vol. i. p. 1 sqq.), we have traced the continual progress of prophecy towards greater clearness and precision, as seen in the book of Genesis. And so again in p. 143 of the same volume, we directed attention to the fact, that the progress made by Messianic prophecy in the time of David, the fresh light thrown upon the regal office by the historical circumstances, is to be traced to the new substratum which prophecy then received from existing events. We observed there, that it was a very appropriate thing that David, who was well used to the cross, and had been proved thereby, should be the first to introduce the thought of a suffering Messiah into the mind of the Church, a thought which had only a germinal character in his case, and was first fully expanded by Isaiah. We also pointed out how the Messianic prophecies are continually placed by the prophets in the closest connection with the announcement of the ruin to be caused by the powers of the world (vol. i. p. 156); and we have throughout endeavoured to prove that the Messiah was first of all set before the eyes of contemporaries, for their consolation and the furtherance of their faith in the midst of their distresses, and as a warning in their temptations.

The weak point in the early orthodox view was to be found in this very department of historical incerpretation; and the lesson which the Church has to learn from rationalism is just to provide a remedy for this particular weakness. But we must still bear in mind that another and far more serious danger threatens from the same side; and this danger the author has been most careful to avoid. It is of importance, it is true, to deprive rationalism of its relative justification; but it is also important to take care not to be caught in its snares, and to see to it that, in the effort to trace the “organic development” of Messianic prophecy, we do not lose sight of its essential characteristics, that we do not bind the prophetic word to the events of history, but content ourselves with pointing out, as far as possible, a historical point of contact, in doing which we must restrain ourselves within very modest bounds. It would hardly be possible, for example, to find anything in the historical circumstances which would explain the reason why Micah fixed upon Bethlehem as the birthplace of Christ. And the fact of Isaiah being the first to depict the high priestly office of the Messiah, can only be traced to the comprehensive character which was given by God to the predictions of this prince among the prophets. The necessity for proceeding cautiously is the more apparent, from the fact that we may

perceive how disastrous the influence of rationalism has been in other departments of the orthodox theology, especially in connection with the doctrine of Christ.

Hofmann himself has yielded to this temptation, so far as the Old Testament Christology is concerned. His method of treating the prophecies relating to Christ is distinguished from that of the rationalists solely by its orthodox dress, which is by no means an improvement.

It has always been admitted by orthodox theologians that even history possesses a prophetic importance. By the side of the prophecies, strictly so called, they have recognised acted prophecies, or types. It is undeniable that “history is also prophecy. The past enfolds the present in the germ and in particular points, which are discernible by the eye of the mind; the greater may be seen in the less, the inward in the outward, and the present or the future in the past.”<sup>173</sup> But it is perfectly obvious that verbal prophecy is the prerequisite and condition of the acted prophecy, and that the type is “a subordinate kind of divine testimony, which merely serves to complete the word of the Spirit, from which at the same time light is thrown in return.”<sup>174</sup> Without the light which it receives from prophecy, the type by itself cannot possibly be understood; and hence, for the whole of the long ages preceding the fulfilment, it would be entirely useless. Its reality must therefore be questionable, if the necessary condition of its efficiency could not be proved to exist. If the evident proof is not to be found in prophecy that there is a God who rules above the world, and moves all events towards their ultimate destiny according to a preconcerted plan, then in the place of the type or the acted prophecy we have nothing but a vague impulse which cannot rest till that which exists already in the design has been fully worked out in history. Hence, if prophecy, in the strict sense of the word, be overthrown, the acted prophecy, which is undoubtedly worthy of its name, must fall with it, and it is nothing but an illusion to attempt to elevate types at the expense of prophecy.

This is the plan proposed by Hofmann. A truly prophetic character he attributes to history alone. In his opinion the prophets do not reveal the secrets which the Lord has communicated to them, his servants, as they are said to do in Amos 3:7; on the contrary, they are nothing but interpreters of history, and they proclaim nothing more than is put within the reach of an acute and far-seeing mind by the circumstances of any age. They do not stand above history to mark out its cause with the eagle glance of a seer absorbed in God; in reality, they are nothing but what the rationalists thought them (see, for example, Gesenius on Is. 39), far-seeing politicians, who could discern in the present the germs of future times. Prophecy is not a light shining in a dark place (2 Pet. 1:19), but is simply raised a few inches above the ordinary standpoint, the distinction between the two being nothing more than that between genius and the common understanding. As the actual state of things is greatly misunderstood, we must prove our assertion by a series of extracts.

“Every triumphal procession,” says Hofmann (*Weissagung und Erfüllung*, i. p. 15), “which passed through the streets of Rome was a prophecy of Augustus Caesar; for what he displayed through the whole of his career was here displayed by the triumphant general on his day of honour, namely, the God in the man, Jupiter in the Roman citizen. In the fact that Rome paid such honours to its victorious commanders, it pointed to the future, when it would rule the world through the great emperor, to whom divine honours would be paid. And after the Apostle John has related how it was that, when Jesus was crucified, not a bone of him was broken, he adds, thus was fulfilled the saying concerning the paschal lamb, ‘a bone of it shall not be broken.’ Thus in the paschal lamb he sees a



type of Jesus, and in that which happened to Jesus he sees the fulfilment of a prophecy of, or allusion to, the future, which was associated with the paschal meal. The meaning of the triumph was not fully realized in the constantly recurring triumphal processions; and so also the meaning of the passover was not fully realized in the yearly paschal meals; but the essential meaning of both was to be fully developed at some future period, when the prophecy contained in them would also be fully confirmed.” Thus, instead of prophecy, we have nothing more than the vague generality of an allusion to the future. Rome and Zion are placed on the same level. As the life which pervaded Rome was at length clothed in flesh and blood in Augustus Caesar, so was that which animated Israel in Jesus Christ. Everything is left to the ordinary processes of nature, which, after a long series of subordinate productions, at length brings forth the most perfect, according to an innate law of necessity.

Again, at p. 52, “Every new epoch in history is a prophecy. And, therefore, by handing these down to us in their proper succession and their true shape, the Scriptures place us in a position to write prophetic history.” Prophecy is no longer *knowing* something about the future. It is an unconscious paving of the way for the future. It consists in the preludes “of the present God, who lives in the world, but especially in man” (p. 16), and who knows no more about what he is doing than man, whom he employs as his instrument.

At p. 54, again, Hofmann says, “The distinguishing characteristics of a nation I can discern in the topstone and culminating point of its history; and as Augustus Caesar enables us to understand the history of Rome, so does Jesus Christ the history of Israel.”

At p. 55, “At the very outset we should expect that the word of salvation would *keep pace* with the facts of salvation. The hope of a coming Messiah will be founded upon, and arise out of the events of natural life.” If history is ruled by a blind impulse, the “word of salvation” will naturally be also unable to break through the magic circle of unconsciousness.

At p. 56, “There is never more than one passage of prophetic history which manifests itself in one deed or one word, one prayer or one prediction.” “The age audits utterances have the same vocation.”

Starting with the view that prophecy is merely a product of history, Hofmann has attempted, as it were systematically, to extinguish its light in all those ages in which he cannot discern any distinct Messianic predictions.

Of the *Protevangelium* nothing is left that deserves the name; and in its place we have simply trifling (we cannot choose any other word). “All that we read here is that the enmity between the woman and the serpent was to be transmitted to the posterity of both” (p. 75).

On Noah’s prophecy, in Gen. 9:25-27, he observes, “This curse and blessing do not profess to be a prediction, but they are both fulfilled, because they are dictated by a just conception of the nature of the event which has just occurred” (p. 91).

Even the announcement made to Abraham is robbed of its deeper meaning, according to the example set by rationalistic commentators. “In thee and in thy descendants will the whole world discern what it regards as its own blessing, and in thee will it find such prosperity as it will desire for itself” (p. 98).

Gen. 49:10 is said to refer not to Christ, but to Judah only, and to mean that Judah will at length come to the enjoyment of peace, and be obeyed by whole nations, p. 118: "That all this would be really a good, and that it is just the blessing which we should necessarily *expect* for Judah in this series, needs no proof whatever." The naturalistic disposition, which measures everything by a human standard, is well saved by such exposition as this.

With reference to Ps. 110, in the face of the clearest declarations on the part of the Lord in Matt. 22, he says (p. 176), "We have met with nothing in this Psalm that carries us beyond the limits of David's reign. Circumstances with which we have already become acquainted in other ways are all that are here expressed."

"The 45th Psalm brings Solomon in his regal glory before our minds" (p. 118). In ver. 17, where the Psalmist says to the king, "whom (thy children) thou mayest make princes in all the earth," according to Hofmann, "The poet means nothing more than that the king will have sons enough to be able to appoint them as superior officers over all the land, wherever he may require them" (p. 188).

"In Ps. 72, Solomon prays for a reign of righteousness and peace."

The origin of the Messianic idea is described as follows (p. 200): "Under the reigns of David and Solomon the Israelitish nation had become acquainted with the blessings of common life, and simply desired that they should continue. But in order to continue, it was necessary that they should be differently constituted; and the pious especially perceived that, without a thorough conversion on the part of the whole community to the law of Jehovah, it would enjoy no true and lasting peace, to say nothing of the extension of peace over the whole world. The hope that this would eventually be the case continued to be entertained in connection with the family of David, upon whom, in fact, the promise rested. A descendant of this hero of God (Isa. 9:5) will ultimately secure the complete enjoyment of the prosperity which has been destroyed, having first removed not merely all the disturbing elements, but also all that brought them into existence."

We are unable to detect any essential difference between such views as these and the early rationalistic hypothesis. The difference between De Wette<sup>175</sup> and Hofmann appears to consist in the mode of expression alone. With both of them the Messianic idea is a patriotic hope, the natural product of certain circumstances connected with the nation. The prophecy is nothing more than a wish in disguise. It did not enter the minds of the people from above, but sprang from the soil of the nation itself, which looked forward to the future for the perfect satisfaction that the present denied.

If this be the genesis of the Messianic hopes, then, so far as the prophecies are concerned in which Hofmann admits that these hopes are expressed, it is absolutely necessary to remove every feature which cannot be explained from the standpoint of ordinary historical observation. Hofmann is particularly careful, therefore, to eliminate everything relating to the divinity and sufferings of Christ. In his opinion, it was "the declaration of Christ himself, and the confirmation it received from his life which first gave rise to the doctrine that there is an internal, divine connection between God the Father of Jesus Christ, and Jesus the Son of God."<sup>176</sup> "In the Old Testament Scriptures there is no mention made of any such distinction in the Godhead, as corresponds to the distinction between the Father and the Son."<sup>177</sup> "In the Old Testament predictions there is no intimation that the coming Saviour is already in existence, and is simply not yet manifested, or that he will even be in existence previous to his appearing" (p. 9).—To

arrive at this result, not only are all the passages which clearly attest the pre-existence of Christ and his divinity (such, for example, as Micah 5:1 and Isa. 9:5) robbed of their meaning, but every effort is made so to distort the Old Testament doctrine of the angel of the Lord, which forms the basis of the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, as to destroy the connection between the angel of the Lord and Christ. It cannot be denied that by such a procedure as this, if not intentionally, yet actually, the truth of the doctrine of the divinity of Christ is endangered. If there be any reality in this, it must be attested by the revelation of the Old Testament.—Again, the passages which contain the clearest announcements of the sufferings of Christ are also put aside (*e.g.* Zech. 9:9, 12:10, 13:7). In his earlier work, *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, it is expressly denied that there is *any* allusion in the Old Testament to the sufferings of Christ. The *Schriftbeweis*, however, makes some concessions. Isaiah is allowed to have foretold the sufferings of Christ, so far as the prophetic institution with which he had primarily to do culminated in Christ. “In these sufferings, incident to the vocation of prophet, *he* will also share, through whom it receives its ultimate fulfilment. ... In the opposition to which he is subjected, he exhausts the whole mass of sufferings which a prophet can possibly endure on account of his vocation” (*Schriftbeweis*, ii. 1, p. 126). This reminds us of Grotius, and does not go a step beyond him. Every sacrifice is made for the purpose of robbing the prophecies of Isaiah, concerning the suffering servant of God, of their specific Messianic contents, so as to make them applicable to an ordinary prophet. According to Hofmann, it is not the death of the servant of God considered in itself which is represented in Isa. 53 as a blessing to Israel, but his fidelity to his vocation. Such sufferings as these the prophets might undoubtedly attribute to the Messiah, on the ground of merely human conjectures.

But Hofmann is not consistent with himself. Whilst on the one hand he agrees with the rationalists in seeking to eliminate the supernatural element altogether from that portion of prophecy which has respect to the Messianic predictions; on the other hand, in direct opposition to the rationalists, he maintains that prophecies in the ordinary sense are to be found in other parts of the Scriptures. Thus, for example, he retains the prophecy in the book of Genesis respecting the 400 years during which the posterity of the patriarch was to sojourn in a land that was not its own (*Weissagung und Erfüllung*), and also Jeremiah’s prophecy, that Israel was to be restored to its own land, after enduring the tyranny of the Chaldeans for seventy years (*Schriftbeweis*, ii. 2, p. 542). Again, he maintains the genuineness of the book of Daniel, and is therefore obliged to admit that actual predictions are to be found in all the details which are contained in chap. 11. And the question naturally arises here, if prophecy enters into such details as these in connection with lower objects, why should it not rise above the circumstances of the times, when the highest of all was concerned. Through this inconsistency on the part of Hofmann, he is placed at a scientific disadvantage in relation to rationalism, which denies that the supernatural element is to be found *anywhere* in prophecy, and as far as possible sets it aside. We may see very clearly from Dan. 9 how Hofmann connects discordant things together in a thoroughly inadmissible manner. The Messianic features are all removed, evidently to serve a purpose, and give place to predictions of events in the period of the Maccabees.

The present *Christology* is based upon the heartfelt conviction that we have a sure word of prophecy, that holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, and that in the Spirit they testified beforehand of the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow. May this revised edition help to strengthen a conviction of such importance to the Church!

## APPENDIX VI—THE NATURE OF PROPHECY

A deeper insight into the prophecies of the Old Testament concerning Christ is contingent in many respects upon our knowledge of the nature of prophecy, and the state in which the prophets were at the time of their prophesying.

Ever since the controversy with the Montanists, the opinion has almost universally prevailed in the Church that the essential difference between the prophets of the Old Testament and the heathen soothsayers was, that the latter were in an ecstatic condition when their oracles were delivered, whereas the former prophesied in a state of perfect consciousness, and with a distinct comprehension of what they were saying.

The views held by the Montanists are given most concisely by Tertullian (*adv. Marcionem*, iv. c. 22): “Defendimus in causa novae prophetiae, gratiae *ecstasin*, id est *amentiam* convenire. In spiritu enim homo constitutus, praesertim cum gloriam dei conspicit, vel cum per ipsum deum loquitur, necesse est *excidat sensu*, obumbratus scilicet virtute divina, de quo inter nos et Psychicos (*i.e.* catholicos, adversaries Montani, *Semler*) quaestio est. Interim facile est amentiam Petri probare. Quomodo enim Moysen et Eliam cognovisset nisi in spiritu?”

The orthodox view, on the other hand, was represented by Miltiades, who is said by Eusebius (*Church History*, v. 17), to have written a book “περὶ τοῦ μὴ δεῖν προφήτην ἐν ἑκαστάσει λαλεῖν.” Origen says (*c. Celsum*, vii. c. 4), “εἰ δὲ Πυθία ἐξίσταται καὶ οὐκ ἐν ἑαυτῇ ἐστὶν ὅτε μαντεύεσται, ποδαπὸν νομιστέον πνεῦμα, τὸ σκότος καταχέον τοῦ νοῦ καὶ τῶν λογισμῶν.” “How,” says Basil (Commentary on Isaiah, *Proem*, c. 5), “can the spirit of wisdom and knowledge deprive any one of his senses? The light cannot produce blindness, but, on the contrary, calls out the natural power of vision.” Eriphanius (*Adv. Hoeres. Montana*, c. 2) observes, “ὅσα γὰρ οἱ προφηῆται εἰρήκασι μετὰ συνέσεως παρακολουθοῦντες ἐφθέγγοντο,” and in c. 3sqq., he argues that the prophets always spoke “ἐν ἐρρώμενῃ διανοίᾳ καὶ ἐν σώφρονι λογισμῷ καὶ οὐκ ἐν παραπληξίᾳ.” Jerome also writes in many passages to the same effect. Thus, for example, in the preface to Isaiah he says: “Neque vero, ut Montanus cum insanis feminis somniat, prophetae in ecstasi locuti sunt, ut nescierint quid loquerentur et, cum alios erudirent, ipsi ignorarent quid dicerent. . . . Legimus et in alio Apostoli loco: spiritus prophetarum prophetis subjecti sunt.” Again, in the preface to Nahum, “Non loquitur propheta ἐν ἑκαστάσει, ut Montanus et Prisca Maximillaque delirant, sed quod prophetat, liber est visionis intelligentis universa quae loquitur;” and in the *Prolog, in Habak.*: “Adversum Montani dogma perversum intelligit quod videt, nec ut amens loquitur, nec in morem insanientium feminarum dat sine mente sonum. Unde et Apostolus jubet, ut si prophetantibus aliis, alii fuerit revelatum, taceant qui prius loquebantur. Et statim: non est enim, inquit, deus dissensionis sed pacis. Ex quo intelligitur, quum quis voluntate reticet, et alteri locum dat ad loquendum, posse et loqui et tacere quum velit. Qui autem in ecstasi, id est invitus loquitur, nec tacere nec loqui in sua potestate habet.” Chrysostom, in the 29th Homily on

the Epistles to the Corinthians, speaking of the difference between the heathen soothsayer and the true prophet, says: “τοῦτο γὰρ μάντεως ἴδιον, τὸ ἐξεστηκέναι, τὸ ἀνάγκην ὑπομένειν, τὸ ὠθῶσθαι, τὸ ἐλκεσθαι, τὸ σύρεσθαι, ὡσπερ μαινόμενον. Ὁ δὲ προφήτης οὐχ οὕτως, ἀλλὰ μετὰ διανοίας νηφούσης καὶ σωφρονούσης καταστάσεως καὶ εἰδῶς ἀφθέγγεται, φησὶν ἅπαντα· ὥστε καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἐκβάσεως καντεῦθεν γνωρίζε τὸν μάντιν καὶ τὸν προφήτην.” Modern theologians have for the most part followed in the steps of the Fathers.

The truth in this controversy lies in the middle. The orthodox theologians have allowed themselves to be carried too far by their opposition to a serious error. They contended with perfect justice against the *amentia* or unconsciousness attributed to the prophets, but they also denied their *ecstasy*, and thus lost sight of the distinguishing characteristic of the prophetic state.

That we are not to regard the prophets as entirely deprived of intelligent consciousness may be seen from the passage, on which stress has already been laid by the Fathers, “the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets” (1 Cor. 14:32), when taken in connection with the verse immediately preceding: “Ye may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted.” According to this, the prophets were not merely instruments in the hands of a superior power. They did not lose their self-possession. On the contrary, they knew what they said, and spoke with a full apprehension of the existing circumstances. At the same time we must not overlook the fact that there was evidently something in the prophetic state which might be cultivated to a disproportionate extent, and in this case would easily lead beyond the limits laid down by Paul. In the case of such as possessed the gift of “teaching” (διδασκαλία), the rule laid down by the apostle would have been taken for granted, and there would have been no necessity for impressing it upon their minds.

But we have a still more decisive proof in 1 Cor. 14, especially vers. 14, 15, and 19. The apostle here speaks of it as a defect in the gift of tongues, when compared with that of prophecy, that the *πνεῦμα*, which was common to both, operated in too violent and one-sided a manner in the case of the former, whereas in prophecy the *ecstasy* went hand in hand with the *νοῦς*, or intelligent consciousness, from which it followed that prophecy was better adapted to influence others. As the understanding ceased to act, the utterance itself became unintelligible. The Montanistic *amentia* could not be more decidedly excluded than it is by this passage.

The Fathers were also correct in stating that the character of the prophetic utterances is directly opposed to anything like *amentia*, for, instead of showing anything like Montanistic confusion, they are universally characterized by clearness and precision of thought.

But there are also not less decisive proofs that the intelligent consciousness of the prophets was something secondary and super-added, and that when in the spirit, they were in a state altogether distinct from their ordinary condition.<sup>178</sup>

The preparatory measures adopted by the prophet seem also to lead to this result. In 2 Kings 3:15; Elisha says, “But now bring me a minstrel. And it came to pass, when the minstrel played, that the hand of the Lord came upon him.” The fact that the prophet prepares himself for prophesying by means of music, presupposes that there was an intimate connection between (sacred) music and prophecy. This is also confirmed by 1

Sam. 10:5: “Thou shall meet a company of prophets coming down from the high place with a psaltery, and a tabret, and a pipe, and a harp before them,” from which it is evident that in Samuel’s time the sons of the prophets were in the habit of prophesying with musical instruments as an accompaniment. A still further confirmation may be found in 1 Chron. 25:1, where Asaph, Heman, and Jeduthun are called “prophets upon harps,” etc.;<sup>179</sup> in ver. 2, where Asaph is represented as “prophesying” (נבא); and in ver. 5, where Asaph, Heman, and Jeduthun, in their capacity as musicians, are called “the king’s seers,” the name which was usually applied to the prophets alone being thus transferred to them. All this leads to the conclusion that there must have been an intimate connection between truly sacred music and prophecy. The one feature which is common to both must be the elevation above the sphere of mere reflection, which does not necessarily involve a complete suspension of the intelligent consciousness, but on the contrary may even assume the form of increased clearness of mind. “Music,” says Novalis (*Schriften*, ii. p. 359), “speaks a universal language, by which the spirit is set free, and for a moment finds itself at home.”—It was not with music only that prophecy was associated, but according to 2 Chron. 29:30, it was also connected with poetry. Asaph, in his capacity of psalmist, is there called נזיר, the seer, a term which is usually applied to the prophets alone. This connection is also attested by the *language* of the prophets, which is very nearly allied to poetry,<sup>180</sup> and the character of which is scarcely intelligible, if the prophetic ecstasy be overlooked.

Cornelius a Lapse (on Ezek. 1) observes that the prophets frequently took up their abode by the side of a river, that the quiet and lovely scenery, and the gentle rippling of the stream might refresh their minds, and prepare them for their divine raptures. According to Ezek. 1:3, it was by the river Chebar that Ezekiel beheld the glorious vision of the cherubim. That this was not a mere accident, but that the river was intimately connected with the prophecy, is apparent from Dan. 10:4: “In the four and twentieth day of the first month, as I was by the side of the great river, which is Hiddekel,” when compared with chap. 10:1, 8, where Daniel is said to have seen a “great vision” there, which denoted “a great war.” The great river, as the Hiddekel is so emphatically called, is evidently connected with the great vision. The appearance and the noise of the river prepared the way for the vision. That the river was closely connected with the prophecy (there is a connection between the life of the spirit and the life of nature) is evident from chap. 8:2, where Daniel is said to have been transported in the *vision* to the river of Ulai. Hence the locality noticed in chap. 10 cannot have been altogether accidental or indifferent. According to Acts 16:13 (“we went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made”), the Jewish place of prayer was by the side of a river. Prayer is frequently represented as the first preliminary to being in the Spirit.

With the ordinary view of prophecy it is impossible to understand the reasons why, from the time of Abraham (Gen. 22:3) downwards, the *night* should have been selected as the time for prophetic communications. In Num. 22:8, we are told that Balaam waited till the night came before he gave an answer to the messengers of the king of Moab. The Lord first revealed himself to Samuel when he was lying upon his bed in the house of the Lord. In 2 Sam. 7, Nathan is said to have given David a general reply immediately; but the special revelations in relation to his question he did not receive till night. “And it came to pass that night, that the word of the Lord came unto Nathan, saying:” a fact which is sufficient of itself to prove that the state of the prophets was altogether an extraordinary one, and that the gift of prophecy did not abide in them in the same way as faith, hope, and charity. It was certainly not a mere accident that Zechariah received the whole series

of visions recorded in the emblematical portion during the night (chap. 1:8). The night, which draws a veil over all visible objects, facilitates that deep concentration of the soul which is the prerequisite of inspiration.<sup>181</sup>

The connection between the prophetic vision and *a dream*, which is mentioned on several occasions, also points to an ecstatic condition. Abraham the prophet (Gen 20:7) has, first of all, a vision (Gen. 15:1), and then falls into a prophetic sleep (ver. 11). In Num. 12:6, the Lord says to Aaron and Miriam, “If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream.” According to the view held by the Fathers, there is no ground for this association. The bridge which connects the vision and the dream they have entirely broken down. In Joel 3:1, it is predicted that “your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams.” In Dan. 1:17, Daniel is said to have “had understanding in all visions and dreams.” According to chap. 7, he has in the night a prophetic dream. In the dream he receives the explanation of what he has previously seen. In chap. 8:1, he says: “In the third year of the reign of king Belshazzar, a vision appeared unto me, like that which had appeared to me at the first.” The allusion here is to a revelation received when he was awake (compare C. B. Michaelis and Hitzig), As a further proof of the intimate connection between these two forms of revelation, they are both called by the same name,  $\pi\pi\eta$ . They have this in common, that in both the dream and the vision the external senses are at rest, and reflection is forced into the background by intuition, though in the case of the vision we are not to regard the former as absolutely quiescent.<sup>182</sup> That the condition of the prophets was an extraordinary one, and entirely different from their common life, is evident from such passages as Ezek. 1:3,<sup>183</sup> “And the hand of the Lord was there upon him;” Jarchi, “*praevaluit ipsi prophetia etiam invito;*” and 3:14, “The hand of the Lord was strong upon me.” We are led to the same conclusion by the words of Peter: “Holy men of God spake as they were  $\phi\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$  by the Holy Ghost;” with which Knapp, in his treatise on this passage, compares such expressions from profane authors as “*κατέχεσθαι ἐκ θεοῦ,*” “*corripi deo,*” “*deum pati.*” Crusius (*Theol. Proph.* i. p. 94) justly regards the fact that the condition of the prophets at the time of prophesying was an unusual one, as explaining the phenomenon that the formula “thus saith the Lord” is so constantly repeated in their case, whereas the apostles, whose divine illumination was continuous, very rarely employed it, and then only when they wished to distinguish their own counsels from the commands of the Lord, as in 1 Cor. 7:10.

In the eyes of men of the world, the prophets were nothing but madmen. There must therefore have been a point of contact between the prophetic state and insanity. In 2 Kings 9:11, when a prophet had been with Jehu, the courtiers said to him, “Wherefore came this mad fellow  $\text{עשׂה עשׂה}$  unto thee?”<sup>184</sup> “Every man that is mad and prophesies” ( $\text{אבנתם עשׂה}$ ): this is the way in which a false prophet speaks of the true in Jer. 29:26. Keil’s opinion (in his notes on the passage), that the prophet is so described simply on account of his *belief*, “just as those who fearlessly profess their faith before the world in the present day are derided by unbelievers as out of their mind,” founders on the second passage, where the madness is placed in immediate connection with the prophesying. But even when applied to the former passage alone, it is found to be unsuitable. The expression “is peace,” and the behaviour of the people when they heard what the prophet had said, shows that  $\text{עשׂה}$  was a profane term, which was used not of a believer, but of an instrument of God. As they discerned such an instrument in the man who had arrived, they did not rest till they learned what he had said. The point of comparison can only be this, that the condition of

the prophets was an abnormal one, just as much as that of the madman, if our ordinary consciousness be taken as the standard.<sup>185</sup>

In Num. 24, Balaam introduces his prophecy thus: "Balaam the son of Beor prophesied, and the man with closed eye prophesied (ver. 3). The hearer of the words of God prophesieth, who seeth the vision of the Almighty, falling down and with opened eyes" (ver. 4). Balaam describes himself as the man with closed eye with reference to the ecstasy, in which the closing of the outward senses kept pace with the opening of those within. "The greater the repose of the soul, and the more it is abstracted from the world, the clearer do the intuitions of the seer become, and the more intense and pure the poet's flame" (Steinbeck, p. 121 sqq.). In the case of those who had reached the highest stage of inward culture, inspiration might undoubtedly take place without any outward closing of the senses; but with men like Balaam, who were on the lowest stage of the inward life, and were simply raised above it for a moment by the influence of the Spirit, the closing of the eye formed the indispensable prerequisite to the opening of the eye. But it is evident from the expression, "the man with closed eye," as a common description of the prophetic state, that the prophet durst not be drawn away by impressions from the outer world, that he must be at rest and abstracted from the world, and must be carried away into a higher region.<sup>186</sup>—A *second* condition requisite to the opening of the eye seems to have been falling down: "falling down and with his eye open." לָפַן refers to the violence of the inspiration which came upon the seer like an armed man, and threw him to the ground. But it was only in such cases as that of Balaam, where there was impurity before, that the inspiration assumed the violent character, and prostrated both body and soul. The more the ordinary consciousness was pervaded by the Spirit, the less necessity was there for it to place itself in a hostile attitude on the occasion of its extraordinary manifestations. But it is evident from the use of the term "falling down," as a general mark of the prophetic state, that so long as it lasted there was an unusual suppression of the natural life, of the sensuous perception and desires, and of worldly thoughts,—a much more forcible suppression than takes place in prayer, which is to be regarded as the first stage in the ecstatic process.

That the prophetic state even in its outward manifestations was very different from the ordinary condition, is evident from the account contained in 1 Sam. 10. Samuel says to Saul (ver. 6), "The Spirit of the Lord will come upon thee, and thou wilt prophesy with them." And in ver. 11 we read that when Saul prophesied among the prophets, all who knew him said with amazement, "What is this that is come to the son of Kish? Is Saul also among the prophets?" There must have been something more in the appearance of Saul than his merely taking part in the songs of the pupils of the prophets.

According to chap. 19, all the messengers who are sent by Saul to take David, the first, the second, and the third company, as soon as they see the prophets prophesying, are overpowered by the Spirit of God, and begin to prophesy as well. At last Saul goes himself, and although everything divine is quite strange to him, yet even he cannot resist the overpowering influence, the Spirit of God comes upon him also and he prophesies. In ver. 24 we are told that "he stripped off his clothes also and prophesied before Samuel in like manner, and fell down naked all that day and all that night. Wherefore they say: Is Saul also among the prophets?" That the condition of the prophets was an exalted one, one of ecstasy, is evident from the effect which it here produces upon rude minds estranged from God. From internal heat Saul takes off his clothes —(מָרַע) does not mean *perfectly* naked; compare Isa. 58:7, Job 24:7, 10),—and at the same time falls to the



ground crushed down by the power of God.<sup>187</sup> Of peculiar significance is the expression, “and he *also*” אַחַרְכֵּן. We must not regard the messengers as alone referred to here; such a limitation as this would have been more precisely defined. The whole of the company, with the sons of the prophets at their head, did the same as Saul. The only exception is Samuel, who is represented in ver. 20 as occupying a superior position, and in whose case the inspiration did not manifest itself by any such violent symptoms, since he had reached a higher stage of the spiritual life.

There is a passage in Jeremiah (31:26) of great importance in its bearing upon the prophetic state. After making the most glorious announcements to the despondent Zion, the prophet says, “Therefore (to receive so glorious a revelation) I awoke, and beheld; and my sleep was sweet to me.” The condition of the prophets, when prophesying, was at the same time both sleeping and waking; sleeping on account of the quiescence of the outward senses, and waking on account of the activity of the higher sense. Upon this passage, which has been variously misunderstood, light is thrown on the one hand by Num. 24:3, 4 (the closed eye there answers to the sleep here, and the opened eye to the waking and seeing), and on the other hand by Zech. 4:1, “And the angel that talked with me came again, and waked me, as a man that is wakened out of his sleep,” where the ordinary condition is represented as one of spiritual sleep, and the prophetic state as one of spiritual waking. (See vol. iii. p. 299.)

If we examine the prophecies separately, there are many things which point to a condition entirely different from the ordinary one. Look for example at the prophecy against Babylon in Isa. 21. That we are here taken entirely away from the ordinary ground is evident from the following passages: (ver. 6) “Go, set a watchman, let him declare what he seeth”—(the watchman, whom the prophet appoints in his trance, is himself); (ver. 7) “And he sees chariots, riders in pairs, chariots with asses, chariots with camels, and he observed them with great diligence;” (ver. 8) “And he cries oat as a lion (with a lion’s voice; Rev. 10:3, ‘And he cried out with a loud voice, as a lion roareth’) I stand continually on the Lord’s watch-tower, and I stand in my watch every night—(ver. 9), and behold, there come chariots, every one with two horsemen, and he answered and said: Fallen, fallen is Babylon, and all the images of the gods he broke to the ground.” See also vers. 3 and 4, where the prophet comes forward in the person of Babylon, and that not the Babylon of the present, but of the future (vol. i. p. 424). So lifelike is the vision that the prophet forgets himself, as it were, and takes his tone from the persons in the midst of whom he is placed. We may also see how completely the prophet is carried away from the standpoint of his ordinary being and thought, from the address to the enemy in ver. 2, “Go up, O Elam: besiege, O Madai,” and in ver. 5 to the besieged, “Arise, ye princes, anoint the shield.” The whole serves merely to confirm ver. 2, “a *hard vision* was shown me,” which shows that we have here not the result of intelligent contemplation, but a *vision* which passed before the eyes of one who was carried away from the level of common reality.

Ideal persons are introduced by the prophets upon the scene, such as the voice which calls from Seir: “Watchman, what of the night” (Isa. 21:11), the spy appointed by the prophet (ver. 6), the voice crying in the desert (chap. 40:3), the voice which says, “cry” (Isa. 40:6), the spies of Zion (chap. 52:8), the watchmen on the walls of Jerusalem (chap. 62:16).

The lively intercourse with the angel-world, which is especially characteristic of Daniel and Zechariah, also points to an ecstatic state. This intercourse is everywhere a

distinguishing characteristic of religious ecstasy. So long as the νοῦς maintains its supremacy, the present world lies before us with its outlines clear and well defined. The gates of the world beyond are opened in the ecstatic state. And what is obscure and confused in the lower kinds of ecstasy, on account of the fantastic dreams which mingle with it, is clear and distinct in the higher or prophetic form. In this a direct communication is opened with the state beyond, where sight takes the place of faith in the realities that are beyond the reach of sense.

According to Ezek. 8, the prophet is carried to Jerusalem “in visions of God.” It seemed to him as if he had actually been taken there. Thus in ver. 3 he says, “He put forth what looked like a hand, and took me by a lock of my head, and the Spirit lifted me up between the earth and the heaven and brought me to Jerusalem.” At another time he is taken to Chaldea in a similar manner. The state in which he was when he received the revelations contained in chap. 8-11 is directly contrasted with his ordinary condition in chap. 11:24, and represented as one of ecstasy. “And the Spirit,” says the prophet, “took me up and brought me to Chaldea to the captivity, in the vision, in the Spirit of God, and the vision that I had seen went up from me.”

In 2 Cor. 12, the Apostle Paul gives a description of a prophetic state in which he himself once was.<sup>188</sup> Rückert observes, in his commentary on this passage, “So far as the doubt is concerned, as to whether Paul was in the body or not when he was carried into heaven, ... we have here the strongest proof that, when this took place, he was in a state in which the intelligent consciousness had so thoroughly left him that he could not trust himself afterwards to pronounce any opinion on the matter.” That the intelligent consciousness could never rise to such immediate perception as that to which Paul attained in this ecstatic condition, but that the νοῦς must always keep at a modest distance behind the Spirit, is evident from ver. 4: ἤκουσεν ἄρρητα ῥήματα ἃ οὐκ ἔξδὸν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλῆσαι.

The distinction, which is drawn in 1 Cor. 12:28, 29, and Eph. 4:11, between the prophets and teachers, can never be understood by those who refuse to admit the ecstatic condition of the prophets.

After all that has been adduced, it will be impossible to arrive at any other conclusion than that it was in an ἔκστασις that the biblical prophets prophesied, as well as the heathen seers. The expression occurs in the Septuagint as early as Gen. 15:12. It is the more difficult to understand how the Fathers could have denied this, from the fact that in the New Testament we not only read of the thing itself, but frequently meet with the very word (*e.g.* Acts 10:10, 11:5, 22:17). In chap 10:10 and 22:17, the ἔκστασις is represented as distinct from the prayer which preceded it. Hence it must have been something different from a merely elevated state of mind in the ordinary sense. “Prayers fit the mind for receiving a revelation; and the trance fortifies a man against his own spirit” (Bengel). The ecstasy is represented as something coming suddenly and even unexpectedly, a something abnormal: ἐπέπεσεν ἐπ’ αὐτὸς ἔκστασις. Things are perceived which lie far beyond the reach of the ordinary perceptive faculty, and which differ from those within its reach, even in their form. It is not thinking, but seeing and hearing. The opposite condition to the ἔκστασις is mentioned in Acts 12:11, “When Peter was again in or with himself” (γενόμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ). A parallel to the passages in which the ecstasy is mentioned is to be found in Rev. 1:10, “I was in the spirit on the Lord’s day,” where the expression “in the spirit” is used in its highest sense, to denote a state of inspiration, in which the natural life is completely overpowered.

Steudel (*über Auslegung der Propheten, Tübinger Zeitschrift*, xxxiv. 1, p. 119) opposes the idea of a prophetic ecstasy on the following ground: “If we look at the prophecies of a Haggai, there is nothing there to suggest the idea of the prophets being deprived of their ordinary consciousness. He directs attention to the opinions of the Jews as they were, and as they ought to have been, and shows how a visible blessing would descend from above upon their affairs.” The same is said to be the case with a considerable portion of the prophecies of Jeremiah.

But it is certainly not a right course to adopt, to form conclusions as to the nature of a magnificent historical phenomenon from its last phases. In the latest of the prophets, we see prophecy passing into biblical learning. Now, from the very outset there can be no doubt whatever that the prophetic gift had its different *degrees*. The true method by which to form a correct conception of the prophetic state is to look, first of all, at the *Coryphoei* of prophecy. And when we have once obtained from these a deeper insight into the nature of the prophetic ecstasy, we shall then be in a position to detect its less conspicuous signs even in the latest offshoots. That there must have been more in Haggai than the first glance would lead us to suppose, is evident from the *effect* produced by his brief and unpretending addresses. The only possible explanation of this is that he was a seer, that divine truth had been communicated to him by direct revelation, and therefore exerted a powerful influence upon the hearers. Whoever has his mind open will see the signs of the prophetic ecstasy standing out with peculiar distinctness in these, the least striking of all the indications.

Philo (*Quis Rerum Divinarum sit Hoeres*, p. 404) has given the following description of the prophetic state: “ἕως μὲν ἔτι περιλάμπει καὶ περιπολεῖ ἡμῶν ὁ νοῦς μεσημβρινὸν οἷα φέγγος εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν ψυχὴν ἀναχέων, ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ὄντες ὅν κατεχόμεθα· ἐπειδὴν δὲ πρὸς δυσμας γένηται, κατὰ μανία. Ὅτε μὲν γὰρ φῶς ἐπιλάμπει τὸ θεῖον, δύεται τὸ ἀνθρώπινον· ὅτε δὲ ἐκεῖνο δύει, τοῦτ' ἀνίσχει καὶ ἀνατέλλει· τῷ δὲ προφητικῷ γένοι φιλεῖ τοῦτο συμβαίνειν· ἐξοικίζεται γὰρ ἐν ἡμῶν ὁ νοῦς κατὰ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματος ἀφιξίν· κατὰ δὲ τὴν μετανάστασιν αὐτοῦ πάλιν ἐσοικίζεται· θέμις γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι θνητὸν ἀθανάτω συνοικῆσαι· διὰ τοῦτο ἡ δύσις τοῦ λογισμοῦ καὶ τὸ περὶ αὐτὸν σκότος, ἔκστασις καὶ θεοφόρητον μανίαν ἐγέννησε.” We have correct and deep biblical truths here, but, according to Philo’s usual method, mixed with views borrowed from heathen philosophers, and particularly from Plato, who speaks of the nature of prophecy in the *Ion* and *Phaedrus*, and explains it as consisting in a complete suppression of human action and intelligent consciousness. Philo is correct in asserting that the prophetic state was an ecstatic one, and that it was produced by the πνεῦμα overpowering the νοῦς; but when he also affirms that the νοῦς was altogether quiescent, instead of assigning to it a subordinate and subservient place, and proceeds to speak of μανία, he passes into heathen ground.

In what relation does biblical prophecy stand to heathen soothsaying?

The points of contact are evidently more numerous than the Fathers admit. They have in common the extraordinary and ecstatic features with which their temporary duration goes hand in hand (we have a proof of this in 2 Kings 4:27), also the deep concentration of soul caused by the suspension of the activity of the senses and of the intelligent consciousness, and at the same time the opening up of the inner sense, and of a capacity for immediate perception.

At the same time there are fundamental differences. That this must be the case will be at once apparent to every one who simply considers the derivation of the Greek μάντις from

μαίνω,<sup>189</sup> or the description given of the Pythia, in the *Scholiast to the Plutus of Aristophanes* and in *Lucanus*, Book v.

Bacchatur demens aliena per antrum  
Colla fereus, vittasque del, Phoebaeaque certa  
Erecta discussa comis, per inania templi  
Ancipiti cervice rotat, spargitque vaganti  
Obstantes tripodas, magnoque exaestuat igne  
Iratum te, Phoebe, ferens.

The account given of Cassandra in the *Agamemnon* of Æschylus 1072-1172, and also in *Lykophron*, is to the same effect. According to Lucian, the seers foamed at the mouth, their eyes rolled, their hair stood on end, and their whole appearance resembled that of a madman.

But the principal difference is to be seen in the fact that the heathen prophets and the false prophets among the Israelites were “prophets out of their own hearts,” as Jeremiah calls them; that the essential principle of true prophecy, the Spirit of God, was wanting in their case; and that they endeavoured to obtain a miserable substitute by making every exertion in their power to produce the highest state of excitement, accompanied by the suspension of the action of both the senses and the understanding. Passavant (*Vorwort*, p. 6) is quite correct in stating that there were two kinds of ecstatic clairvoyance: “In the phenomena of ecstatic clairvoyance many regard the immediate perception as a lower faculty of the spirit, inferior to reflection; others, again, suppose it to be a higher one. But it is evident from the nature of the powers of the human soul that there are two species of this direct perception, a lower, corresponding to the nature of instinct, as an attribute of the animal soul, and a higher, which consists of the unfettered action of the spirit. The instinctive perception and foresight which is possessed by animals in even a higher degree than by men, is evidently a lower faculty than the reflecting understanding. On the other hand, the clear vision with which the inspired man of genius, the thinker, poet, or composer, takes in at a glance the whole of his work, is a direct intuition of a far higher description, and certainly superior to the reflecting understanding.” He says again at p. 129, “As the keys which open the depths of the soul differ, so also do the secrets disclosed. Hence it is the greatest mistake to apply the same standard to all circumstances of this description. For the highest and the lowest, truth and error, the clearest and the most disturbed conditions of the soul can manifest themselves in this form of life.” It is to be observed, however, that Passavant’s attention is fixed upon the lowest phases of the higher kind of ecstasy, viz. the artistic and poetical, as exhibited in such facts as Mozart and Raphael record, the former of whom says of himself: “All inventing and composing resemble in my case a very vivid dream;” and the latter of whom writes concerning one of his works as follows: “It was completed as in a pleasant dream, and while engaged upon the work, I always thought more of the subject itself than of the manner in which I should present it;” or such as Schiller had in his mind when he wrote the words which occur in *Wallenstein*: “There are moments in the life of man when he is nearer to the world-spirit than at other times. But these are merely faint copies of the genuine ecstasy, from which it is impossible to discover the true nature of the latter, and which merely serve as slight analogies to prepare the mind for the comprehension of the true spirit-vision which comes before us in prophecy. The same distinction was also made by Tertullian between the two ecstatic states. He distinguishes between ἔκστασις and μανία (*furor*), and attributes the latter to the false prophets.

There was also a difference in the *preparatory processes*, and in the *means* by which this result was produced. In the case of the sacred ecstasy, prayer and sacred music were the means employed. The heathen seers, on the other hand, made use of narcotics for the purpose of inducing an unnatural condition. The proofs of this may be found in *Von Dale de Oraculorum Ethnorum Origine Atque Auctoribus*, p. 140 sqq. Strabo speaks of a *πνεῦμα ἐνθουσιαστικόν*, the vapour of which inspired the Pythia. “The disturbance connected with this condition (says Passavant, p. 340) is also evident from the means employed to produce it. Its unnatural and therefore immoral character is apparent in the disorganization produced by these semi-poisonous materials. It was not by any elevation of the soul, as in the pure ecstasy, but by an organic and physical dissolution, a kind of suicide, that the soul was cut off from its ordinary intercourse with the body in such cases as these.”

A third difference is to be found in the fact that the *νοῦς*, the intelligent consciousness was completely suspended in the case of the heathen seers; whereas, in that of the sacred prophets, although it certainly occupied a subordinate position, it was not quiescent, but, on the contrary, was elevated and equipped, and sought to follow the intellectual vision to the farthest limits of its upward flight. The consequence of this was, that the heathen seers, like modern clairvoyants, had no recollection of what had passed, when they returned to a waking condition. “When the ecstasy is over,” says Justin with reference to the sibyls, “the memory of what has been said is entirely gone.” On biblical ground, on the contrary, ever in the highest kinds of ecstasy, the vision remained clearly and deeply impressed upon the mind. The prophets did not need the help of another, as the sibyls did, to write down and interpret their oracles. “And the vision, that I had seen, went up from me,” says Ezekiel (chap. 11:24, 25), “and I spake unto them of the captivity all the words of the Lord, that he had showed me.”

Lastly, there was not only a difference in the condition itself, but also in the results. The heathen soothsaying, like modern clairvoyance, did not issue in any genuine disclosures. The biblical prophecy, on the other hand, brought to light an abundance of divine truths, which have worked for centuries as the salt of the earth.

From the fact that, in the case of the prophets, the intelligent consciousness did not predominate at the time of their prophesying, as at ordinary times, but that they were in a state of *ἐκστασις*, we deduce the following important conclusion. All the divine revelations were discerned by the prophets by immediate perception. The impressions were made upon their inward sense, which was roused into action by the Spirit of the Lord, whilst the outward senses were quiescent and the power of reflection was for a time suspended. Sacred ecstasy had this in common with the lower kind. “Ecstatic persons,” says Passavant, p. 52, “invariably describe their inward activity as *seeing*, and talk of an inward light.” But from what has already been stated, it will be evident that the agreement is merely a formal one. “A vision,” as Tholuck (p. 86) has justly observed, “is a species of inward sight, which decides nothing as to the truth or error of what is seen and heard; and it is only so far as the form is concerned, and not at all in relation to the substance, that we compare the visions of the Bible to the phenomena of somnambulism.”

The *proof* of the visionary character of the prophetic revelations is undoubtedly involved in the proof of the ecstasy of the prophets themselves; but we are also in a position to establish the former apart from the latter, and by this means to add considerably to the strength of our arguments in support of the ecstasy itself. For it is evidently an inconsistency to admit the visionary character, and deny the ecstatic condition, as



(the term *הנה*, which occurs with such remarkable frequency in the prophets, is easily explained from the visionary character of prophecy) a man clothed in linen, and his loins girt about with a golden girdle.” He hears a loud voice from Ulai. In Zech. 2:1, we read, “And I lifted up mine eyes and saw, and behold four horns.” (See also Amos 7; Ezek. 40:3, 4; Rev. 4:1, 21:10.) The close connection between the ecstatic state and the activity of the inward sense is clearly pointed out in Ezek. 1 “The hand of the Lord was there upon him,” we read in ver. 3; and immediately afterwards in ver. 4, “and I looked, and behold there came,” etc. In Acts 10:10, it is said of Peter, there fell upon him ἔκστασις;” in ver. 11, “he saw heaven opened,” etc.; in ver. 13, “and there came a voice to him;” in ver. 17, “now while Peter doubted in himself what *this vision which he had seen* should mean.” In Acts 11:5, Peter says, “I saw a vision ἐν ἔκστασει.” In Acts 22:17, 18, Paul also speaks of *seeing* as the immediate result of the *ecstasies*, “I was in a trance, and saw him saying unto me.” In Rev. 1:10, *hearing* follows upon being in the spirit, and in chap. 4:2 *seeing*: “And immediately I was in the spirit, and *behold* a throne was set in heaven, and one sat upon the throne.”—The visionary character of the prophetic discourse may also be inferred from the frequent change of persons, without any particular explanation. The prophecy of Nahum is peculiarly instructive in this respect. In chap. 2:1, for example, the prophecy passes suddenly from Judah to Nineveh: “the destroyer cometh near thee.” In ver. 3, “the shield of his heroes is made red,” the suffix belongs to the enemy of Asshur, though the previous verse refers to Israel. In ver. 5, “he remembers his heroes,” etc., the subject is the king of Assyria; but the two previous verses relate to his enemies. The ground-work is always the inward vision, and the prophet merely describes, as he passes rapidly from one thing to another, whatever presents itself to his view. In chap. 1:11, Asshur is addressed without being named; in vers. 12 and 13, Zion; and in ver. 14, Asshur again. In every case the contents alone enable us to determine who is intended. In every instance the prophet appears in the capacity of seer. This is also the case with chap. 1:8, “he bringeth her place to nought.” Except in the superscription, Nineveh has not been mentioned at all. The suffix, therefore, can only refer to the object which was present to his inward view. Lastly, the opinion, that this was the mode in which the divine communications were made to the prophets, is confirmed by all the facts, which we shall immediately prove to have been the necessary consequences of the adoption of such a mode.

The majority of commentators have not entirely overlooked this view of prophecy.<sup>191</sup> At the same time, they have for the most part restricted it to those portions of prophecy in which it is peculiarly obvious, such as Isa. 6, Ezek. 1, the first part of Zechariah, and the second portion of Daniel, to which, for that reason, the name of visions has been exclusively applied.<sup>192</sup> But the difference between these prophecies and the rest is a vanishing one, the arguments we have brought forward are equally applicable to all (compare, for example, Isa. 21:2, “A hard *vision* was shown me,” with Zech. 2:1), and, on the whole, if we but possess the power and the ability to look more deeply into them, the marks of the vision may be discerned.

We will now proceed to examine the peculiarities which result from these characteristics of prophecy.

I. If this be the nature of prophecy, no one who has carefully considered the subject would expect that the prophets should always describe the events referred to in a connected form, or with all their bearings. “The prophet,” says Herder, *Briefe*, p. 108, “was not a preacher in our sense of the word, much less the interpreter of a system of doctrines.”

Such a complete and connected mode of representation could only be looked for from a teacher in whom the reflective faculty predominated. The attention of the prophets was chiefly concentrated upon *lumina*, flashes of light. They merely expressed on each occasion what was presented to their inward view, and there was presented simply what was suitable, and 'likely to produce an effect under existing circumstances. This is especially apparent in the Messianic prophecies. The doctrine of the Messiah is never taught by the prophets in a complete form, but all the Messianic predictions have a one-sided character. Sometimes they direct their attention chiefly to the person of the Messiah. At other times this is not mentioned at all, and they merely describe the nature of his kingdom. It not infrequently happens that they speak only of the Messiah in glory. Malachi, for example, passes by the first coming of Christ in humiliation altogether, and leaves the interval between his forerunner and the judgment on Jerusalem a perfect blank. Very often the most minute circumstances are mentioned, and others of far greater importance left unnoticed. On many occasions, when *consolation* is the thing demanded by the existing state of affairs, prominence is given to the future events of a joyous character alone; on another occasion, the attention is principally directed to the more gloomy prospects. Jeremiah, for example, in chap. 23:5, 6, connects together the bestowal of salvation upon the *elect portion* of the Jews, and the restoration of their *full number*, which is to be expected in the future, and overlooks the rejection of the greater portion which is to intervene. Ezekiel does the same in chap. 34:24-31, 37:21-28. Daniel and Malachi, on the contrary, give greater prominence to the other side, viz. the rejection of the nation, the devastation of the land, and the destruction of city and temple. Very frequently the prophets overlook all the obstacles which will hinder the progress of the Messianic kingdom, and consequently embrace in one picture the weak commencement and glorious end.

It is to this peculiar feature in prophecy that the Apostle Paul appears to allude when he says in 1 Cor. 13:9, "We know in part and we prophesy in part." A necessary consequence is, that all the separate predictions can only be regarded as fragments, and that we cannot possess a complete picture till we collect and combine the individual features. We can do this with the greater facility on account of our possessing a clue in history, which enables us to determine the exact position of every one.

In modern times, not only has the nature of prophecy generally been entirely misunderstood, but this peculiarity, which necessarily results from it, has also frequently been overlooked. The attempt has been made by some to prove from the facts in question, that in the different prophets the Messianic idea was presented in different ways; and on this they have founded an argument in favour of the human origin of prophecy generally. From the fact that Joel, for example, merely describes the kingdom of the Messiah, not the Messiah himself, it has been argued that his expectations were not directed towards a Messiah at all. And because Jeremiah merely speaks of a Messiah in glory, he is said to have known nothing at all of a suffering Messiah. The incorrectness, however, of such a mode of arguing as this may be demonstrated even from the standpoint of our opponents themselves. If it were correct, it would follow as a necessary consequence not only that the prophets were irreconcilable with one another, but that they were inconsistent with themselves. Thus, for example, in chap. 2 of the prophecies of Isaiah, just as much as in Joel, we have a description of the Messianic times, without any allusion to the Messiah himself. On the other hand, the Messiah is mentioned in the prophecy contained in chap. 4, which is connected with it, and was delivered at the same time. And so, again, in the second part, there are many Messianic descriptions of a general character side by side



with passages announcing a personal Messiah; *e.g.* chap. 53, 55:3, 4, and others. In chap. 31:31 sqq., Jeremiah is occupied exclusively with the nature of the Messianic kingdom; and, on the other hand, in chap. 23, etc., with the personal Messiah alone. There are many passages in which Isaiah sets before us only the glorified Messiah; whilst in chap. 53 we find a complete picture of his humiliation, which is represented as the cause of his subsequent glorification.

If now we adopt the same course with the prophets which we are accustomed to adopt with profane writers, when, for example, we determine the doctrines taught by Plato not from one single passage, but from the whole of his writings, it is obvious that we can only know what are the Messianic views of any prophet, when we have brought together into *one* picture the features which are scattered throughout different passages. If this be admitted, it must also be granted that the fact of certain large portions of this picture having been left unnoticed by other prophets does not prove that they were not acquainted with them. If we had received a larger number of Joel's prophecies, the various features would complete one another quite as much as in the case of Isaiah. If Jeremiah had prophesied under the same circumstances as Isaiah in the second part, the suffering Messiah would not have been omitted. But the fallacy of such a view as the one referred to is evident from the fact that it shuts us up to the conclusion that the later prophets were ignorant of the contents of all the previous prophecies; that the faith of the whole nation was entirely unknown to them; or else that they had renounced this faith,—an assumption which would be perfectly absurd in the case of Jeremiah, for example, who drew his life entirely from the prophecies of the earlier men of God.

The reason for the incorrect views entertained by the rationalists is to be found in the fact that the prophets are regarded too much as merely doctrinal teachers, and that it is expected in consequence that they will bring forward on every occasion the whole of their doctrinal system. But if we regard them as what they really were, *viz. seers*, it will be thought a perfectly natural thing that they should never give more than they have seen without mixing with it the things which they have already learned, through the mere exercise of their intellects, from other men of God, and from the general faith of the Church of God.

II. If the medium through which the prophets received their revelations was the inward sense, the whole must of necessity have appeared to them as occurring at the time. There are many peculiarities, of which this will furnish an explanation. 1. In this case it will not surprise us when we find the prophets speaking of coming events and persons, and even such as belong to the remote future, as if they saw them, and could point to them as standing before them. Forgetfulness of this peculiarity has led many commentators to suppose that in such passages as these the prophets are speaking of persons actually and outwardly present, and has therefore given rise to false interpretations and conclusions. Nahum, for example, lived a considerable time before the fall of Assyria, which he predicts. According to chap. 1:12, the power of Assyria has lost none of its vigour and beauty. The instruments by whom the judgments of God upon Assyria are to be inflicted are not pointed out. There is no trace as yet of the Chaldeans. Judah has no threatening enemy except Assyria. And it is evident from the position assigned to his prophecy in the collection of Minor Prophets, which is arranged chronologically, that Nahum preceded Habakkuk. There are strong grounds for believing that the prophecy was written under Manasseh, and that the historical starting-point was the time when he was led into captivity by the Assyrians. Yet in chap. 2 Nahum describes the capture and destruction of

Nineveh as if he had been an eye-witness of the event. "The enemies," as Hitzig says, "draw near (chap. 2:2), place themselves in order of battle (chap. 2:4), and with a confidence which admits of no doubt, Nahum anticipates the siege and eventual destruction of Nineveh." From the facts in our possession, Hitzig infers that Nahum prophesied in view of the events; but by such a conclusion as this he is led into inconsistency. For not only are the preparations represented as present, but also the final issue, which Hitzig allows to be future, viz. the capture and complete destruction of Nineveh, and the utter ruin of the imperial city. The words of chap. 1:15, "Behold upon the mountains the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace! O Judah, keep thy solemn feast, perform thy vows," presuppose that the blow has already fallen. The preparations and the result must evidently be looked at from one point of view. So again, in Obadiah, the present is an ideal one. The prophet is carried away into a far distant future. The fall of Judah is represented as having already taken place, and also the wrong done by Edom to the covenant nation. The judgment on Edom is beheld by the prophet as actually present, as well as the restoration of Israel. From this, in spite of the most decisive evidence to the contrary, commentators who had no deep insight into the nature of prophecy have been led to conclude that the book was not written till the period of the captivity. Habakkuk says (chap. 3:6): "In the midst of wickedness I see the tents of Cushan." At a time when the Chaldean power is still in its infancy, and before it has commenced its victorious course through Asia, the prophet beholds how the Kushan Rishathaim (of the double, that is, of the great wickedness) mentioned in the book of Judges, of the country on the other side of the river, which revives again in her, is visited with the *punishment* of wickedness. Other analogous examples have already been given in vol. ii. p. 170 sqq. We will give a few more here, connected with the subject under our immediate notice. Isaiah, referring to the future Redeemer, says (chap. 9:5), "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given." So again, in chap. 7:14, he speaks of the Messiah as really present, and Ewald, Bruno Bauer, and others, forgetting that they have to do with a seer here, have substituted the actual for the ideal present. See also chap. 42:1, "*Behold* my servant, whom I support, my chosen one, in whom my soul delighteth." According to Micah, a long period is to intervene between his time and that in which "she which travaileth" is to bring forth (vol. I. p. 417); and yet, in chap. 4:1-3, the Messianic kingdom appears to him already present, and in chap. 5:3 he sees the Messiah stand and feed in the strength of the Lord. Even the times of suffering which are to precede the coming of the Messiah are anticipated by the prophet in the spirit. The prophet is so completely transported into the future, that he suddenly loses his own consciousness and that of his suffering people (vol. i. p. 423), and even personates the Babylon of the future (vol. i. p. 425). The triple עתה in chap. 4:9, 11, 14, is very characteristic. It points out on each occasion the opening of a new scene of the future in the form of the present.—2. The fact that the prophets are seers serves to explain, the frequency with which they make use of the preterite when speaking of the future. The preterite represents an event as having already taken place, and, according to the rules of grammar, can only be applied to the present or the past. The reason of this frequent use has been entirely misapprehended, not only by rationalistic expositors, but even by many of the earlier orthodox commentators. When such passages occur, we commonly find them dismissed with the remark, "The prophet employs the preterite to denote the *certainty* of the event." Even Vitranga gives this explanation in his notes on Isa. 7:14.<sup>193</sup>—3. For the same reason, the length of the interval must, as a rule, have been unknown to the prophets, unless they received a special revelation, as in Isa. 7, Jer. 25, and Dan. 9. They were not chronological historians so much as describers of pictures. When they saw the Messiah, for example, standing before them, how could they possibly know the length of time that would intervene previous to

his appearing? As Crusius (*Theol. Proph.* i. p. 622) has very forcibly observed, “The prophets looked upon future events with the divine light with which they were illuminated, for the most part in the same way in which we look upon the starry heavens. We see the stars above us, but do not perceive how far they are off, nor even which are the nearer, and which the more remote.” In connection with this chronological indifference on the part of the prophets, one of their peculiar characteristics is the formula *מִיָּמֵי תִּירְחָאב* (in the last days) which is frequently used by them to denote the Messianic times, and applied exclusively to these (see the remarks on Hos. 3:5). It merely serves to indicate, in the most general way, that these times are still far off, and also to contrast them with the existing state of things, which has, first of all, to complete its course.

On the same ground as was observed in the first edition, we may explain “this peculiar characteristic of the prophecies,” that events which are separated by long intervals are represented as continuous. In the prophetic vision there was, as a rule, a juxtaposition, not a succession. Babylon received the first blow from the conquest by the Persians; but more than a thousand years passed by before its complete overthrow and almost utter annihilation. Yet Jeremiah (chap. 50 and 51) connects the conquest with the complete destruction, the germ of which was contained in the conquest, without noticing the succession at all. In the prophecies relating to the kingdom of God, after the prophet’s mental eye has been directed to the joyous or mournful side, the nearer and lesser manifestations of mercy, and the nearer and lesser judgments which are about to take place, are generally so closely connected in the representation with such as are greater and more remote, that the immense interval which lies between is not alluded to at all. In this case the connection rests upon the internal relation between the nearer events and such as are more remote. Thus Isaiah, for example, in chap. 11, passes at once from the deliverance from Assyria to the deliverance by the Messiah, and leaves all the intermediate events unnoticed. And in the same way do Isaiah, Micah, Hosea, Amos, Ezekiel, and Jeremiah very frequently connect together the deliverance from captivity and the redemption by Christ, although no prophet has ever given utterance to the thought that the Messiah would be the leader of those who returned from their exile. In the description of the Messianic kingdom itself, its historical development is not noticed; the commencement of the kingdom and its glorious close are connected immediately together. Zechariah, for example (chap. 9:9, 10), passes at once from his description of the coming of Christ in humiliation to the glorious completion of his kingdom.

It not infrequently happens that, instead of being placed side by side, the events enfold each other; just as in a distant prospect the objects melt away the one into the other, and things which in reality are far removed from one another, appear to be closely connected. This remark will throw light upon the second part of Isaiah particularly, where we often find the deliverance from captivity and the redemption by Christ placed side by side, whilst at other times they pass before the eye of the prophet, here with the one more prominent, and there with the other. In like manner, all the judgments of the future are frequently embraced in one view; the foreground and the background passing the one into the other. (“Just as, by a similar optical delusion, a tower at a great distance off seems to rest upon the top of a house close at hand, or the moon’s disc appears to be contiguous to the mountains and the groves,” Velthusen, p. 89.) But this view is too mechanical. It is overthrown, too, by the fact that there is a similarly connected view of things which are separated by long intervals of time in the discourse of Christ in Matt. 24 and 25, which has nothing of a visionary character about it; as, in fact, there is not the slightest indication anywhere of Christ passing into an ecstatic state. The facts in question are

rather to be explained, as they have been in the article entitled “Zur Auslegung der Propheten” in the *Evang. Kirchen-Zeitung*, 1833, from the ideal character of the prophetic style, and from the fact that, as a rule, the prophets had to do with general truths, not with events in their empirical separation; a rule, undoubtedly, to which there are innumerable exceptions, since the mere statement of general truths would never have been sufficient to meet the wants of the weak faith of the Church of God, and therefore the prophets were frequently obliged to enter into details. But these exceptions cannot do away with the rule. “The prophets are not soothsayers, they do not predict future events simply as such, without regard to God and to his kingdom. With every one of their predictions, so far as the germ is concerned, a pledge of its truth was given long before the fulfilment. To look into the very nature of God, to behold in his light the laws of eternity, according to which he governs the Church and the world, is something infinitely higher than a mere knowledge of the future, which is itself a matter of indifference.” In order that the glory of the idea itself may shine forth with the greater brilliancy, the prophets frequently abstract themselves from the particular events in which it is eventually to be realized, in other words, from the circumstances of the time. “With a greater concentration of the mind,” says Passavant, p. 109, “a view may be obtained apart from the condition of time, the things being observed not in their succession, but as a whole, and as coexistent.” In such a view as this there is something very exalting and edifying to those who live in the midst of the course of history. It quiets their hearts when the latter fails to satisfy them. It teaches them how to see the end in the beginning.

III. If the prophets received their revelations in a vision, it follows that *imagery* would necessarily be very extensively employed in prophecy. It is too much, indeed, to affirm, as some do, that “all knowledge obtained from direct perception is figurative, and that the abstract idea belongs to direct (? indirect) perception alone.” The tenor of the prophecies is at variance with this, for a wide space is allotted to teaching of the most liberal kind. It is also disproved by those passages in which the *word* is represented as the object of vision; e.g. Isa. 2:1, “the word that Isaiah saw;” Amos 1:1, “the words of Amos, which he saw concerning Israel” (Michaelis: “mentis intuitu, per revelationem dei”); Ezek. 12:23, “the days draw nigh and the word of every vision,” equivalent to “the words of all the prophetic visions are about to be fulfilled;” and 1 Chron. 17:15, where we have not only the juxtaposition of the *words* and the *vision*, but also the fact that Nathan’s prophecy does not possess a figurative character. The intellectual vision of the prophets can perceive the word, even without its being clothed in imagery. At the same time, it is undeniable that all mental vision, preserving its affinity with bodily sight, has a *preference* for imagery. We may see this from an examination of poetry, which invariably avoids what is merely abstract, and loves to paint the objects themselves. And the first glance at prophecy will show us the same thing. One need only read Isa. 2:2-4, for example, to be convinced that prophecy does not dogmatize but paints, and that not in mere chalk sketches, but with colours. The connection between the imagery and the vision is also attested by express statements, made by the prophets themselves. The prophetic utterances of Balaam are introduced in Num. 24:3, etc., with the words “He took up his *simile* and said.” In Hos. 12:10, in the account of the benefits conferred by the Lord upon his people since the time of their deliverance from Egypt, we read, “I multiplied visions, and by the prophets I speak (the present describes what has been constantly repeated and still continues to take place) in *similitudes*” (Michaelis: “As when Israel was compared to a harlot or an adulteress”). In Ezek. 17:2 the prophet receives these instructions, “Son of man, compose a riddle (הקדמה : every figurative expression, the idea conveyed by which is different from the actual meaning of the words,’ Hitzig); and

prepare a figure for the house of Israel.” And in chap. 20:49, he utters the complaint, “Ah, Lord God, they say of me, Doth he not speak parables” (Michaelis: “He utters nothing but parables, which are neither coherent nor intelligible”).

The figures, under which the future was presented to the prophets, were necessarily such as lay within the circle of their ideas, and were taken from the circumstances amidst which they lived. For, on the one hand, God does not work upon the minds of those to whom his communications are made in a magical way, but in a manner suited to their peculiarities and the extent of their knowledge; and, on the other hand, if the prophecies had been composed of unknown figures, they would have failed of their object and been perfectly unintelligible. But the strongest reason is to be found in the relation in which the future history of the people of God stood to the past, a relation which rested upon the connection in which both stood to the divine Being himself. When the prophets describe the restoration of the rejected Israelites to the kingdom of God and a state of grace, as a return to the land of Canaan, they furnish at the same time a proof of their prediction for the fact that God had formerly manifested his mercy to his faithful people in this particular form, was a pledge that if they drew near to him again, he also would again regard them as worth of his presence. When they speak of the deliverance of the nation as a fresh passage through the Red Sea, they obliterate, as it were, the fact that this took place “centuries ago,” and call it up from the dead to be a living witness to the truth of the deliverance which is yet to come. And when Egypt, Assyria, and Edom are employed as names denoting the enemies of the future, the very names pronounce their doom.

It could not be otherwise, therefore, than that the kingdom of Christ should be represented in the Messianic prophecies by figures borrowed from the earlier form of the kingdom of God, and that the names of the various things and persons connected with the latter should be directly applied to the things and persons belonging to the former, the two being closely connected by their internal similarity. This mode of representation was the more natural, on account of the Mosaic economy having been arranged with distinct reference to the economy to be founded by Christ, and being at the same time typical of it. This was pointed out by Eusebius in his *Church History*, i. 3, in connection with the prophetic, royal, and high-priestly offices; and he sums up the result in the following words: “ὡς τοῦτους ἅπαντας τὴν ἐπὶ τὸν ἀληθῆ Χριστὸν, τὸν ἐνθεὸν καὶ οὐράνιον λόγον, ἀναφορὰν ἔχειν, μόνον ἀρχιερέα τῶν ὅλων, καὶ μόνου ἀπάσης τῆς κτίσεως βασιλέα, καὶ μόνου προφητῶν ἀρχιπροφήτην τοῦ πατρὸς τυγχάνοντα.”

We will now illustrate what we have said by means of examples. In the description of the person of the Messiah, the existing form of the kingdom of God furnishes the prophets with a triple substratum, to which they add on each occasion the features distinguishing the antitype from the type. The Messiah appears to them as an exalted king, and they introduce into the picture of a distinguished sovereign under the Old Testament economy, whose glory was but a faint reflection of the glory of his great successor, all the characteristics which are peculiar to the latter. Compare, for example, Mic. 5, Isa. 11, and Jer. 23. They even call him by the name of David, the one monarch in whom the idea of the typical king was most perfectly realized (Jer. 30:9; compare Ezek. 34:23; Hos. 3:5). There is also an allusion to the name of Solomon in Isa. 9:5. Again, the Messiah is represented as the prophet who is endowed with all the fulness of the spirit of the Lord, and who, whilst perfectly realizing the idea of prophecy, does not confine his labours to the narrow limits of Canaan, as the typical prophets did, but teaches, warns, and reproveth among all the nations of the earth (Isa. 42, 49, and 50). Lastly, the Messiah is represented

as a high priest, who is actually to procure by the sacrifice of himself that forgiveness of sins which the high priest of the Old Testament might point out, but could never secure (Zech. 6; Isa. 53). And whilst the Messiah is thus described as the greatest king, prophet, and high priest, his kingdom also is not represented as something dis severed and different from the kingdom of God under the Old Testament, but as the completion and highest form of that kingdom. Very frequently Jerusalem or Zion, as being the capital of the kingdom of God under the Old Testament, is used to denote the Church of the New (see the remarks on Isa. 11:9, and Zech. 14:1). Joel (chap. 2:32) expresses the thought that, when the judgments to be inflicted in the Messianic times shall fall, the true members of the kingdom of God will escape, in such words as these, "In Mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be that which has escaped." Micah, Jonah, and Ezekiel speak of the future victory of the Church over the world as the raising of the temple-hill (see vol. i. p. 439); and with reference to the temple as the symbol of the kingdom of God in Israel (vol. iii. p. 55), the reception of the heathen into the Church is regarded by the former as a flocking on their part to Mount Zion, and by Jeremiah, in chap. 31:39, 40, as a great extension of Jerusalem. The sufferings of the people of God, which would precede the coming of the Saviour, are represented under the symbol of the wilderness, in which the sufferings of Israel had formerly been endured (see the remarks on Hos. 2:16, 17, and Jer. 31:2). The hindrances to deliverance, which the Lord will overcome in the Messianic times, are figuratively described as the Red Sea (Isa. 11:15; Zech. 10:11). The redemption by Christ is to the prophets the antitype of the redemption from Egypt (compare the notes on Hos. 2:2). The universality of the operation of the Spirit in the Messianic times is spoken of by Joel (chap. 2:28) as a universal diffusion of the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, which were common under the Old Testament. The thought, that in the Messianic times all nations would worship the true God, and be received into the fellowship of his Church, is expressed by Zechariah (chap. 14:16; see vol. iv. p. 121) in the form of an announcement that they will celebrate the feast of tabernacles at Jerusalem; whilst Isaiah describes them as coming to Jerusalem every Sabbath, and at every new moon (chap. 66:23). The perfect love and fidelity towards God, which are to distinguish the Israel of the future, are predicted by Hos. 2:18, 19, and Zech. 13, as consisting in the abolition of whatever, under the Old Testament economy generally, or in the times of the prophet in particular, had interfered with the connection between the nation and its God; such, for example, as their readiness to adopt heathen customs, their idolatry, their reliance upon the help of Assyria, and their encouragement of false prophets.—In the view of the prophets the prosperous times of the kingdom, under David and Solomon, form the substratum of the glory and prosperity of the Messianic age (compare Jer. 23:5, 6; Mic. 4:4; and Zech. 3:10, with 1 Kings 5:5). In the detailed descriptions of the victorious power of the kingdom of God in the days of the Messiah, the nations are mentioned which had formerly been subject to David (Isa. 11:14). The general truth, that peace and love will prevail in the nation when it has been truly reconciled to God, is presented to the view of the prophets under the figure of a cessation of the mournful division which took place under the Old Testament, viz. the separation of the two kingdoms of Israel and Judah.—The enemies of the Israel of the future are frequently called by the name of some particular nation, which had been distinguished in the past or was distinguished at the time for its enmity or its power. Thus Zechariah (chap. 10:11) introduces Assyria and Egypt as the representatives of the oppressors of the people of God; Isaiah, (chap. 25:10-12) calls them by the name of Moab; in Isa. 34:6, 3, and Amos 9:12, the ungodly world is represented by Edom; and Obadiah also illustrates the general truth, that judgment is afterwards to be poured out upon the heathen, by the example of Edom; whilst Ezekiel (chap. 38) applies the name Magog to the ungodly imperial power.

If the visionary character of prophecy be admitted, it necessarily follows that there must be a difference between the figure and the fact. At the same time, it must not be forgotten that the figurative style employed by the prophets is moderated by the endeavour to render themselves intelligible to the people, and to exert an influence upon them; and this constitutes the great distinction between a strictly poetical style and that employed by the prophets (see my work on Balaam, p. 77 sq.).

Many erroneous views have been entertained with regard to this connection between the figure employed and the facts referred to. There are two opposite views, both equally wrong, to which we would especially direct attention. The representatives of the first are the carnally-minded Jewish commentators, in whose footsteps most of the rationalistic expositors have trodden, though under the influence of different motives. The latter either ignore the figurative character of the prophecies altogether, or insist upon a literal interpretation without the guidance of hermeneutical principles, in every case in which they obtain a result that will serve to confirm their preconceived opinions. And even of the commentators who believe in the Scriptures, the same error has been fallen into by those who insist upon the strictly literal interpretation of such portions of the prophecies as have not yet been fulfilled. This view has been chiefly adopted in England (for proofs see v. Oettingen, *Die Synagogale Elegik des Volkes Israel*, p. 24); but it has also found many supporters in Germany, particularly in Wurtemberg. In relation to one preconceived notion, peculiar to the supporters of this view, it has already been remarked in the article previously referred to, "Zur Auslegung der Propheten:" "We cannot possibly understand, how the supporters of the strictly literal interpretation of the prophets can maintain that it is the result of stronger faith. We should have thought that history would suffice to save them from such an error. This mode of exposition is essentially the very same as that which the Jewish commentators adopt; and we may see clearly enough from their example, that no peculiar assistance from the Holy Spirit is needed to bring a man to believe, on the ground of Isa. 2, that in the Messianic age the temple-hill was to stand upon the top of the loftiest mountains, which were to be piled up under it, or on that of Zech. 14, that the Mount of Olive, was to be split in two. According to this theory, J. D. Michaelis another predecessor of these commentators, must have possessed faith that would remove mountains. And there are many Dutch expositors in the present day (Palm and others) who tread in their footsteps, but of whose faith we can form no very high opinion seeing that it is but too obvious that they are destitute of any vital acquaintance with the simplest truths of the gospel." But the strongest argument that can be brought is this, it was this very method of interpretation which led to the crucifixion of Christ. In the other wrong road we find those who rob the prophecies of their actual meaning, by laying excessive stress upon their figurative character. This method has been adopted by not a few of the rationalistic expositors; and whilst the supporters of the former were chiefly actuated by a desire to establish a positive opposition: between the Old Testament and the New, the leading object the case of the latter was to generalize as much as possible, and thus to do away with the harmony between correctly interpreted prophecy and its fulfilment.<sup>194</sup> It is by no means a rare thing to find the same expositor adopting both methods, just as it suits him. And to some extent we find the latter course pursued by those of the believing commentators, who give such an interpretation to any of the prophecies, which look beyond the coming of Christ in humiliation and the present condition of the Church, as to do away as much as possible with the actual facts to which they refer, and rob the kingdom of God of its glorious termination. Luther was not altogether exempt from this fault. In his later writings, for example, he declares himself a decided unbeliever in the future conversion of the Jews. "To convert the Jews," he says

(Works, vol. xx. p. 2528), “is quite as impossible as to convert the Devil. The heart of a Jew is as hard as stone or iron, as hard even as the heart of the Devil himself, and nothing will ever move it.” “Others may cherish what hopes they please, I have no hope of the whole herd” (p. 2529). In the article, “Zur Auslegung der Propheten,” it was said of Calvin, “He was repelled by the scrupulous literalism of earlier commentators. For forced interpretations, such as necessarily result from this literalism, were exceedingly distasteful to his sound exegetical feelings. And in addition to this, he was so firmly convinced that the sacred Scriptures must everywhere possess the characteristics attributed to them by the apostle that he could not look on with complacency, and see a considerable portion robbed of the light of life by being referred to something absolutely past or absolutely future. But he, again, went to the other extreme. For the purpose of connecting the whole with the present, he proceeded invariably to generalize, overlooked those cases in which there is evidently an announcement of a special realization of the idea, and robbed the kingdom of God of its glorious termination by completely identifying its present and future condition.” In the orthodox exposition of the 17th century, that of a Calovius for example, we find a great deal of this system of interpretation. Whether v. Oettingen is correct in charging it upon the author himself, as he does at p. 23, where he speaks of a “rationalizing spiritualism represented by Hengstenberg and his school,” will appear from the remarks which follow.

If we would avoid these two by-paths, having proved that the figurative character of prophecy, generally, results inevitably from its very nature, we must look round for *safe rules* by which to *determine the limits* between the figure and the fact.

1. Where we can compare the fulfilment, the distinction may be determined with the greatest certainty under its guidance. But even then prudence is necessary, for, as we have already shown, the prophets frequently represent events which are separated by long intervals of time, especially the weak commencements of the kingdom of Christ and its glorious termination, as though they were continuous. The first inquiry, therefore, must be whether a prophecy has been fulfilled at all; and if so, to what extent? In deciding this question, the statements of the New Testament, respecting the future history of the kingdom of God, will render the best possible service. The book of Revelation is of peculiar importance, inasmuch as it takes up the unfulfilled portion of the prophecies of the Old Testament, and represents their fulfilment as still in futurity.<sup>195</sup>—So far as that portion of prophecy is concerned which can be proved to have been already fulfilled, either by simply comparing the prophecy with history, or from the statements of Christ and the apostles, it is quite right to make use of history for the purpose of drawing the line between the mere figure and the literal meaning. But we must take care to distinguish between the two questions, what was the meaning which the prophets found in their prophecies? and what was the meaning which God intended? The two questions may be shown to be distinct, if it can once be proved that the prophets spoke in a state of ecstasy, and in the Spirit (see 1 Pet. 1:11; 2 Pet. 1:21). The reply to the first question cannot be found in this way; nor is it of any great importance. The reply to the second question can be thus obtained. The same God who opened up to the prophets a vision of the future, far beyond the power and comprehension of their own minds, was he who afterwards brought about the fulfilment. The rule of hermeneutics, that the meaning intended by the author must invariably be what we look for, is not violated here. The simple difference between us and our opponents has respect to the question, who is to be regarded as the true author of the prophecies? Our opponents confine their attention to the human instrument; we ascend to the divine Author.



At the same time, there are not wanting boundary remarks between the figure and the literal signification in the prophecies themselves; and therefore they were within the reach of the prophets and their contemporaries, although the want of the leading mark, namely fulfilment, must have prevented them from arriving at any safe and satisfactory result.— We have now to examine the marks in question.

2. Descriptions are undoubtedly to be regarded as figurative in which there is an evident allusion to earlier events in the history of Israel. In this case we have only to extract the general and fundamental thought which links together the future and the past. Examples of this are to be found in Habakkuk (chap. 3), who prays in ver. 2, “O Lord, revive thy work in the midst of the years”—in other words, do the same to us now as thou didst of old—and who then sees not only the glorious phenomena connected with the giving of the law repeated, but also the victories over Kushan and Midian; and in Isa. 11:15, 16, where we find it stated that, when the redemption of Israel takes place, the Lord will dry up the Arabian gulf, and divide the river into seven brooks. The thought intended to be expressed here, is merely that all the obstacles to the deliverance of the covenant nation will be removed. When Hosea says, in chap. 2:14, 15, that God will lead Israel into the desert, speak to her there in a friendly manner, and then conduct her into the land of Canaan, it is evident that it is merely in substance that he expects a repetition of the former dealings of God with his people. (See the remarks on Zech. 10:11; Isa. 4:5, and 12:3.)

3. In many other passages we are shut up to a figurative explanation, unless we would make the prophets contradict themselves. If, for example, we were to follow in the steps of many of the Cabalists (Gläserer, *De Gemino Judaeorum Messia*, p. 52), and interpret all those passages literally, in which the prophets call the Messiah King David, and were to attribute to them the belief that David would rise from the dead and assume the government again, we should bring these passages into contradiction with the very many others in which they speak of the Messiah as the offshoot or son of David (see the notes on Ex. 34:23). If we were to interpret Jer. 33:18 literally, and understand it as predicting the continuance of the Levitical priesthood and the sacrificial worship, this passage would be at variance with chap. 31:31 sqq. and 3:16 (see vol. ii. p. 464). When we read in Isa. 14:2, “Nations shall take them and bring them to their place, and the house of Israel shall possess them in the land of the Lord for servants and handmaids; and they shall take them captives whose captives they were, and they shall rule over their oppressors,” the idea of outward slavery is excluded by the opening words, “nations shall take them,” etc. (compare 66:20), and still more by the numerous passages to be found elsewhere, in which the Gentile nations are promised an equality with Israel in the kingdom of God, for example, chap. 19:23, and 66:21, where the Gentiles are even promised a share in the priesthood. From this it is evident that the idea intended to be conveyed cannot be any other than that the Israelitish principle will become the predominant spiritual power. The drapery is selected from a regard to the outward servitude which awaited Israel. If we were to understand Isa. 45:13: “The labour of Egypt, and the merchandize of Ethiopia and of the Sabeans, men of stature, shall come over unto thee, and they shall be thine; they shall come after thee; in chains they shall come over, and they shall fall down unto thee, they shall make supplication unto thee, saying, Surely God is in thee, and there is no God besides,” as denoting outward bondage, the passage would stand in direct contradiction to chap. 2:2-4; in fact, there would be a contradiction in the passage itself, for if the heathen submit of their own accord—they shall “*come over*”—the thought suggested is not that of outward subjection, but rather of dependence in a spiritual point of view. This spiritual

dependence is represented under the image of servitude, because, at the period into which Isaiah was carried, Israel followed the power of the world in chains. Again, a literal interpretation of Isa. 11:14: "They shall fly upon the shoulders of the Philistines towards the west, they shall spoil them of the east together; they shall lay their hand upon Edom and Moab, and the children of Ammon shall obey them," would be a direct contradiction, on the one hand, to ver. 4: "He shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked"—(the people of such a king are not appointed to make war after the manner of David; and the fact that, according to the announcement of the prophets, the nation was to become utterly defenceless before the coming of Christ—vol. i. p. 578—is a sufficient proof that the allusion could not be to anything of this kind in the kingdom of Christ); and on the other hand, to the prophetic anticipation which is especially obvious in Isaiah, that the neighbouring nations mentioned here would be entirely destroyed before the coming of Christ by the empires which were afterwards to arise, and would entirely lose the importance which they possessed previous to the rise of these imperial powers. In this passage the idea of the victorious power of the kingdom of God is clothed in imagery taken from the circumstances of David's times. A literal interpretation of Isa. 66:23, where all flesh is represented as coming from month to month, and from Sabbath to Sabbath, to worship at Jerusalem, would not be in harmony with chap. 19:19 (vol. ii. p. 238); Zeph. 2:11; Mal. 1:11 ("in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering:" Michaelis, "Sicut olim in uno loco"); and Deut. 12:5, 6 (vol. iv. p. 148). In such cases as these, the figure is always to be sought for in those points in which the idea can be proved to have been suggested by something within the range of the prophet's vision.

4. Other passages contain within themselves the proof that they cannot be understood otherwise than figuratively. Thus, even if we were to look altogether away from history and the testimony of Christ, we could not regard Elijah the prophet, whose coming is predicted by Malachi, as meaning the literal Elijah, as the earlier Jews and some of the moderns have done, but must necessarily understand it as meaning a prophet who would come in the spirit and power of Elias. For we could not attribute to the prophet so abnormal a thought as this, unless it were impossible to find any safe analogies on which to found the figurative interpretation. So, again, the literal interpretation of Isa. 53:12 is proved to be untenable, from the simple fact that worldly triumphs are not obtained by the deepest humiliation, and the worldly rulers do not confer upon their subjects the forgiveness of sins and justification. The literal explanation of the last nine chapters of Ezekiel is disproved by chap. 47:1-12, where the spiritual meaning is very conspicuous. That Edom is a figurative term, employed to denote the enemies of the kingdom of God, in Isa. 34 and 63, is evident from the whole context, where the judgment predicted is represented as falling upon all the nations of the earth. Very often a literal explanation leads to romantic ideas, which a sound exegetical feeling at once detects as at variance with the sacred Scriptures; for example, in Isa. 2, where, according to the literal reading, Mount Zion is to be raised upon the top of the loftiest mountains of the earth, and in Zech. 14:10, where the mountains of Judea, with the exception of those in Jerusalem itself, are said to be turned into plains.

5. In distinguishing between the figure and the fact, we must never lose sight of the general character of each particular prophet. It is undeniable that, although in many respects they all see the truth in a figure, yet in the case of some the figure bears a much greater resemblance to the fact, and the covering is much more transparent than in that of others. Several of the Jewish scholars noticed this (see the passages quoted by J. Smith;

also Maimonides, c. 45), and attempted to make a classification of the prophets accordingly. In Isaiah, for example, much more could be said in defence of a literal interpretation of such a description as that contained in Ezek. 40-48, than in the case of Ezekiel himself.

6. Sometimes the figurative character is expressly pointed out, and the clue is given to the literal meaning which lies beneath it. Thus Zechariah (chap. 10:11) explains the figurative expression, "They pass through the sea," which is borrowed from the deliverance from Egypt, by adding the words, "the affliction." In Isa. 2 the figurative view is suggested at once by the frequency with which mountains are employed to represent kingdoms; and in Ezek. 40-48, by the fact that the temple is undoubtedly used elsewhere as a symbol of the kingdom of God.

7. In prophecies which have not yet been fulfilled, the boundary line between the figure and the fact is always to be drawn according to the analogy of faith. On this ground, as Theodoret (on Ezek. 48; *opp.* ed. Hal. ii. p. 1045 sqq.) has conclusively shown, all those explanations of the prophecies relating to the future are to be rejected in which, through a false adherence to the letter, such doctrines are maintained as the future restoration of the exclusive privileges of the Jewish nation, the rebuilding of the temple, the renewal of the Levitical ceremonies, and consequently a return to the "beggarly elements" which the Church has left behind it. Those passages which speak of the return of Israel to Zion in the Messianic times must be regarded as figurative, because Zion always means the seat of the kingdom of God. And under the Old Testament it was merely the local sanctuary which gave to Zion this central importance. That the sanctuary would lose its importance when the Messiah came was expressly declared by Jeremiah, in chap. 3:16. With his coming the kingdom of God received a new centre, and the temple bore the same relation to him as the shadow to the substance. This is also the case with such passages as announce the coming of the converted heathen to Zion, passages which cannot be literal, for the simple reason that if they were we should be compelled to maintain, in opposition to the evident fact, that their fulfilment belonged exclusively to the future. Isaiah (chap. 2 and 66:23), Micah, and Zechariah speak of Zion as being without exception the only place of salvation for the heathen world, so that whoever does not come to Zion can have no part in salvation itself (compare Zech. 14:17-19); from Zion alone goeth out the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem, and whoever does not fetch it thence is excluded altogether; Zion is the only place of prayer for the whole earth, and therefore the only place where any one can have part in God himself. These consequences of a literal interpretation ought to be well considered before any one resolves to adopt it. V. Oettingen has made a perfectly vain effort to escape them. We have but one of two alternatives in this case, and all attempts at reconciliation, or at steering a middle course, must be regarded as unscientific. If Zion be once understood locally, in direct contradiction to the New Testament, where the temple, Jerusalem, and Zion all assume a spiritual character, it will also be necessary to go a step farther, and to conclude that the end will come back to the beginning, that the clear and decisive declaration of the Lord in John 4:21 will lose its force, and that the Church will relinquish its universal character (see my *Commentary on the Revelation*, i. p. 558). A preference for literal interpretation leads eventually to a renewal of the early error of the Jewish Christians, which has long been overcome and rejected by the Church; and the fact cannot be concealed that there are many who not only approach it, but have reached it already.

8. Just as the prophets and their contemporaries were not always able to distinguish the figure from the literal meaning by means of the marks alluded to, so are we also not always in a position to make this distinction with certainty, in the case of prophecies that are still unfulfilled. We must take care, therefore, that our conclusions do not go beyond the marks we possess. And since history has proved, in connection with that portion of prophecy which is already fulfilled, that many things are literal which must have appeared figurative, and others again figurative which must have appeared literal before the fulfilment took place, there are many instances connected with unfulfilled prophecy in which the question can be decided by history alone.

IV. Another result of the state in which the prophets were at the time of their prophesying is the obscurity of the prophecies themselves previous to the fulfilment. This obscurity is the consequence of the three peculiarities mentioned above.—1. The prophets generally had clear visions of only a few detached portions of the great future. Their prophecies need to be dovetailed together, and the fragments assorted, so as to form a perfect whole. This is not a difficult thing for us to do, since history has shown us how each particular feature is to be arranged; and even those who were living before the fulfilment, as we have already seen, were not left without any directions as to the manner in which the arrangement should be made. At the same time, it must have been a much more difficult task for them, and the prophets themselves may frequently have failed. That it was a difficult matter for those who were without the light of fulfilment, for example, to combine together the passages which proclaim a Messiah in glory, and those in which he is represented as coming in humiliation, is evident from the fact that it was this which led the Jews to resort to the fiction of a double Messiah.—2. Obscurity must in many instances have been caused by the fact that the visions of the prophets, as a rule, were abstracted from the relations of time, and that things are in consequence connected closely together which the historical development has proved to be far removed from one another. The prophecies, for example, in which the deliverance from the Babylonian captivity and the redemption by Christ are represented as continuous, might easily lead to the conclusion that the two events would also be historically connected (see the remarks on Mal. 2:17, and the introduction to Zechariah). From the fact that the weak commencements and glorious end of the Messianic kingdom are combined together in the prophecies, even John the Baptist and the apostles, previous to the outpouring of the Spirit (Acts 1:6), were unable to arrive at any other conclusion than that the coming of Christ would be closely connected with the setting up of the kingdom of glory.—3. A still greater cause of obscurity was the figurative character of the prophecies. We have seen, it is true, that even apart from the fulfilment, there were not wanting marks by which the figurative and literal might be distinguished; but, notwithstanding this, it must have been very difficult and frequently impossible to make this distinction where the particular prophecies were concerned. The members of the Old Testament stood in precisely the same relation to the prophecies generally, in which we stand to those which relate to the future development of the kingdom of God. Still greater misconceptions would also of necessity result from the figurative character of the prophecies, when the difficulty of interpretation inherent in them was increased by the fact that the commentators themselves approached them with a carnal mind and a desire to find their cherished hopes confirmed by the predictions they contained. The national pride of the Jews led them to despise the means within their reach of attaining to a correct understanding of the prophecies; and by a literal reading of the theocratic imagery, they drew their carnal notions of the Messiah and his kingdom from the prophecies themselves.

That this partial obscurity of the prophecies was not unknown to the prophets themselves is obvious from many of their own statements. Isaiah (chap. 6:9, 10, and 29:10-12) and Jeremiah (chap. 23:20, and 30:24) both expressly state that the prophecies are unintelligible to the carnally-minded portion of the nation, and will not be understood by them till they issue in their hurt. Zechariah says on several occasions that he cannot understand the visions which he has received; and it is not till afterwards that their meaning is explained to him.<sup>196</sup> From this it follows that in the case of visions such as Ezek. 40-48, which are not followed by any explanation, there must have been some obscurity about the meaning, even to the prophet himself. Daniel was told that his prophecy would be shut up and sealed for the present, and even for a long time to come, and that the Church of the future alone would be able to make a proper use of it (chap. 12:4, 9, 8:26; see *Dissertation on Daniel*, and the commentary on Rev. 10:14). And in Rev. 22:10, it is also stated that, so far as the prophecies relate to anything absolutely future, they are as it were shut up and sealed.

The rationalistic writers refused to compare the prophecy with the fulfilment, and thus going back to the standpoint of those who lived before the fulfilment had taken place, deduced from the obscurity of the prophecies, which they were perpetuating through their own fault, an argument against their divinity. Thus Ammon, for example (*Christologie*, p. 12), says, "Such simple sentences as the following: Israel has not to expect a king, but a teacher; this teacher will be born at Bethlehem during the reign of Herod; he will lay down his life under Tiberius in attestation of the truth of his religion; through the destruction of Jerusalem and the complete extinction of the Jewish state he will spread his doctrine in every quarter of the world—a few sentences like these, expressed in plain historical prose, would not only bear the character of true predictions, but when once their genuineness was proved, they would be of incomparably greater worth to us than all the oracles of the Old Testament taken together." Our first remark in reply to this that the Christ of rationalism is here substituted for the historical Christ, the mere "teacher" for the prophet, high priest, and king. If this be done, the distinction between the Christ of the Old Testament and the Christ of the New is no longer simply one of form, but the greater part of the prophecies are changed into mere chaff. If, however, the *πρωτον ψευδος* of the rationalists, from which every Christian mind shrinks back with abhorrence, be removed out of the way, it will not be difficult to defend the form in which the Old Testament revelations of the future were made.—(1) It is opposed to the nature of God to force men to believe. He hides himself in history as well as in nature, that he may be found of them that seek him. And thus in the prophecies also, there was sufficient clearness for those whose hearts were prepared to be able to discover whatever was essential and important to themselves, am everything that related to the salvation of their souls; and, on the other hand, so much obscurity that those who did not desire the truth might not be forcibly constrained to see it. It would be just as reasonable to demand that God should work miracles every day, for the purpose of convincing those that despise his name of the folly of their conduct, as to require that there should be greater clearness in the prophecies. That there was sufficient light to lead the elect to Christ, is evident from the living examples of Zechariah, Simeon, John the Baptist, Mary, Anna, and others.—(2) If the prophecies had possessed the clearness of history, their fulfilment would have been rendered impossible. If the light of Christ, his rejection by the Jews, and the mournful consequence, viz. the destruction of Jerusalem, had been described in the prophecies as clearly, as literally, as connectedly, as circumstantially, and even for the carnally-minded as intelligibly, as in the New Testament, the decree of redemption which required the death of Christ would never have been carried into effect.—(3) Even upon believers

themselves the obscurity which rests upon certain portions of prophecy must have exerted a more beneficial influence than greater clearness would have done. If, for example, the Old Testament believers, who lived before the coming of Christ, had known that his appearance would be so long delayed, how greatly would this have tended to cool their love and cripple their hopes! How could the Messianic expectations in this case have become the centre of their whole religious life? If the Christians of the first centuries had foreseen that the second coming of Christ would not take place for 1800 years, how much weaker an impression would this doctrine have made upon them than when they were expecting him every hour, and were told to watch, because he would come like a thief in the night, at an hour when they looked not for him? (4) A considerable portion of the Messianic predictions were intended to produce an immediate effect upon the whole of the people, and to preserve at least its outward fidelity towards the Lord. But if prophecy had had all the clearness of history, this end would never have been realized. It was attained, on the other hand, by such an arrangement of the prophecies as made even a wilful misunderstanding salutary in its results. The people laid hold of the shell, and thought that they necessarily possessed the substance also. And this contributed to the maintenance of such outward conditions as were adapted to give life to the actual substance of the prophecies. (5) If the question be asked, what end was answered by such of the prophecies as were obscure in themselves, and not merely in consequence of the carnal minds of the readers, it is a sufficient reply that the prophets did not utter the predictions for their contemporaries alone, but for posterity also, and the Church of every age. Those portions which were clear were amply sufficient for contemporaries.

V. A further consequence of the state in which the prophets were at the time of their prophesying was the dramatic character which so frequently distinguishes the prophecies. Events and persons are all presented to their inward sight: this is, as it were, the stage, on which the latter come forward to act or to speak. Very frequently this takes place without any previous notice or introduction, as, for example, in Isa. 49, where the Messiah suddenly comes forward and speaks. The discourse also is often suddenly directed to those whom the prophet beholds by his inward sight: for example, to Christ in Isa. 52:14, "As many were astonished at thee." The changes made without any further notice in the persons speaking or addressed have frequently given rise to differences of interpretation, as, for example, in Nahum 1:9, "What think ye of the Lord?" where many suppose Assyria to be addressed, though, according to the correct view, Judah is intended (ver. 11).

VI. From the state of the prophets we may prove the correctness of the assumption that the symbolical actions which they describe took place for the most part inwardly, and not outwardly, an assumption which, as Maimonides says (chap. 46), is imperatively demanded by the nature of the actions themselves. For as the sphere of the prophets, as long as they were in an ecstatic state, was not the outward world, but the inward, every action performed by them in this state of ecstasy must have been an inward action also. The few instances in which it can be proved that the symbolical actions were performed outwardly are to be regarded as exceptional cases, in which the prophets passed away from their proper element.<sup>197</sup>

1. " Calvin has well observed: "These predictions appear to contradict one another. But it was necessary that the blessings of God should first of all be announced to the Jews, in order that they might engage with greater alacrity in the "work of building the temple, and might feel assured that they were not wasting their time. It was now desirable to address them in a different style, lest, as was too generally the case, hypocrites should be hardened by their vain confidence in these promises. It was also requisite, in order that the faithful should take alarm in time, and earnestly draw near to God; since nothing is more destructive than false security, and wherever sin is committed without restraint, the judgment of God is close at hand.""
2. " According to the testimony of Jarchi, Kimchi, and Abendana, the allegorical interpretation was a very ancient one among the Jews. From a passage in the Talmud (Joma, 396) it is evident that Lebanon was supposed to represent the temple at Jerusalem. We will quote the words of this singular passage. "Quadraginta annis ante excidium apertae sunt portae templi sua sponte. Abjurgavit igitur eas R. Jochanan fil. Zaccai et dixit: O templum, templum, quare tu terres te ipsum? novi ego, quod finis tuis erit ut desoleris. Nam sic prophetavit de te Zacharias, filius Iddo: aperi Libane portas tuas." This opening of the temple-doors is mentioned by Josephus also (de bell. Jud. vi. 5), and it is not improbable that he regarded it as an omen of such importance to himself and his contemporaries, because the explanation referred to was so generally current at the time. The antiquity of this exposition among the Jews is also apparent from the fact that it is given by many of the Church-fathers, particularly Eusebius and Jerome, who probably borrowed it from them. The latter observes, "Lebanon opens its gates that the Roman army may enter, and the fire consumes its cedars, either when the whole is destroyed by fire or when the leaders and chiefs are overthrown by the attacks of the enemy." There were many even of the modern commentators, Grotius, for example, who adopted the reference to the temple. Others, again, were of opinion that Lebanon meant Jerusalem generally; whilst there were others, such as Marck and Eichhorn, who understood by it the whole of Palestine, "of which this mountain formed the "them boundary, and which, like Lebanon itself, was distinguished in many ways above the other countries of the earth.""
3. " The supporters of the allegorical interpretation have from time immemorial justly looked upon these words as affording a direct confirmation of their views. In the Septuagint the clause is rendered ὅτι μεγάλως μεγιστᾶνες ἔταλαιπώρησαν. Jerome translates them "guoniam magnifice vastati sunt," and observes, "He now states more clearly what he had already said obscurely. ... I want to know what are these cedars of Lebanon which are consumed, these fir-trees to which howling is attributed, these pines which fall to the ground; the great ones, he tells me, are laid low," Theodoret: καὶ ἑρμηνεύων, ἃ τροπικῶς ἔιρηκεν, ἐπήγαγεν, κ.τ.λ. and Cyril, ὅτι δὲ ἄνθρωπον ὁ λόγος ἀταλαίπωρον ἔδειν· ἔφη γὰρ εὐθύς, ὅτι μεγάλως μαγιστᾶνες ἔπαλαιπώρησαν."
4. " According to Zechariah, the whole body of shepherds is to be regarded as the subject of שׂב, and not Jehovah (compare Ezek. 19:1 sqq.)."
5. " Schnurrer (on Jer. 12 in Velthusen, Kuhnbl, and Ruperti, Comm. Theol. iii. p. 372) maintains that the expression, "the pride of the Jordan" gradually worked its way into the language of the people as a strictly geographical term. But this is wrong; for it never loses its appellative signification as a term of honour. Not only do we find the expression itself in three passages of Jeremiah, and in no other book, but in all three passages the pride of the Jordan is specially described as the abode of lions. Now this can hardly have been the case previous to the depopulation of the land through the devastations caused by the wars which attended the breaking up of the kingdom (compare 2 Kings 17), and certainly was not the case in the age to which the second portion of Zechariah has latterly been assigned. Moreover, this was so far from being an exclusive mark, that we can only explain its recurrence in Zechariah on the ground that it was taken from Jeremiah. In Jer. 49:19, we find this passage in the prophecy against Edom, "Behold he will come up like a lion from the pride of the Jordan to the fold of the strong" ("The land of Edom which boasts of its impregnable strength." Schmid). The same sentence occurs word for word in chap. 50:44 in the prophecy against Babylon. The

repetition is intentional. It points out the retributive justice of God. In Jer. 12:5, "in the land of peace thou trustest, but what wilt thou do in the pride of Jordan," a safe district is contrasted with the neighbourhood of the Jordan, which was rendered dangerous by lions. If we pay attention to such phenomena as these, "we cannot but marvel at the blindness of those who transfer the second portion of Zechariah to the period antecedent to the captivity. Bleek (p. 279) reverses the order. He says that Jeremiah borrowed the expression from the passage before us. But this is contrary to analogy. Every word in Jeremiah indicates its priority in age. And in addition to this, the perfectly independent use of the phrase in chap. 12:5 and 49:19 is also a proof of the originality of Jeremiah."

6. " הגרה, not slaughter-house, but slaughter, also occurs in Jeremiah. Compare more particularly chap. 12:3, where נאצ and הגרה are mentioned together. The corrupt nation is introduced there as a flock destined for the slaughter. The same state of things is to occur again."
7. " Hitzig himself condemns what he says on ver. 4, by the remark which he makes at ver. 15, "When the prophet takes the shepherd's staff a second time, he does this not to tend them himself, but as the type of a future shepherd.""
8. " The words of ver. 10 go far beyond the province of a prophet, "That I might break my covenant which I had made with all the people." The person to whom the Lord said in ver. 4 "feed my flock," here attributes to himself a divine work."
9. " Correctly explained by Jonathan thus: "post gloriam, quae promissa eat, ut adducatur super vos.""
10. " Compare the passages quoted by Abicht, in his readable treatise "de baculie jucunditatis et corruptentium," Thesaurus Novus, i. p. 1094 sqq."
11. " He says, according to Abicht's version: "Sensus prophetae ia est. Postquam deus prophetae indicasset bona, quae erant futura super incolas secundi templi, si vias suas bonas redderent, secundum prophetias, quas jam interpretatus sum, perguit sermo ad prophetam, ipsi significando futura, si non bona redderent opera et se bonis illis dignos exhiberent, sed si e contrario reges et sacerdotes eorum una cum reliquo populo deterius viverent, quam patres eorum, quomodo non sufficiebat, ut operibus bonis Shechinam et revelationem non reducerent, sed quoque se reos redderent desolationum et captivitatis. Et huc tendit sapientium p. m. in principio capitis: Aperi Libanon portas tuas." (Compare the remarks on ver. 1.)"
12. " "Suscipit propheta in se personam omnium pastorum; quasi diceret: non esse cur obtendat populus iuscitiam, vel culpam suam aliis titulis et coloribus fucari velit; quia deus semper obtulit se pastorem, et adhibuit etiam ministros, quorum manu regeret populum huuc. Non stetit igitur per deum, quin feliciter haberi potuerit hie populus.""
13. " His main argument is the following: "In antecetibus propheta habitatoribus templi secundi dei specialem providentiam et defensionem contra insultantes hostes, terrae fertilitatem c. 10. 1, defensionem et robur 3-7, multiplicationem et collectionem, 8 sqq. promisit, quae omnia ad templi secundi tempora respiciunt. Quoniam vero deus praevidit, quod in bono non perstituri, sed malis operibus contaminati, poenam meritori sint, nunc bonorum promissioni poenam adjungit, quae eos mansura sit, si a legis divinae tramite deflecterent.—His rationibus subiuxus dico, nostra verba de modo Judaeos in templo secundo pascendi in genere loqui, quo deus modo bonos, modo malos concessit pastores, prout Judaeorum vita et opera comparata fuerunt.""
14. " "Grex occisionis refertur ad prophetae aetatem; mortuae oves, quas dominus eripuerat, multis molestiis adhuc expositae erant.""
15. " Bleek says (p. 287): "Hengstenberg, according to his usual disposition to regard the prophets of the Bible as soothsayers and diviners of the future, looks upon this as a distinct prediction of the work and fate of Christ." In our opinion, however, any one who is disposed to regard the prophets as holy men of God, moved by the Holy Ghost (and this is not a matter of personal predilection, but the opinion of the whole Christian Church), will find in this prophecy, even when looked at from a purely scientific point of view, very strong ground for congratulating himself on having the disposition referred to, and for commiserating those who do not share it. The rationalistic expositors in their interpretation of this 11th chapter, as well as of the 53d chapter of Isaiah, have brought to light nothing but exegetical monstrosities, to



be free from the necessity of upholding which is one of the blessings of faith in the word of God."

16. "Jonathan: "And as any one who ate of the first-fruits of the harvest before the priests, the sons of Aaron, had offered some of the sheaf upon the altar was guilty, so did all who spoiled the house of Israel contract guilt to themselves by so doing.""
17. "Calvin has well observed, though in a different connection: "We are accustomed to give thanks to God, when we can regard the benefits which fall to our lot as his gift. The thief who has murdered an innocent man does not say, 'Blessed be God,' for he would prefer that the name of God should be obliterated, since he has wounded his own conscience.""
18. "The last to defend this view is Hofmann (Schriftbeweis, ii. 2. p. 557), "As there is a לבה, which means to do evil or inflict evil, מילבה, which denotes the various methods of inflicting evil, forms an appropriate antithesis to מעג" (Heb)."
19. "The passages adduced in support of the meaning to destroy, which has already been contested by Gousset and Schultens (ad Jobum, p. 964) are the following: Neh. 1:7, "We have sinned against thee קָבַלְנוּ לְךָ," is generally rendered, "We have dealt corruptly towards thee," or "We have acted wickedly towards thee;" but it ought rather to be rendered, "We are pledged to thee," *omni pignore obstricti tibi tenemur ad poenam*; Schultens has admirably illustrated this from the Arabic sayings, "Every man is pledged to death, every evil doer to punishment," or "Every man binds himself by the things which he does." 34:31 is usually translated, "I paid the penalty, and will do wrong no more" (לֹא אֶעֱשֶׂה לְ). But the proper rendering would be, "I bear (or there has come upon me) what I do not deserve." Job intends to represent his innocence as continuous, and therefore employs the future.—Prov. 13:13, "Whoso despiseth the word, יִקְבַּל לוֹ is pledged to himself, namely, for punishment." Thus there is not a single passage in which either the Kal or Niphal is used where the meaning to destroy is even a probable one. The fact that it is found in the Niphal proves nothing. For this may be traceable to a modification of the primary meaning of the word, produced by the conjugation itself. קָבַל, to bind and to be bound; Piel, to ensnare, then to destroy. In Chaldee also the meaning to destroy is not found in the Piel, but in the Pael alone. קָבַל (prave factum, scelus), in Dan. 6:23, to which appeal is also made, is literally the pledged one (Amos 2:8) according to the view already given. קָבַל, hurt, in Dan. 3:25 (compare Ezra 4:22), is to be explained by the help of Mic. 2:10, where לבה, a cord, is used to denote pain; pain and hurt being regarded as a condition of restraint, tormentum a torquendo. Gesenius endeavours to trace the supposed meaning, *pervertit et perversus pravus fuit*, to the primary signification to bind, but with little success. There is no necessity to assume, as some of the more modern lexicographers have done, that קָבַל is made up of two different roots. Abicht (p. 1100) has already shown in what way the meanings may all be traced to the one primary signification to bind or to be bound."
20. "Bleek subscribes to the same view (p. 282). But this gives us a far less suitable meaning than the received reading. "Cords" would point rather to the idea of fettering, for which it is very commonly employed."
21. "This is the view held by Gesenius: *constringens poet. pro fune*; but the plural shows that it is incorrect."
22. "This is very obvious from the derivative words קָבַל, a sailor (*ligator funis nautici*), קָבַל, a cord, and union or company (*קָבַל יָמִים חֶבְרִים*, I Sam. 10:5, 10, properly rendered by the LXX. *χορδὸς προφητῶν*), קָבַל, consilia (*nectere dolos*)."
23. "It is also to be observed that the thought of the future predominates throughout the whole of the Scriptures, that it is never the existing generation alone which is addressed, and that the knowledge assumed as possessed is never such as was accessible to their own age alone."
24. "The rationalistic critics (e.g. Hitzig, Maurer, Ewald, and Bleek) fall back with a certain unanimity upon 2 Kings 15:13. But in this case it is impossible to do justice even to the most outward circumstances. According to that passage, Shallum reigned a full month. Menahem, who must have been the third, was not killed at all, but died a natural death at the end of ten years, and his son reigned in his stead. To get rid of the difficulty Hitzig works away at the word דִּיחַחַח, which must mean to cut off, as ver. 9 clearly shows; and Ewald invents "a third ruler, who rose up at the same time and was quickly overthrown, possibly on the other side of

the Jordan, but who is necessarily passed over in 2 Kings 15:10-13.” The opinion is based upon the assumption, which we have already shown to be erroneous, that we have not a prophecy here, but a historical picture relating to the circumstances of the ten tribes, an assumption sufficiently disproved by ver. 14. Another objection may also be offered, namely, that so special an interposition of the providence of God would hardly be looked for in the case of the kingdom of Israel, which rested upon a thoroughly false foundation. The destruction of the three shepherds is represented here as a consequence of the feeding; it was an act of mercy. But in the kingdom of Israel, the overthrow of one or other of the kings was attended with but little loss or gain to the kingdom of God. The men of God looked upon its changes of dynasty with comparative indifference. It is also a point of some moment that all history fails to yield a suitable explanation if we understand by the three shepherds three individuals. There is no gap in the history of either Judah or Israel, and therefore no opportunity is afforded anywhere of introducing the three shepherds.”

25. " Thus Theodoret says: “He refers to the rulers of the Jews, the prophets and the priests, for by these three orders they were fed.” Cyril gives the same explanation, except that he substitutes the scribes for the prophets: “I think,” he says, “that by the three shepherds he means the legally-appointed priests, the duly-constituted rulers of the people, and in addition to these the scribes; for they fed Israel.” Jerome also mentions it. “I have read,” he states, “in the commentary of a certain writer, that the shepherds who were cut off in one day through the indignation of the Lord are to be seen in the priests and false prophets and rulers of the Jews, because they were all cut off at once after the death of Christ.””
26. " Schultens (on Prov. 20:21) says, “This expression does not denote weariness so much as the indignation which arises from intolerable injuries, under which the mind is, as it were, oppressed and suffocated. . . . The impatience of one who is grievously harassed, oppressed, stifled, who can hardly breath, is everywhere apparent.””
27. " Calvin: “When they cannot be healed, and suffer no remedy to be provided for their ills, I will leave them: they shall learn what it is to be without the Good Shepherd.””
28. " Marck: “Ex rabie fera, in quam praeter naturam hae oves degenerabunt.””
29. " Maimondes (Mor. Neb., c. 40, part 3) “ut plus minus reperies hominem liberum aestimari sexaginta siclis, servum vero triginta.””
30. " Gesenius says, “תוסרה, figlina sc. officina pottery, in qua fiunt vasa testacea, שרה.” That שרה is not a potsherd, but an earthen vessel, is evident from שרה רצוי in ver. 1. When used by itself it never means a sherd. In the Pentateuch it is always used for an earthen vessel: “Every Cheres, in which thou boilest,” Lev. 6:21 (compare 11:33, 14:50, 15:12; Num. 5:17); and again Jer. 32:14 “Make them שרה ילכב into an earthen vessel,” Prov. 26:33.”
31. " Lightfoot says (Centur. Ckorograph. Matth. Praem. Opp., t. ii. p. 200), “In the time of the second temple, when the things which had formerly brought the place into such ill repute had all vanished, there still remained so much that was disgusting and repulsive, that the name suggested the thought of hell as much as it had done before. It was the common cesspool of the whole city. In which every kind of filth was collected.””
32. " This is so obvious that it even forced itself upon Abarbanel’s mind, “quia tempore excidii latrones aucti sunt, et cum amore etiam fraternitas est imminuta in tribu Juda, et insuper inter hos et filios Israelis, sacerdotes et Levitas, qui apud ipsos erant, idcirco hic ait, ad irritum faciendam fraternitatem inter Judam et Israellem.””
33. " The commentators who dispute Zechariah’s authorship of the second part generally pass very quickly over this verse. It is inconceivable how Bleek could assert that it points to a period antecedent to the breaking up of the Ephraimitish kingdom. If the authorship of Zechariah is denied, the only possible conclusion to which we can come, is that the prophecy belongs to an earlier period than the division of the two kingdoms, and this is not for a moment to be thought of. There is an account in 1 Kings 12:20 of the breaking up of the brotherhood, (הוהא, brotherhood, is only met with here: the form is Aramaic, see Fürst). From the period of the division of the kingdoms to the dissolution of the kingdom of the ten tribes, the brotherhood between Judah and Israel was never restored. The first indispensable condition was communia sacra. That the breaking up of the brotherhood extended to the time of Isaiah is evident from Isa. 7:17. But the brotherhood between Judah and Israel is referred to

here in terms which show that at least the first step must have been taken towards its restoration."

34. " Calvin says on this verse: "The prophet teaches here that even when God had relinquished the care of the people, a certain show of government would still be maintained, but one from which it could easily be gathered that God was no longer acting the part of a shepherd. . . . God had already laid down his office of shepherd, but he afterwards placed wolves and thieves and robbers over the nation in the place of shepherds, when he was about to execute his fearful judgment upon the Jews.""
35. " According to Ewald, the foolish shepherd is "Pekah, the wild king who was ruling at the time." Maurer thinks Hosea is intended, Hitzig, Menahem. Such guessing as this is a sufficient proof that the principle of interpretation is false."
36. " Abendana (in the Spicilegium to Sal. Ben Melech's Miclal Jophi) had the right idea; but his explanation is too limited: "per pastores nihili intelliguntur principes latronum, Jochanan, Simeon et Eliezer.""
37. " "It is opposed to that which lies down and is prostrate from disease. For as the sick and broken down stand in need of medicine, so do those that stand up and are well need food and substance, that their health may be preserved." —BOCHART."
38. " Ewald and Hitzig adopt Tarnov's explanation, "He will tear their hoofs, by giving them on bad roads." But tearing or breaking in pieces points to a direct act. Compare the parallel passage in Mic. 3:3, where allusion is made to the breaking of bones by the voracious princes."
39. " "In this verse the prophet teaches that although God will justly inflict this severe punishment upon the Jews, yet the shepherds themselves will not escape with impunity; and thus he shows that, even in the midst of all this confusion and destruction, he will still remember his covenant."—CALVIN."
40. " See the remarks on Hos. 2:1 (vol. i. p. 209 sqq.), or Rev. 7:4 and 11."
41. " There is a parallel in Isa. 42:5: "Thus saith God the Lord,—he that created the heavens and stretched them out, he that spread forth the earth and that which cometh out of it, he that giveth bread to the people upon it, and spirit to them that walk therein." The two passages cannot be unconnected. For not only are the three points mentioned the same in both, but they occur in the same order, and the context is the same. In both passages the omnipotence of God is appealed to as the guarantee of the certain realization of the Messianic salvation. As proofs that Isaiah is the earlier of the two, we may mention, first, that it is a customary thing with Isaiah to introduce such epithets in connection with the name of God, especially in the second part, in accordance with the character of his commission as expressed in the words, "Comfort ye, comfort ye, my people;" and, secondly, that Zechariah refers to such passages as these, of an earlier date, in almost every verse."
42. " This explanation is adopted in the Chaldee paraphrase, and also by Jerome, "But Judah also, when Jerusalem is besieged, is taken by the heathen, and entering into alliance with them, is compelled to besiege its own capital." There are only two ways in which this explanation has been defended with any plausibility. The first is that of Michaelis, to which Rosenmüller and Ewald subscribe, "But it will also be over Judah (i.e. it will lie upon Judah, even Judah will be held or forced) in the siege," etc. The second is the one adopted by Kimchi, Hitzig, Maurer, and others, "But it (the cup of giddiness) will also be upon Judah when it shall be compelled to come to the siege against Jerusalem," or else, "But even for Judah, Jerusalem is such a cup of giddiness." It is a sufficient reply to both of these, however, that there is not the slightest indication in what follows of any participation on the part of Judah in the siege of Jerusalem; on the contrary, Judah is represented as the ally of Jerusalem, by whose victories, obtained through the help of the Lord, Jerusalem is to be delivered."
43. " This argument tells all the more powerfully against the explanation given by Kimchi; for, according to this, Judah is visited by severe punishment from God for its forced participation in the siege, whereas there is nothing but salvation announced in the verses which follow. A special objection to the exposition given by Michaelis may be found in the fact, that although his rendering of לַיְיָ is not in itself untenable (see Ezek. 45:17; Ps. 56:13), it is inadmissible

here on account of the parallelism of Judah and Jerusalem, which precludes the adoption of a different rendering in the one case from that given in the other."

44. " "Damnum non sentiens, ipse magnum damnum iis affert,"—MARCK."
45. " The use of the noun מְלִיץ in this passage, and also in chap. 9:7, to denote the princes and leaders of the covenant nation, is very remarkable. Elsewhere it is merely applied to the hereditary princes of Idumea (Gen. 36:15 sqq.; Ex. 15:35; 1 Chron. 1:51 sqq.) It is true that many lexicographers bring forward Jer. 13:21, in addition to the passages from Zechariah, as an example of the more general use of the word. But Schultens has shown (*Animadvv. Phil. on Jer. 13:21*) that מְלִיץ is not used there in the sense of prince, but means friend, as in other passages of Jeremiah (e.g. 3:4). The peculiar use of this word in the case of Zechariah is an answer to the hypothesis of those who maintain that chap. 9 was composed by a different author from the one before us. It also furnishes a proof that the second part was composed after the captivity, and therefore that it is genuine. The use of the word, in such a sense as this, can only be explained by a study of the language of the earliest written documents, which Zechariah constantly employs."
46. " "By tents, in my opinion, the prophet means huts, which cannot afford any protection to their guests and inhabitants. . . . There is a contrast implied between huts and fortified cities."—CALVIN."
47. " Maurer, "Animus qui gratiam divinam conciliet.""
48. " There is apparently an allusion to this passage here, in anticipation of John 3:14, 15."
49. " Maurer, who supports the figurative explanation, thinks that he can get rid of the objections by the simple remark, that "even reviling is a severe offence, and a just cause for deep lamentation; "but he overlooks the וּלְאֵל דָּפַס. The word דָּפַס, the ordinary term applied to mourning for the dead (cf. לַע דָּפַס with לַע, to denote the person for whom lamentation is made, 2 Sam. 11:26), must be taken in this sense here, especially when we consider the following דָּפַס מַמְכָּה, which undoubtedly refers to mourning for the dead."
50. " Such reasons as these have but little weight, is it true, with Ewald. His inclinations are of much greater importance. "For לָא," he says, "read וּלְאֵל, which is found in many mss." The reason assigned is this, "The first person makes the Old Testament speak nonsense, namely, that the people would mourn for Jehovah (for no one else could be thought of), as for one dead, who would never return again(?)." Such practices as these should be left to the Jews; they should never be heard of within the limits of Christendom."
51. " The apparent contradiction between this passage and the account given in the book of Kings, in which Josiah is said to have died at Megiddo, is sufficiently explained from the attempt at conciseness on the part of the latter author, whose general design leads him throughout to show less precision, with regard to external circumstances, than the writer of the Chronicles. He does not stop to mention that there was still a feeble spark of life remaining in the king, but speaks of Megiddo as the scene of his death, because he was mortally wounded and nearly died there."
52. " Grotius: "Sicut illa Darii ad Arbella, ab Arbellitide regione, et ad Gaugamela ex oppido aut vico propinquo.""
53. " "Hadadrimmon urbs est juxta Jezreelem, hoc olim vocabulo nuncupata, et hodie vocatur Maximianopolis in campo Mageddon, in quo Josias rex Justus a Pharaone coguomenteo Necho vulneratus est.""
54. " In numerous passages of the Sohar, the fulfilment of this prediction is assigned to the Messianic times. We quote a few of these. "Sin will not cease from the world till the king Messiah comes, as the Scriptures say, 'I will cause the unclean spirit,' etc."—"The left side will have the upper hand, and the unclean will be strong, till the holy God shall build the temple and establish the world. Then will his word meet with due honour, and the unclean side will pass away from the earth. And this is what the Scripture saith, 'I will cause the unclean,' etc." (compare these passages in Schöttgen, *Jews der wahre Messias*, p. 407 sqq.)."
55. " The principal passages quoted as evidence of this custom, which was continued in the East even till modern times, are to be found in both the earlier and later commentaries on 1 Kings 18:28, and in Rosenmüller's *A. und N. Morgenland*, iii. p. 189 sqq."

56. " Hitzig observes: "As the flock which is to be scattered is evidently the nation, the shepherd cannot be the prophet, but the king, and of this we have a proof in the use of the singular." But in his commentary on chap. 11:4 sqq., Hitzig still maintains, even in this second edition, that the prophet is intended. And yet it is evidently to the Lord's shepherd, spoken of here, that the commission, "feed the flock of slaughter," was addressed in chap. 11:4."
57. " Vid. Jos. de Voisin, Observv. in Proem. Pug. Fid. p. 160. Hulsius, Theol. Jud. p. 54. Eisner, Praes. Wessel, de Messia Gladio Judicis, non Bello Percutiendo. Leiden, 1741."
58. " The reason why תימע is only found in Leviticus, and not in Exodus also, is sufficiently explained on the supposition that it was used interchangeably, after the almost synonymous words ער and הא had been written very frequently, to prevent these from being weakened and losing their deeper meaning by constant use. We cannot adopt the rendering given by Gesenius and Hitzig: "Vir sodetatis me, i.e. socius mewis." Even if תימע was originally an abstract, it is always used as a concrete in the Pentateuch (compare וילע in Lev. 19:17), and Zechariah has simply taken the word as he found it there."
59. " The passages are not precisely the same; in Ezekiel one third is slain by the sword, one third dies by pestilence and famine, and one third is scattered to the winds and destroyed, with the exception of a remnant, which "escapes the sword among the nations; "in Zechariah, on the other hand, the whole third is represented as preserved.—tr."
60. " Crit. Sacr. p. 805: "There will be no light; the precious things will flow together. By precious things he means the heavens, the sun, the moon, the stars, the air, the earth, the water, which are really the most precious objects in the world. These will all be dissolved at the end of time, when 'the elements shall melt with fervent heat,' and 'the heavens, being on fire, shall be dissolved' (2 Pet. 3:10-12); and being dissolved they will flow together and coalesce, as it were, in one mass. From this it follows that there will be no light, because the objects which now give light will be all mixed up with the rest.'"
61. " The primary signification of נָפַק is to contract; from this come (1) the meaning "to curdle" and (2) the idea of diminution or deterioration. In the Arabic [it] means contracted, corrugata fuit res. In the Talmud נָפַק means allevare, leve reddere וְנָפַק, leve, vile, vilis pretii. In the gloss to the Talmud it is explained by לָק (see Buxtorf, c. 2084), The verb is also found in Ex. 15:8, in the sense of contracting, diminishing."
62. " "For how could all the inhabitants of the whole earth, Japanese, Chinese, and those living near either pole, by any possibility come every year to Jerusalem to keep the feast?" (Dachs, Dissert, ad Sack. 14, 16, ad. calc. cod. Talmud. Succah, Utrecht 1726, p. 547). The difficulty of travelling is pointed out very clearly in Ezek. 33:21, where more than a year passes before Ezekiel receives information of the destruction of Jerusalem."
63. " The passages which prove that it was a custom in ancient times, particularly in the East, to suspend bells upon the horses and mules, sometimes for use, viz. for the same purposes to which they are still applied among ourselves, and sometimes for ornament, have been most diligently collected by Dougltaeus (in the Analecta Sacra, p. 297, ed. 2). Thus, for example, Diodorus says, in his description of Alexander's funeral procession (Book 18, ed. Wessel. p. 279): "ὥστε τοὺς ἅπαντας ἡμιόνους εἶναι ἐξήκοντα καὶ τέσσαρας· ἕκαστος δὲ τούτων ἐστεφάνωτο, κεχρυσωμένῳ στεφάνῳ καὶ παρ' ἑκατέραν τῶν σιαγόνων εἶχεν ἐξηρητημένον κώδωνα χρυσοῦν." And Nicetas Choniates says of the Persians, "They rode upon beautiful horses, which, in addition to other ornaments, καὶ περιηρητημένους ἔχουσι ἠχητικούς κώδωνας.'"
64. " Dissertatio ad Zach. xiv. 20, 21, praes. J. H. Hottinger, Marb. 1711."
65. " Jonathan, for example, says, אַשְׁדָּקַם תִּיבַב דּוּעַ דִּיבַע יְהִי אֱלוֹ, "and there will no longer be any one carrying on a trade in the house of the sanctuary; and Aquila (who is said by Jerome to adopt the rendering mercator, ἔμπορος), Abenezra, Kirachi, Abarbanel, and Grotius, express a similar view."
66. " The rendering given in the English version.—TR."
67. " Caspari appeals to the fact that the name יבא in 2 Kings 18:2 is an abbreviation of הַיְבֵא in 2 Chron. 29:1. But the cases are not parallel. The י in יבא is not an abbreviation of Jehovah, but the name of God is dropped altogether, a circumstance of frequent occurrence: "Hebraei

nomina divina saepissime in fine nominum priorum reticent,” Simonis,” p. 11. The same remark applies to the name יִטְלַף, “my deliverance,” of which the full form is Paltiel, “God my deliverance,” 2 Sam. 3:15.”

68. " "In hoc nomine ‘est μνημόσυνον potissimae prophetiae hujus libri, quae exstat,” c. iii. 1."
69. " For אִשָּׁר see the remarks on Zech. 9:1. Hitzig explains it as meaning “utterance, word of Jehovah;” but in this case it would be rendered superfluous by רַבָּד, which follows."
70. " Michaelis: “In omni loco, in Assyria et Aegypto, Ezra xix. 18 sqq., sicut olim in uno loco, Deut. 12:5, 6.”"
71. " On incense as a symbol of prayer, see the remarks on this passage, and also the commentary on Rev. 5:8, and 8:3, 4."
72. " Hofmann (Weissagung, p. 361) objects to the ideal interpretation of יִכְאַלֵּם on the ground that the expressions “suddenly” and “behold” both show that one particular prophet is intended. Reinke (Der Prophet Maleachi) adduces the same expressions as favouring the reference to John the Baptist. But it is a universal truth, which is constantly being fulfilled again and again, that the Lord comes unexpectedly, whenever through his interposition a call to repentance is uttered in the ears of his people. “This ‘suddenly,’” says Schmieder, “is repeated in every act and judgment of the Lord. The Lord of glory always comes as a thief in the night to those who are asleep in their sins.”"
73. " “God here casts reproaches upon the Jews, and appeals to his covenant in opposition to their impious blasphemies, for their impious murmuring will not prevent him from fulfilling his promises, and bringing to pass in his own time what they imagine will never take place.—CALVIN."
74. " Hitzig has quite mistaken the meaning. In his opinion, the design is “to represent the ungodly individuals as pure silver. i.e. as righteous.” It is true that he is obliged to substitute the work of reformation for that of punishment, which is so conspicuous here, on account of his having previously confounded the “angel of the covenant” with the “messenger” who prepares the way for the Lord. But a comparison of Isa. 1 ought to have put him upon his guard against such a view as this. It is evident that the “ungodly individuals” are there represented as exposed to the righteous judgments of God. Repentance and salvation are the portion of Zion, not of them."
75. " “For although they boasted of their piety, we know that they defiled the Church of God.”—CALVIN."
76. " “The Levites were too thoroughly impregnated with the dross for it to be removed in one day or without difficulty.”—CALVIN."
77. " It is upon this passage that our own must be regarded as based; and in this we have therefore a proof of the correctness of the explanation we have given."
78. " Possibly בּוֹשׁ, the primary meaning of which is to turn, may be used here to denote simply the contrast to their previous condition. Compare Zech. 1:6, 8:15."
79. " For proofs, see Joh. Heinr Majus, De Christo sole justitiae, Giessen 1710."
80. " Macrobius (Sat. i. 19) “hoc argumentum Ægyptii lucidius absolvunt, ipsius solis simulacra pennata fingentes.” Euripides (Jon. v. 22) ἔμ’ ἠελίου πτέρυγι θοῆ. Virgil (Aen. viii. 396) “nox ruit et fuscis tellurem amplectitur alis.” On the pillar of Antoninus, Jupiter himself is represented under the image of a winged sun."
81. " The meaning “stall,” which is given by many to קְבֵרָם, namely, a stall in which cattle are confined, does not suit the expressions, “go out” and “skip.” The latter indicate a state of freedom."
82. " Thus, for example, v. Til says: “He enjoins this upon them, as long as they should continue in expectation of Christ and without the prophets, . . . until Elias is sent.” And Michaelis, “In the meantime, attend to the instruction contained in the whole of the Pentateuch, more thoroughly than ye have hitherto done, until better things shine forth when I appear.”"
83. " The prophet appears to have had Deut. 4 particularly in his mind. The whole chapter contains an earnest injunction to fidelity in the observance of the law. מִשְׁפָּטִים and חֻקִּים are connected together in vers. 1 and 8, and Horeb is mentioned in ver. 15. Compare also ver. 5, “Behold I have taught you law and judgments, even as the Lord my God commanded me;”

- and ver. 14, "And the Lord commanded me at that time to teach you laws and judgments, that ye might do them in the land whither ye go to possess it" (see Lev. 26:46)."
84. "The fallacy of the arguments adduced by Bretschneider against the genuineness of this passage, which has every external authority in its favour, is very obvious."
  85. "It was equally intentional on his part that, before mentioning Elijah, he spoke of the messenger of the Lord without any further personal allusion. This is sufficient to prove that he did not refer to the reappearance of Elijah in the flesh. Chap. 4:5 must evidently be explained from chap. 3:1. If the prophet wished to be understood as announcing a personal appearance, he ought to have mentioned it at the commencement of the third Chapter."
  86. "“This difference between rewards and punishments, which distinguishes the righteous from the wicked, is not seen amidst the vanities of this present life, but, when it is displayed in the manifestation of the future life under the Sun of righteousness, there will then be judgment, such as never had been before.”—AUGUSTINE."
  87. "“He will persuade both fathers and children together to turn with all their heart to the Lord, and such a return will be delivered from the day of judgment.” Abenezra gives the same explanation. Michaelis interprets it thus, “All the Jews, both high and low, parents and children, will believe in Christ with unity of heart.”"
  88. "Iken: “When the whole of the Jewish nation is intended, the term ‘parents’ is usually applied to the ancestors and ‘children’ to posterity. Ezek. 18:2, ‘The fathers have taken,’ etc., Ps. 22:5, and Mal. 3:6, 7.”"
  89. "Hofmann’s question, “What is there to show that the fathers were more pious than the sons?” is fully answered in chap. 3:4 and chap. 2:5, 6."
  90. "“There can be no doubt that God intended to say, that he would give up to certain destruction both the obstinate transgressors, of the law and also their city, and that they should suffer the extreme penalty of his justice, as heads devoted to God, without any hope of favour or forgiveness.”—VITRINGA."
  91. "This was the view entertained by Bengel, “Even the dress and food of John preached in accordance with his teaching and office. This minister of repentance led the same life as penitents themselves should always lead.”"
  92. "ὁ μέλλον ἔρχεσθαι; Bengel observes, with reference to μέλλον, “the expression is employed, as it were, by one who is looking forward from the Old’ Testament to the New.”"
  93. "Meyer has justly observed that “this agreement appears to furnish evidence that the passage was quoted in this way by Jesus himself, and therefore fixed itself in this form in the traditions of the Church.”"
  94. "In Ecclesiasticus 48:15, after a sketch of the labours of Elijah and Elisha, we find these words, “For all this the people repented not, neither departed they from their sins, till they were spoiled and carried out of their land, and were scattered through all the earth.” This statement may be applied to the second Elias without the least alteration, a fact which may easily be explained, if we only bear in mind that God is always the same, and that man is so too."
  95. "The words of Mark 6:20, “For Herod feared John, knowing that he was a just man and a holy, and observed him; and when he heard him, he did many things; and heard him gladly,” apply without the least alteration to Ahab."
  96. "The appropriateness of this symbolical representation of judgment, in connection with the approaching death of Christ upon the cross, may be seen from the following remarkable passage of Josephus (Wars of the Jews, 4. 5. 2), who erred in the person alone: “I can hardly be wrong in asserting that the death of Ananias opened the way for the conquest of Jerusalem; that the wall of the city crumbled to ruins, and the national existence of the Jews was at an end, from the day on which they saw the high priest, on whom their own welfare depended, murdered in the midst of the city.”"
  97. "According to Delitzsch (Die Bibl. Prophetische Theologie, p. 170), the connection between the two is the opposite of this. He appropriates the words of Augustine, “Christ did not act thus because the prophet had foretold it; but the prophet made the announcement because this was the way in which Christ would act.” That this statement of Augustine’s, however, is not applicable to the form, but only to the essence, that is, to the fundamental idea contained in

- the prophecy and expressed in the word יגע, is evident from this, that there were circumstances connected with the affair which were unimportant in themselves, and derived their importance solely from their connection with the prophecy, such, for example, as the fact of the she-ass being taken as well as the foal. If the attention to individual traits, such, for example, as the riding upon an ass, is to be rejected without hesitation as a reprehensible attempt to "idealize," what are we to do with such passages as Isa. 50:6, "and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair," of which no historical fulfilment can be pointed out?"
98. " Glaubenslehre, i. 116 (105. 6), Zweites Sendschreiben an Lücke, Studien und Kritiken, 29, p. 497."
  99. " Thus, for example, the unbelief of Augusti gave way when he was engaged in writing a work upon Isaiah, and came to the 53d chapter. See the account of the life and conversion of F. A. Augusti, formerly a Jewish Rabbi, but afterwards for fifty-three years a teacher of Christianity, Gotha 1783. Other examples are to be met with in Hausmeister's *Bekehrungsgeschichten Jüdischer Proselyten*."
  100. "Est etiam pars verbi divini prophetica suavissimum studii perpetui exercitium, ubi incrementum successive capimus, quod fastidium detergit, sed finem nunquam reperimus, gaudemus tamen alimento spirituali, fidem, spem et caritatem roborante et excitante."
  101. " See, on the other hand, Knapp, *Opusc.* p. 16."
  102. " See the collection in Stolberg's *Religions-geschichte*, i., *Beilage*, iv.; Rosenmüller, *Alien und Neues Morgenland*, i. p. 13 sqq.; and Tholuck, *Von der Süde und com Versöhner*."
  103. " From Voss's translation."
  104. " See Heyne's *Virgil*, vol. i. p. 96, ed. 1800; and Voss's *Virgil*, vol. i. p. 85 sqq."
  105. " The introduction of two other Saviours into this passage, along with Caoshyanc, has been pronounced by Spiegel an interpolation, which had no existence when the Huzvareh version was made, and which he has therefore erased; see p. 242."
  106. " The rendering of this passage given by Haarbrücker, in *Schahrastani's Religionsparteien und Philosophenschulen*, corresponds in all essential points to that of Hyde. But instead of Oshanderbega and Osiderbega, he writes in both instances Ashidsarbaka, which he renders "the knowing one."
  107. " The reason was pointed out in my commentary, vol. iv. p. 614, 615: "The deeper the consciousness of the sinfulness, weakness, and worthlessness of man in the minds of the Israelites, the greater the impossibility of their resting satisfied with a purely human Redeemer, who would be able to accomplish but very little, according to Israelitish ideas. A human king (in all the Messianic Psalms, in the strict sense of the word the Messiah appears as a king), however glorious, could never effect what the idea of the kingdom of God imperatively demanded, and what had been promised in the very first stages of Messianic prophecy, the bringing of the nations to obedience, the conferring of blessings upon all the families of the earth, and the acquisition of world-wide dominion."
  108. " Thus Gousset also explains it: "מיכאלם" inter omnes operations et occupations illam nuntii specific designat." He calls attention to the fact that in Ps. 114:4, גאלם is construed, not with גאלם, but with תרשמ."
  109. " Weissagung und Erfüllung, i. p. 127."
  110. " For example, J. D. Michaelis, who says (*Supplem.* p. 1395) "What ambassador of our own sovereign would reply to the inquiry, who art thou? 'I am George the Third, King of Great Britain; this is my name for ever?'" Nor is there any greater force in the reasoning of those who appeal to the example of the Lord Chancellor of Great Britain, who reads the royal speech addressed to the Houses of Parliament in the first person. For it is one thing to read and another to speak."
  111. "Although he sees two, he directs his words to one; from which we may infer that the mind of Lot does not rest upon the angels, for he is fully persuaded that they do not possess supreme power, and that his safety is not in their hands. He uses their faces as a mirror in which to contemplate the face of God."—CALVIN."
  112. " The other passages adduced by Clericus (on Gen. 16:13), viz. 1 Kings 5:3 and Luke 7:6 (*Quiuctilian, Inst. Orat.* 4:4), are not conclusive; for here the sender is mentioned first, and the



- messengers show at the very outset that they are not speaking in their own name, but in that of the person by whom they have been employed."
113. " Bertheau, who has attempted, as well as Studer, to revive the notion, which was long since exploded, that by the angel of the Lord a prophet is intended (see Witsius, *Miscell.* vol. i. B. i. chap. 18, sec. 10, 11. *Ode de Angelis*, p. 1042), is obliged to admit that "it is very striking that the words of God, which the prophet introduces into his discourse, are in this instance not preceded by the clause, "thus saith Jehovah the God of Israel;" compare, for example, Josh. 24:2 and Judg. 6:8."
114. " The sacrifice here offered to the Lord away from the sanctuary contains in itself a sufficient proof, that by the angel of the Lord we cannot possibly understand a prophet,—a supposition which the parallel passages in chap. 6 and 13 ought to have been sufficient to preclude. The appearance of the Lord alone contained in itself a practical summons to arise and offer sacrifice."
115. " *Ode de Angelis*, p. 1061: "Cum Angeli ministri accurate distinguantur ab illo Viro, patere potest illum esse principem exercitus Jehovae, Jos. 5:14.""
116. " See, on the other band, Auberlen, *Der Prophet Daniel und die Offenbarung Johannis*, p. 407."
117. " In the 16th homily on Jeremiah (Opp. t. iii. p. 329, ed. Ruaei), he speaks to this effect of Ex. 3:1: "God then was here beheld in the angel.""
118. " The most important passage is in his *De Trinitate*, l. iii. c. 11. "Proinde illa omnia, quae patribus visa sunt, cum deus illis secundum suam dispensationem temporibus congruam praesentaretur, per creaturam facta esse, manifestum est. Et si nos latet, quomodo ea ministris angelis fecerit, per angelos tamen esse facta non ex nostro sensu dicimus, ne cuiquam videamus plus sapere, sed sapimus ad temperantiam, sicut deus nobis partitus est mensuram fidei, et credimus, propter quod et loquimur. Exstat enim auctoritas divinarum scripturarum, etc. (He appeals to Heb. 2:1, where the law given by angels is opposed to the gospel proclaimed by the Lord himself.) Sed ait aliquis: cur ergo scriptum est: dixit dominus ad Moysen, et non potius: dixit angelus ad Moysen? Quia cum verba iudicis praeco pronuntiat, non scribitur in Gestis: ille praeco dixit, sed ille iudex, sic etiam loquente propheta sancto, etsi dicamus propheta dixit, nihil aliud quam dominum dixisse intelligi volumus. Et si dicamus: Dominus dixit, prophetam non subtrahimus, sed quis per eum dixerit admonemus. . . . Sed jam satis quantum existimo demonstratum est, quod antiquis patribus nostris ante incarnationem Salvatoris, cum deus apparere dicebatur, voces illae ac species corporales per angelos factae sunt, sive ipsis loquentibus vel agentibus aliquid ex persona dei, sicut etiam prophetas solere ostendimus; sive assumptibus ex creatura, quod ipsi non essent, ubi deus figurate demonstraretur hominibus, quod genus significationum, nec prophetas omisisse, multis exemplis docet scriptura."—See tract 3 in Jo. xvii. 18, *De Civ. Dei*, 16, 29."
119. " "Quod autem ait lex ordinata per angelos, hoc vult intelligi, quod in omni V. T., ubi angelus primum visus refertur et postea quasi deus loquens inducitur, angelus quidem vere ex ministris pluribus quicumque sit visus, sed in illo mediator loquatur, qui dicat: ego sum deus Abraham, deus Isaac, deus Jacob. Nec mirum si deus loquatur in angelis, cum etiam per angelos, qui in hominibus sunt, loquatur deus in prophetis, dicente Aggeo: et ait angelus, qui loquebatur in me, ac deinceps inferente: hsec dicit dominus omnipotens." Jerome had before his eyes the passages in Zechariah, chap. 1:9, 13, 14, 2:7, where he renders הַדְבָר הַמְלָאךָ after the example of the Septuagint (ὁ λαλῶν ἐν ἔμοι), qui loquebatur in me. See the remarks on Hosea 1:2, vol. i. p. 192."
120. " "Modo angeli, modo dominus vocantur, qui angelorum vocabulo exprimuntur, qui exterius ministrabant, et appellatione domini ostenditur, qui eis interius praeerat.""
121. " See, especially, Grotius on Ex. 20, and Clericus on Gen. 16:13, 18:1; Ex. 20:1, 23:20: "Nomen Jehovae si proprie loquamur, non tribuitur angelis, sed deo in iis apparenti, quemadmodum nulla ratione instrumenti habita, ei, qui instrumento utitur actio tribui solet. Nec periculum fuit, ne Israelitae pro deo angelum propterea colerent; observabatur enim eorum animis deus deorum, coeli et terrae creator, seu ipse loqueretur, seu per interpretem angelum, nihil intererat, recte ad eum ferebatur eorum cultus.""

122. " Weissagung und Erfüllung, i. p. 130: "Between Israel and the eternal God there stands a finite spirit, to act the part of a mediator;" and p. 131, "From the first book of the sacred Scriptures to the very last we find one and the same finite spirit maintaining that peculiar relation in which the Almighty stood to one family and nation, to Abraham and Israel."
123. " Compare Apol. i. c. 63: Ἰουδαῖοι οὖν ἠγησάμενοι αἰεὶ τὸν πατέρα τῶν ὄλων λελαληκέναι τῷ Μωσεῖ, τοῦ λαλήσαντος αὐτῷ ὄντος υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, ὃς καὶ ἄγγελος καὶ ἀπίστολος κέκληται, δικαίως ἐλέγχονται καὶ διὰ τοῦ προφητικοῦ πνεύματος, καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὡς οὔτε τὸν πατέρα οὔτε τὸν υἱὸν ἔγνωσαν. . . . καὶ πρότερον διὰ τῆς τοῦ πυρὸς μορφῆς καὶ εἰκόνας ἀσωμάτου τῷ Μωσεῖ καὶ τοῖς ἕτεροις προφήταις ἐφάνη· νῦν δ' ἔν χρόνοις τῆς ἡμετέρας ἀρχῆς, ὡς προείπομεν διὰ παρθένου ἄνθρωπος γενόμενος κατὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς βουλήν ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας τῶν πιστευόντων αὐτῷ καὶ ἐξουθενήνα καὶ παλωῖν ὑπέμεινεν."
124. " See the collection of passages from the Fathers, maintaining the identity of the angel of the Lord and the Logos, in Keil's Opusc, Acad. p. 303, and in Ode de Angelis."
125. " See the remarks on these passages."
126. " Compare Sohar, fol. 96, ed. Solisbac. (Edzardi Tract. Talm. Berachoth, p. 227), "quando divina majestas habitat circa hominem, turn innumeri alii exercitus sancti adsunt ibi simul."
127. " Compare the remark of Grotius on Ex. 20, "errant graviter, qui hic per angelum intelligunt secundam del hypostasin. Variis enim multiplicibusque modis deus locutus est patribus; at per filium ultimis demtim temporibus."
128. " According to Röth (Etymologisches zum Avesta Zeitschrift der D. Morgenl. Gesellschaft, vol. vi. p. 247), Zarvan Akarana means time, which has no limits, and knows no end."
129. " Whilst this resemblance serves on the one hand as a refutation of those views respecting the angel of the Lord, which deviate from the doctrine held by the Church, on the other hand it is opposed to the assertion made by Baur (Das Manichäische Religions-system, p. 11, 12), J. Müller, Spiegel (Zeitschrift der D. Morgenl. Gesellsch. vol. 5:p. 225), Röth (Anzeige von Röths Geschichte unserer Abendländischen Philosophie in Fichtes Zeitschr. 47), that Zervane Akerene in the Persian religion is by no means an actual being, in the same sense as Ormuzd and Ahriman, that instead of possessing a nature superior to Ormuzd, he is simply an attribute of Ormuzd. It would be a very remarkable thing if the striking agreement should have arisen from mistaken views, on the one hand, respecting the angel of the Lord, and on the other respecting Zervane Akerene, and especially if these mistakes had arisen altogether independently of each other. The passages, taken from a modern Parsee catechism, to which Spiegel, who follows Müller, has appealed as favouring his views, and also "the express testimony of the Persians of our own day" (p. 226), are more recent paraphrases, in which there is a reaction of the original Parseeism against the interpolated element. They are not even sufficient to counterbalance the testimony of Theodore of Mopsuestia. The realistic view has the greatest pretensions to originality. And, as a rule, the idealistic views are later paraphrases. Schlottmann's defence of the earlier view respecting Zervane Akerene, which is strongly supported by its agreement with the Jewish theology, from which in all probability the Persian doctrine was originally derived, has not been weakened by Spiegel, and this defence might even be rendered considerably stronger."
130. " Spiegel is somewhat wavering; for at one time he tries to explain away this doctrine, and at another recognises its existence, but is at great pains to prove that it cannot be original."
131. " Very different opinions have been expressed as to the etymology of this name. The most probable is that of Danz (p. 727 sqq.) and Buxtorf, who trace it to the Latin metator, which Suidas has explained as meaning ὁ προαποστελλόμενος ἄγγελος πρὸ τοῦ ἄρχοντος. The expression appears to have been derived from Isa. 63:9, where the revealer of God is called the angel of Jehovah's countenance. Compare Elias Levita, Tischbi, f. 536, Eisenmenger, p. 386, "The Metatron is the prince of the countenance (מֵינֵי רַשׁ, and it is declared of him, that he is the angel who always beholds the countenance of God." This derivation is favoured by the fact, that metator is very commonly met with in the Rabbinical writings in the sense of legatus, and as a synonym of מְלִיץ (see Buxtorf, c. 1191, Danz, p. 725); that Metatron may be shown to be used as an appellative, with the same signification (see Breschit Rabba, in Buxtorf, c. 1193), that the Rabbins almost universally give ὄδηγος as the literal meaning of

the name, though they differ as to the etymology; and lastly, that several of the Rabbins give this etymology without any hesitation (see the passages quoted by Danz, p. 724 sqq.). The derivation, which has comparatively the greatest probability next to this, is from the Latin mediator. In the Sohar, the Metatron is called *בִּיאַצְמֵאָה אֲדוּמֵעַ*, *columna medietatis* (see Sommer, *Theol. Sohar*, p. 36). But mediator is not met with anywhere else in the Rabbinical writings; and in addition to this, none of the arguments by which the former derivation is defended can be adduced in support of this one. Another derivation, which was suggested by Majus (*Theol. Jud.* p. 72), and has been repeated by v. Meyer (*Blätter für höhere Wahrheit*, 4:188), viz. from *μετᾶ* and *θρόνος*, equivalent to *ὁ μέτοξος τοῦ θρονου, ὁ σύνθρονος*, has still less in its favour. *Μετάθρονος* is not even a Greek word, and it would be impossible to show that it was ever admitted into the Rabbinical language. Moreover, the Rabbins base the whole doctrine of the Metatron upon passages from the Old Testament, and in all probability they borrowed the expression itself from the Old Testament also. Now there is not a single passage in which the angel of God is called by the name *Μετάθρονος*. But it is a decisive objection that the name was not originally restricted to the angel of Jehovah. We will quote only one passage, in which it occurs with this general signification (Jalket Rubeni in Danz, p. 731), “*Si non fuerit Justus in hoc mundo, tunc Schechina vestit sese in quodam Metatron.*” Compare all the passages in which the inferior Metatron is mentioned. But Schmieder’s hypothesis (in the *Programm Nova Interpr.* 1 Gal. 3:19) is the one which least commends itself to our approbation. He derives the word from the Persian Mithras (p. 41 sqq. *Excursus de Mitatrone*). There is nothing whatever to favour this derivation except the comparatively trifling resemblance in sound. The similarity between the two beings, on which Schmieder lays particular stress, is only in appearance. As we have already shown, the Metatron of the Jews, the supreme revealer of the invisible God, the participator in his nature and glory, stands on the same level as Ormuzd, from whom all revelations are derived. Mithras, on the other hand, is an inferior being created by Ormuzd, a brave warrior in his army, it is true, but standing far behind the great Bahman, the king of the Amshaspands. It is only in appearance, again, that those passages in Plutarch (*De Is. et Os.* c. 46) and the Zend books, in which Mithras is called a Mediator, establish a connection between Mithras and Metatron. The Metatron of the Hebrews is the medium of all intercourse between the invisible God and the creation. Mithras, on the contrary, is called a mediator only “so far as he intercepts (comes between) the influences of Ahriman, during the conflict between him and Ormuzd, so as to render them harmless.” Moreover, the doctrine concerning Mithras has a physical rather than a moral signification (see Rhode *das Religions-system des Zendvolkes*, p. 264 sqq.). Lastly, whilst on the one hand the original appellative signification of the word would lead us to conclude that it was not borrowed from, the Persians, on the other hand no analogy whatever can be adduced in its favour; whereas it is possible to prove that names have frequently been borrowed from the Greek and Latin. Compare, for example, *Armillus*, the Greek *ἄρημιλλος* and *Matrona*, which, occurs so frequently in the Cabalistic writings.”

132. " The omission on the part of Eisenmenger to distinguish between these two has caused great confusion. We will quote one or two passages only. R. Ruben fil. Hoschke (Danz, p. 736) says, “*Shechina longe excelsior est Henocho convenienter cum illo quod per traditionem accipi, fore metatorem magnum et metatorem parvum, quorum magnus est ipsissima Schechina e qua ille emanat et de nomine ejus Schechina vocatur Metatron;*” and in another passage, “*Invenimus in Sohar, quod duo sint metatores, Metatron maximus et Metatron rvus creatus.*” For other passages see Danz, p. 730-735. The assertion made by several Rabbins, to the effect that *יְהוָה יְהוָה* with Jod denotes the higher etatron, and without Jod the lower, is incorrect, as Schmieder (p. 28) has proved from the paraphrase of Jonathan, Gen. 5:24, where the word is written Jod, though the lower Metatron is referred to.”
133. " Although Tholuck (*De Ortu Cabalae*, Halle 37, p. 21) assigns the composition of the Cabalistic writings to a recent date, he supposes the groundwork to have belonged to an early age. And Schmieder (p. 25) has correctly observed, “*Cabalistica de Mitatrone doctrina in libro Sohar ita exculta est, ut nec illa aetate recens inventa, sed variis multorum meditationibus versata et aucta jam fuisse videatur.*”

134. " Compare the passages (quoted from Othioth R. Akkiva with Eph. 1:21 sqq. In Sohar f. 77, Sulzb. (Sommer, p. 35), the Metatron is called תחלת מיקם לש ויתורב, "the beginning of the creatures of God." Compare Col. 1:15, "the first-born of every creature." The Metatron is called "the glory, the covering of God," "he through whom God is known," "he who bears the image of God," "the being in whose image man was created" (R. Bechai, in Edzard, p. 232; Jalkut Chadasch, p. 237; Sohar, l.c.; and p. iii. f. 91; Sulz. Sommer, p. 36). Compare Col. 1:15, "the image of the invisible God;" Heb. 1:3, "the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person ;" and 2 Cor. 4:4."
135. " Compare the commentaries on Isa. 53, but more especially De Wette, De Morte J. Chr. Expiatoria. Berlin 1813, p. 13 sqq., and Baumgarten-Crusius Bibl. Theol p. 419.
136. " That the words, "all this was done that the Scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled," belong to Christ and not to the evangelist, is evident from Mark 14:49, "but the Scriptures must be fulfilled."
137. " Vid. Matt. 16:21, "From that time forth began Jesus to show unto his disciples how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and scribes, . . . and be killed." The Lord proved the necessity for his sufferings and death from the prophecies of the Old Testament, which could not remain unfulfilled without imperilling the honour of the God that cannot lie. That this is the meaning of δεῖ (Bengel, quia praedictum erat), is evident from the parallel passages, chap. 26:54-56, Luke 24:25, and others. The prophecy, again, was under a still higher law of necessity."
138. " Das Alte Testament im Neuen Testaments, Ed. iii. p. 28."
139. " The quotations from Ps. 22 are not so thoroughly in point as others, since there is a direct Messianic element in the Psalm, though not an exclusive reference to the Messiah (compare my commentary on the Psalms, vol. ii.). There is a complete analogy, however, in Acts 1:16-20, where Peter finds the fate of Judas predicted in Ps. 69 and 109, two Psalms in which illusion is made, not specially and primarily to Judas, but to the righteous sufferer and his enemies."
140. " This is the meaning of the name Job."
141. " The assertion of Hofmann (Schriftbeweis, ii. 1, p. 123), that ינב is not applied to a sufferer, but to one who keeps himself low, is at variance not only with the whole of the usages of the language, but also with the relation in which this prophecy stands to the second part of Isaiah, especially to chap. 53 of which ינב is a condensation. Even if we are to understand by the servant of God in the second part of Isaiah not the Messiah, but the prophetic order, or the better portion of the nation, so much at least ought to be learned from it, that we have no warrant for forcibly removing the doctrine of the suffering Messiah, whenever it lies clearly before our eyes. At all events, whatever interpretation may be given to the passages relating to the servant of God, the second portion of Isaiah does teach indirectly the doctrine of a suffering Messiah."
142. " Umbreit, Studien und Kritiken 1838. Heft 1, p. 15, Vom Knechte Gottes, p. 72."
143. " The earlier writings are cited by De Wette at pp. 3-5. Stäudlin has clearly pointed out the doctrinal motives which have prevailed in this inquiry, in the Gottinger Bibl. f. Theol. Lit. i. p. 252 sqq."
144. " Grimm On the book of Wisdom, p. 67."
145. " "ὄ, the article, has respect to the prophecy delivered concerning him under this figure, Isa. 53:7; also under the type of the paschal lamb. Moreover, the passover itself was then near, ch. 2:13."—BENGEL."
146. " De Wette says (p. 55), "ubi locutiones de Jesu munere Messiano adhibitae deprehendimus, quae ad illum locum referendae videntur, de expiatione cogitemus necesse est." It does not follow from this undeniable allusion to Isa. 53 that αἴρειν must necessarily mean "to bear," and not to "take away;" but this we must say, that if the latter meaning be adopted, the taking away must be the result of an atonement, and not merely of teaching and example. The meaning "to take away," however, is favoured by the fact that although αἴρειν occurs in the Septuagint (Lam. 3:27), and also in the New Testament (Matt. 27:32), in the sense of "carrying," yet αἴρειν ἀμαρτίας is used in the former to denote, not the bearing, but the taking

away of sin (see 1 Sam. 15:25, 25:28; and Lev. 10:16, where ἀφαιρῆν is employed), and in 1 John 3:5 it has the same signification, “and ye know that he was manifested ἵνα τὰς ἁμαρτίας ᾄρῃ.” On the other hand, the meaning “to carry” is favoured by the frequent repetition of the verb in original passage in the sense of “to carry,” e.g. ver. 4, τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει; ver. 11, ἀνοίσει; ver. 12, ἀνήνεγκε; Symmachus, ver. 11, καὶ τὰς ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν αὐτὸς ὑπενέγκει. It is best to assume, as Olshausen does, that the two meanings are combined together in the same verb.”

147. " That they did possess so much knowledge as this is evident from Matt. 20:22, where the Lord says to the sons of Zebedee, “Can ye drink of the cup that I shall drink of?” and they reply, “We can.””
148. " That this doctrine is of recent date has been proved by Gläser, De Gemino Judaeorum Messia (Helmst. 1739, p. 145 sqq.), Schöttgen (p. 359), and De Wette who borrows from them, from the fact that the earliest paraphrases, Jonathan (on the prophets) and Onkelos (on the Pentateuch) refer to Messiah ben David, all the passages which the more modern writers apply to Messiah ben Joseph."
149. " It is true, Gläser (App. p. 11) has revoked this statement, and quotes two passages, in which the Messiah ben Joseph is represented as a kind of under-king in the Messianic kingdom; but he is wrong in this, for the passages in question belong to two very recent authors, Rabbi Meier Aldabi, and Menasse ben Israel, and therefore hardly come into consideration at all. In this instance, as in fact throughout his work, Gläser lays himself open to the charge brought against him by Schöttgen (p. 366) of confounding together the doctrines of the ancient and modern Jews."
150. " The fact that the Messiah is called ben Joseph and ben Ephraim interchangeably, is a proof that the patriarch Joseph must be intended. This is a sufficient objection to the hypothesis suggested in Cölln's Bibl. Theol. i. p. 497, that the doctrine of a Messiah ben Joseph originated in a misunderstanding of certain New Testament expressions, especially in the fact that, in the New Testament, Jesus is not merely called the Son of David, but also the Son of Joseph, Luke 3:23 and 4:22."
151. " That Calvin was influenced by his dislike of forced explanations, and not by any rationalistic tendencies, is everywhere apparent. Thus, for example, after quoting the opinion of those who understand by the seed of the woman (in Gen. 3:15), Christ, he says: “Eorum sententiam libenter meo suffragio approbarem, nisi quod verbum seminis nimis violenter ab illis torqueri video. Quis enim concedet, nomen collectivum de uno tantum homine accipi?” In opposition to such as suppose the expression in Jer. 31:22 (see vol. ii. p. 426), “a woman shall compass a man,” to refer to the birth of Christ from Mary, he observes, “merito hoc ridetur a Judaeis.” And again, on Isa. 53, “Hoc caput violenter torsit Christiani, quasi ad Christum haec pertinerent: cum propheta simpliciter de ipso deo pronuntiet: atque finxerunt hic rubicundum Christum, quod sanguine proprio madidus esset, quem in cruce fuderit.” He opposes the interpretation of Hag. 2:7, as alluding to a personal Messiah on this ground: “Quia statim jungitur: meum argentum et meum aurum, ideo simplicior erit sensus, venturas gentes et quidem instructas omnibus divitiis, ut se et sua omnia offerant Deo in sacrificium.” The work of Aug. Hunnius, entitled Calvinus judaizans (Wittenberg 1595), must be regarded as in the main incorrect. In most cases in which Calvin differs from the current interpretation he is in the right, and when he goes too far, the fault is not so much his own as that of the orthodox party, whose dogmatic narrow-mindedness and arbitrary expositions excited a well-grounded mistrust in his mind. It is impossible to hit the true medium in every case, when such errors as these render a thorough revision and reform imperatively necessary."
152. " For a fuller account see Ernesti's learned Narratio Critica De Interpretatione Prophetiarum Messianarum, in Ecclesia Christiana in his Opuscul. p. 495 sqq.
153. " For details see Reuss, Opusc. Theol. ii. p. 118 sqq."
154. " Vol. i. p. 113."
155. " Thus, for example, we find in his work the correct explanation of the idea of Israel, which so many are now inclined to distort in a thoroughly Judaizing manner. Although he rejects—

and quite properly so—the distinction between the natural and the spiritual Israel, he finds the legitimate continuation of Israel in the whole Christian Church, in which he follows the Apostle Paul, who speaks of the Christian Church as the Israel of God (Gal. 4:16), and says, with reference to all the true members of the Christian Church, whether circumcized or uncircumcized, “we are the circumcision” (Phil. 3:3). In part i. p. 173, Crusius says: “Oinnes veri Christiani accensentur Israeli, non tamen eo modo ac si Israel vetus, proprie dictus, typus sit Israelis spiritualis, improprie dicti. Vetus Dei Israel etiam, antequam Christus venit, proselytas sinu suo excipere potuit, qui deinde partem gentis faciebant. Multo magis vi foederis et promissionis, postquam Christus venit, cujus fide verus Israel etiam antea coram deo censebatur, et a maculis gentis (Deut. 33:5) discernebatur, gentibus quam plurimis secum coalescentibus jamjam amplificatus est, et postremum omnem omnino terram possidendam accipiet. Totum hoc ecclesiae corpus, cujus basis fuit pars fidelis Israelitarum secundum carnem, aliquando reliquias posterorum partis degeneris itidem in sinum suum recipiet.” Compare with this our own remarks in vol. i. p. 210 sqq., and vol. iv. p. 50, also the Commentary on Rev. 7:4 and 11.”

156. " For example, part i. p. 621, “Res, quas prophetae praedicunt, plerumque sistuntur complexe, ita ut in universo ambitu summatim spectentur, vel κατὰ τὸ ἀποστέλεσμα, h. e. secundum id, quod res erit, ubi ad fastigium suum pertigerit, non item adduntur partes singulae, nec successiva graduum consecutio, aut periodorum temporis distinctio, etiam ubi de remotis, vel per tempora longe dissita dlvisis dicitur.””
157. " Die Bibl. Propketiche Theologie ihre Fortbildung durch Crusius. Leipz. 47."
158. " If consistency in itself and under all circumstances be really an honour, this honour must be awarded to Ammon in connection with this subject. In his Weltreligion, which appeared a generation later, and in which he has compressed the attitude of his life into a single word, he writes exactly to the same effect.
159. " Vid. De Wette, Bibl. Dogm. § 138, “David was the first who united the divided and shattered nation, and raised it to prosperity and power. With the division of the kingdom this golden age came to an end. It was natural that the hope of its future return should be connected with the house of David, and that a hero should be expected to arise resembling his great ancestor. In the period anterior to David, it is possible that the hope of reformation, common to all men, may have been entertained; but the hope of the Messiah could not arise till after the time of David, for it was under him that the nation, as it were, first came to its senses, and discovered, the advantages of the theocratic kingdom. From this it naturally follows that the hope was of Jewish origin.””
160. " Ziegler in Henke’s Magazin, I. i. p. 83."
161. " V. Aminon, Fortbildung des Christenthums zur Weltreligion, i. p. 189 sqq."
162. " D. Strauss, Glaubenslehre, i. p. 80, see vol. iii. p. 33."
163. " Strauss and v. Ammon."
164. " Crusius, Theol. Proph. 1, p. 5. Scriptura fidem superstrui vult prophetis, quod docet praxis Christi nec non piorum hominum tempore Christi, v. g. Zachariae Luc. i. 70, Mariae Luc. i. 54, et omnium apostolorum, ut et diser effata, Job. 5:39; 2 Tim. 3:15; 1 Pet. 1:12, 13."
165. " Theologie des A. T. Leipz. 1796, p. 404."
166. " We avail ourselves of this opportunity to direct attention to the fact, that the whole passage (1 Pet. 1:10-12) serves to confirm the exposition which we have given of Dan. 9. The allusion to Dan. 9 was pointed out by Bengel, who says in his notes on ver. 12, “The times, for example, defined by the seventy weeks of Daniel exactly extend to the time of Christ’s appearance upon earth, and to the faithful then living; this is the force of ‘unto us.’ And these weeks came to an end during the ministry of Peter.” Steiger and others, who have overlooked this reference, have completely mistaken the meaning. The intention is to bring the reader to a knowledge of the privileges possessed by him. The inquiry of the prophets sprang from the desire, that it might be granted to their age to behold Christ. What they longed for was granted to the contemporaries of the apostle, for whom, according to a revelation that had been made to the prophets, it was expressly intended. Let us be duly thankful. Dan. 9 is the only passage in which there is any indication of the inquiring and searching diligently for the time of the Messiah, which Peter certainly does not mention without foundation. We have already shown

(vol. iii. p. 83) that the main question in Dan. 9 is whether the Messianic salvation was to be looked for immediately at the close of the seventy weeks of Jeremiah.—ἕαυτοῖς, the sixty-ninth year had already arrived. Ἐξεζήτησαν and ἐξήρουνσαν, when taken in connection with ver. 3 of Dan. 9, show the earnestness of the inquiry and search. Again, Dan. 9, where the divine reply is found, that the Messianic salvation would not be manifested then, viz. at the end of the seventy years of Jeremiah, but after seventy weeks of years, is the only passage in the Old Testament where there is a distinct declaration that the coming of Christ was to take place in that particular age (ἡμῖν, to us)."

167. " Beitrag zur Charakteristik des Hebraismus in den Studien von Daub und Creuzer, 1807, ii. p. 307."
168. " Die Theologie des A, T, p. 429."
169. " See vol. i. p. 164, 357, 517; ii. 105, 110; iii. 364."
170. " Appendix Hermeneuticae s. exercitationes ezegeticae auct. J. Jahn, fasc. i. 2. Vaticinia de Messia. Wien 1813."
171. " Weissagung und Erfüllung, i. p. 3."
172. " Die Bibl. Proph. Theol. pp. 166, 167."
173. " B. Jakobi, in Sack's Apologetik, p. 356."
174. " Sack, p. 253."
175. " P. 129."
176. Schriftbeweis, i. p. 154."
177. " Schriftbeweis, ii. 1, p. 1."
178. " "As there are manifestations of the Spirit's life, which anticipate the reflective self-consciousness, so are there others which force the existing consciousness into the background."—Delitzsch, Bib. Psychol. p. 309."
179. " Clericus makes the superficial and unsatisfactory remark, "The reason is to be found in the fact that the prophets were accustomed to sing the praises of God accompanied by such instruments as these.""
180. " Many facts might be adduced to prove that the effect of a state of ecstasy is to ennoble the speech. In an account sent by Pastor Kern in Hernhausen to the Prussian Government in Halbertstadt, in the year 1738, he says, "After the Lord's Supper had been received in a believing and cheerful frame of mind, the invalid fell into a state of torpor, and was laid upon the straw under the impression that he was dead. When he at length awoke, he sent for the minister, and told him that he had had wonderful visions during his death-like sleep, that the whole of his past life, and all the sins which he had long since forgotten, had passed before him, and that after this he had heard delightful sounds, and had seen an indescribable splendour. The minister adds, that the sick man, who had previously been very weak, as soon as the torpor was over, appeared to be quite healthy and free from pain, and that his face had all the freshness of youth. This must I confess, that after his last trance his intellect had considerably improved. For he no longer spoke like a common man, or as he had done before, but his words were all forcible, emphatic, and telling, as if he had learned the art of oratory during the brief period of his insensibility.—I had previously been his teacher and comforter, but now the tables were turned. I was like a little child by the side of him, and listened to his words with admiration." Steinbeck says (p. 451), "Clairvoyants, who were accustomed to a dialect full of provincialisms when in their ordinary condition, have been known to speak in the purest style and with the most select expressions when in this exalted state. As the features of the face assume a noble expression, so is the language also ennobled, and acquires a dignity, fervour, and meaning of which it possessed nothing before.""
181. " See Steinbeck, Der Dichter ein Seher, p. 114: "It is but natural that during the bustle of the day, when our senses are constantly called into exercise from without, the dissipation of the mind should render it more difficult to collect our thoughts than it is in the night, when the senses are at rest, and are seeking to gather fresh vigour from within;" and Tholuck, Vermischte Schriften, i. p. 59: "There are two different stages in the spirit's life, that of direct, undivided, and more potential consciousness, and that in which the consciousness is unfolded and divided, and has more of an actual character. . . . Just as the unfolded, conscious life is more closely connected with the day, in which every object stands out alone with distinct

outlines, so has the involved genius-life greater affinity with the night, in which things all flow together. As genius, the spirit is most active in the night; as a conscious spirit, in the day.””

182. " "Every deep sleep, it is true, so far as the soul is drawn away from its relation to the outer world into its relation to itself, and to the spirit, and through this to God, is an ἔκστασις; but there is also naturally, even in our waking condition, a state of absorption resembling this, and spiritually, one produced expressly by God for purposes of revelation. This is the state of ecstasy (from ἐκστῆναι, the opposite of σωφρονεῖν, the clear, sober, discursive thought. 2 Cor. 5:13).”—Delitzsch, *Bibl Psychol.* p. 239."
183. " Many of the passages, which are frequently adduced to prove that the natural life was forcibly suppressed by the influence of the Spirit of God are not conclusive. The illness of Daniel, which followed the vision, according to chap. 8:27, was not caused by the excitement attending the ecstatic state, but by what he saw, the visions of his head frightened him (chap. 7:15). In Dan. 10:8-10, the utter exhaustion and prostration are caused by the glory of what he had witnessed, "And I saw this great vision (the appearance of Michael), and there remained no strength in me." Even upon those who did not see the vision there fell great terror, and they fled and hid themselves (ver. 7). The same objection applies to Gen. 15:12; Ezek. 1:28, 3:23, and 43:3; Rev. 1:17 (see my work on Balaam, p. 141, and my commentary on Rev. 1."
184. " Michaelis: "The prophets generally appeared as if they were not altogether sane.””
185. " "From the ordinary standpoint of perception and feeling, the truly inspired man and the madman are insane; their actions are not determined by the senses as in our ordinary waking existence, they are in a certain sense out of their senses," Steinbeck, p. 540."
186. " What Novalis (*Schriften*, Th. ii. p. 472) has said of poetic inspiration is to a certain extent applicable to prophetic inspiration: "The most arbitrary prejudice is to deny to man the power to be out of himself and to preserve his consciousness apart from his senses. A man can at any moment become a supersensual being. ... It is true that it is very difficult to preserve one's presence of mind and self-consciousness in this state, since they are so constantly and necessarily bound up with the changes in our other modes of existence. But the more we are able to attain to a consciousness of this condition, so much the more lively, strong, and satisfactory does our consequent conviction become, namely, our faith in genuine revelations of the Spirit. It is neither seeing, hearing, nor feeling. It is a compound of all three, more than all three a feeling of immediate certainty.””
187. " The difficulty of reconciling the ordinary view of prophecy with such passages as these, is evident from the glosses of Michaelis, "Exuit vestes consuetas et induit sacras, pauciores et leviores, ut David coram arca;" and again on the words, he fell down, "humilis coram deo ut reliqui discipuli.””
188. " With reference to the prophetic state of the apostles, see my *Commentary on the Revelation*, vol. i. p. 54 eqq."
189. " Nägelsbach (*Die Nachhom. Theologie der Griechen*, p. 174): "Such a μανῆναι is also attributed to the sibyls, several of whom are mentioned by Pausanias (x. 12. 1), and of one of whom he says ταῦτα μὲν δὴ (τὰ ἔπε) μαινομένη τε καὶ ἕκ τοῦ θεοῦ κατόχος πεποίηκεν.””
190. " Maimonides (*Moreh Neb*, ii. 36): "Nomen הארמ or האר significat quod ad facultatem imaginatricem tanta perveniat actionis perfectio, ut homini ita res appareat ac videatur acsi exterius sibi exhiberetur, eamque sensibus externis perciperet.””
191. " The best explanation is to be found in Maimonides, *Doctor Perplexorum*, ii. 36 sqq.; in John Smith, in the *Dissertatio de Prophetia et Prophetis*, reprinted at the commencement of "Clericus on the Prophets;" and in Velthusen: *De Optica Rerum Futurarum Description*, ad illustr. Isa. 63, reprinted in the *Commentat. Theol. of Velthusen and others*, vi. 75 sqq."
192. " The interpretation which follows the visions is quite as much a part of the ecstasy as the vision itself, Maimonides (c. 43) explains this, by imagining a man in a dream relating to another the dream which he has just had, and receiving an explanation, under the idea that he is awake."



193. " The true reason was perceived by Iken (on Isa. 53; Biblioth Hag. ii. p. 238 sqq.). "Fundamentum tails styli dispositionis ex modo, quo prophetis futura revelabantur, repetendum potius censeo. Non semper illud fiebat expressis verbis. Toti interdum corripiebantur spiritu; facultas mentis, cujus ope res nobis repraesentamus, in iis acuebatur, ita ut recondita futuri temporaria fata in imagine quasi ipsis exhibita non aliter contemplarentur, acsi oculis ea cernerent. Hinc non potuerunt non praesenti aut praeterito tempore uti, cum naturalis dicendi ordo id flagitaret," etc."
194. " See, for example, Meier's Hermeneutik des A. T, Part 2."
195. " No one, who notices the careful and systematic way in which the prophecies of the Old Testament are repeated in the New, could possibly fail to observe that it is altogether out of place to assume that any portion is unfulfilled, merely on the ground of the Old Testament. And for this reason, if for no other, the return to Zion in the prophecies of the Old Testament must not be understood literally. The New Testament knows nothing of a return to the outward Zion. And Paul, in particular, who professedly treats of the future of Israel, merely announces its conversion, but not a national restoration. This silence, in what is really the classical passage, is of very great importance."
196. " Zech. 4:4, 5, 'So I answered and spake to the angel that talked with me, saying, What are these, my Lord? Then the angel that talketh with me answered and said unto me, Knowest thou not what these be? And I said, No, my Lord.' A similar confession of ignorance is to be found in vers. 12, 13. (Compare 1:9, and 2:2)."
197. " Prophetica scena, intra quam omnes peragebantur apparitiones, fuit ipsius prophetae phantasia, omniaque, quae deus ei revelata volebat dramatice in phantasia gerebantur, ita ut plures interdum inducerentur in scenam personae, inter quas propheta partes etiam suas agebat. Itaque prout dramaticus ille apparatus postulabat, oportuit eum, ut ceteros actores partes suas agere, aliquando verbia et narratione rerum gestarum, aut propositione quaestionum, aliquando eas partea ferentem, quas jussus erat per alios agere, adeoque eum non tantum sermone, sed etiam gestibus et actionibus locum suum inter alios obtinere."