

JESUS CHRIST IN THE OLD TESTAMENT



BY
R. H. JUDD

PUBLISHED BY
NATIONAL BIBLE INSTITUTION
OREGON, ILLINOIS
1928

Archives
232.5
J92j
1928
c. 2

232.9
J92j
1928
c.2

Judd, R.H.

Jesus Christ in the old
testament

~~13587~~ 5504

Date Due

**JESUS CHRIST
IN THE OLD TESTAMENT**

**By
R. H. JUDD**

**"For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given:
and the government shall be upon his shoulder."**

**NATIONAL BIBLE INSTITUTION
OREGON, ILLINOIS
1 9 2 8**

232.9
J 92j
1928
c. 2

13587

FOREWORD

The Person of Jesus, the Christ, is the heart of salvation. He is the center around which God has encircled His "eternal purpose, which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord". Just as we now look BACK to Him, so God directed the patriarchs to look FORWARD to Him through the prophecies by which God foretold Him "at sundry times and in divers manners." The Living Christ to be the Messiah of God is the One who in every way fulfills God's foretellings of Him.

To discover these foretellings and to present them to sincere students of Scripture has been the earnest aim of the author of this book. It is worthy the consideration of one and all who are searching for Him who is The Way, The Truth and The Life.

F. L. Austin

13587 - C. 2

JESUS CHRIST IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

PREFACE

FOR SOME TIME PAST we have desired to give a series of studies on "Jesus Christ In The Old Testament." Such a title of itself must arouse attention in the minds of thoughtful persons, for of all others of whom history has given us record, the enquiry has invariably been, "Who were they?" Their history lies in the past, and is buried there so far as they themselves are concerned, and the systems they founded are powerless to pass beyond the circumscribed horizon of their vision, which was limited, not only because human nature has its limitations, but because human *life* is limited "by reason of death". In other words the systems they founded had no origin before them. Except as they embraced truths which were already common among men, they had no *basis* in anything that was past, and no certainty of that which is to come. If these facts are fully grasped; if the reader will carefully meditate on their deep significance, he cannot fail to be impressed by the thought, thus borne in upon him, of the utter incompleteness of that which is of human conception only, in its origin.

There are many ways by which we might prove the immeasurable gap that lies between the religion of Jesus Christ and all other systems, but none surely are of greater significance than the ones we are endeavoring to make clear. Again and again, have we stated it as our belief, our firm belief, that true Christianity does *not* rejoice in its analogy to other religions, but rather in its contrasts to them.

Others may delight in seeking to find out points of contact, so that no great change of heart is required to pass from one to the other; but to us, the "points of contact" are few and insignificant, while the differences are marked and insurmountable.

The very fact that Christianity (and we use this term advisedly) centuries before the birth of Christ, was inseparably foreshadowed in ceremony, type and prophecy, must surely evidence its divine origin, *for the founder of any religion, be that religion what it may, can have no control over events before his birth.* Hence other systems being human only, had no prior existence. They could not have unless they were divine. Is it not because Paul believed this very thing that he so frequently referred to the gospel as "the gospel of God," recognizing that none but God could possibly be its Author?

With reference to the above the question may be asked, "Is it not stated that Jesus Christ is the Author of our salvation? (Heb. 5:9; 12:2). How then do you harmonize this statement with your remarks?" With reference to Heb. 5:9, Young gives the meaning of the Greek, "aitios" as "cause," "occasion"; and the Revised Version corroborates this in the margin. Heb 12:2 is from another Greek word, "archegos," which, according to the same authority, is "Prince," or "chief leader" (see pages 63 and 776, also margin of R. V., which reads, "captain.") In each case, if the context is considered, it will be seen that God Himself is the Source, and that all others derive from Him both capacity and power.

But there is another difference between Christianity and every other religion that has made its appeal to the sons of men. Not only does it prove its divine origin by its vital, undeniable and inseparable connection with the past that anticipated and foreshad-

owed it, even before the birth of Him who was thus foreshadowed, but its divine origin is proved by the fact that there is a present power, living, vital and progressive, unlimited by human capacity, fitting into and fulfilling prediction concerning Him who was, and who by these very predictions we believe is now, and is to come. Others "could not continue by reason of death"; and the stunted condition of that which succeeds them is emphatic testimony to the fact that they are still in its power. In contrast to them there is ample proof in the world to-day *that Jesus Christ lives*. To deal with that which is material only (and God forbid we should so do), events of great moment are daily occurring in these latter days, so much so that human thought has almost ceased to wonder, and their very frequency has in many instances laid to rest that spirit of enquiry so helpful to the attainment of truth. Among these momentous events we unhesitatingly place the return of the Jews to their own land as being of first importance. For centuries, according to prediction long foretold, they have been "scattered and peeled"; a people without a kingdom and without a king. The same Word declares that they shall return, and it also reveals that Jesus Christ shall be their King. Blind must he be who cannot read the writing on the wall in that the kingdom is preparing and the King already *lives*. It is, therefore, with hearts filled with adoration and wonder that we pursue the study of "Jesus Christ In The Old Testament."

Reader, will you join us in this study? We trust that it may make a lasting impression in our lives, in things present, in things to come, in things spiritual, eternal, and in things material and temporary as we consider Him to whom our God has given a "name which is above every name."

CHAPTER I.

THE PROMISED REDEEMER

THE SUREST sign of genuine interest in the pursuit of truth is manifested by enquiry. The pathway of life is strewn with questions, and knowledge and growth in knowledge are attained chiefly by the endeavor to find the answer to that which excites our desire to know the unknown. That the thirst for knowledge is God-implanted is evidenced in many ways. Two things in God's own Word stand out in striking proof: one is that God Himself seeks to draw forth by question man's earnest interest in things concerning Himself; the other is the definite statement, oft repeated though varied in form, "that ye may know". Thus encouraged we proceed with our enquiry.

Very briefly, but very pointedly, the Bible gives us God's inspired account of creation. All the wonderful works of nature by nature's God are surveyed in language so majestically brief as to suggest the thought that none but One who is omnipotent could thus modestly describe the stupendous works of His own hand. But once man comes upon the scene, the Divine Record becomes extensive in detail. All the vast ages of the past that have led up to him seem to be for the moment forgotten in the great realization of the outstanding event of his creation and his life upon the earth. Unless we give due consideration to this subject, it is difficult for us to realize the greatness of the event in God's sight. Isaiah tells us that God did not create the earth in vain, but He "formed it to be inhabited." Here then is stated comprehensively the why and the wherefore of this world of ours, and in it the thought is surely expressed that the underlying

and ultimate aim of every detail connected with creation throughout its long ages of process was specially directed for man's habitation. If we grasp this thought in some of its profound bearings it will help us to measure in our minds the high purposes that God purposed for man and intended that he should fulfill. That these purposes had no temporary design must be evident; for purposes so embedded in the past must have their unfolding in ever increasing volume in a future of interminable duration. With such preparations for his coming, and with powers given to him that are almost without limit in their variety and scope,—powers unknown and yet to be known,—we get just a glimpse of what God intended man to be, and of the value He had placed upon him.

Much as we would like to look further into these interesting preludes of the history of our race and the great purposes of God in relation to its future, as viewed from its beginnings and its progressive developments, we feel we cannot now do so, for our subject is not man in general, but Jesus Christ in particular. The two subjects are, however, closely allied, therefore any study of Christ must of necessity include some preliminary consideration of man; and to the extent that we realize his position in the sight of God are we able to appreciate the greatness of God's gift to him in Christ Jesus. The outstanding feature in man's characteristics according to Scripture revelation, was to be that he should, under God, exercise dominion over things on the earth (Gen. 1: 28), the rest of the animate creation being specially mentioned as coming under his rule. It may, or may not, be significant that before Adam "gave names . . . to every beast of the field" he himself was put under rule by the command not to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. For supreme purpose

of his life he was put under test; and in the test he failed, and failed before the very object over which he should have had rule. By his disobedience to God's command he sinned, and thus brought himself and his posterity under the power of death; nor has he to this day gained dominion of the animal kingdom, put under his charge. Not only they, but the whole earth was to be his; and he was to "subdue it." We are only in these days beginning to find out what a wonderful heritage God has "given to the children of men."

Thus briefly we have given us by Moses the servant of God, the story how man was created in God's image; how God gave to him the earth with its storehouse of teeming treasures, animate and inanimate, things visible and things invisible, that he and they might shew forth His glory (Psa. 29:2; Isa. 43:7), and thus contribute to the pleasure of Him who created them. Rev. 4:11. Here, too, we have the record how man, we know not for how long, lived in happy innocence and in constant fellowship with his Creator; and here also is related the fact of his fall through disobedience; the loss of communion with his Maker; the loss of dominion; and to crown it all, the loss of his life.

But, friends, the record goes farther. It shows us the contrition of Adam and Eve by the acceptance of the covering provided, and their recognition of the fact that Another, innocent of sin, must redeem their forfeited life. This other was to be of the Seed of the woman, who should bruise the serpent's head (rule), and thus regain the life and dominion lost. To some the reference in these early chapters of Genesis to the promised Redeemer may seem to be scant and lacking in fulness, but a careful and close study of the narrative reveals to us the fact that much was revealed to

5304

Adam and Eve; and the evidence seems clear that they thus interpreted God's dealing with them. This evidence, we would submit, is first shown by their acceptance of the coats of skins provided for them, and indicates the substitution of life for life already forfeited. Their continuance of the practice of sacrifice thus instituted is borne out by the sacrifices of Cain and Abel, who could only have gained knowledge of the rite from the precepts and practices of their parents. That they deemed the blood of beasts to be insufficient for the purpose of redemption is apparent by the fact of their repetition of the sacrifice both by them and their children. In this, also, we have the evidence that they looked *forward* to a Redeemer yet to come. Only under such conditions is it possible to rightly understand why Cain's sacrifice was refused and Abel's accepted. Genesis 4:7, "If thou doest well", is rendered by the LXX (Septuagint): "If thou offer correctly", thus showing that acceptance was not dependent altogether upon their doing apart from the sacrifice itself (as might possibly be inferred from the authorized rendering), but on the sacrifice itself. Cain's offering indicated no sacrifice of life: Abel's did. Cain thus practically denied a belief in a Redeemer to come as God had said. Further evidence that a Redeemer was promised who should be of "her seed", is found in the cherished hope of the expectant mother from generation to generation.

If we have succeeded in this first section of our subject in arousing interest in a theme which will increase in interest as we progress, we shall thank God that our labor has not been in vain in the Lord.

CHAPTER II.

GOD'S GIFT TO MAN

AS IN THE preceding chapter, so in this, the references to Christ may seem to be obscure, but just as we are able to discern the ultimate beauty of the bud that holds within its outer petals the inner glory of the rose, so as Scripture opens up before our gaze do we see little by little the ever expanding splendor of the revelation concerning the Christ.

Our last brought us face to face with a crisis in the life of man, a crisis on which depended his very existence, and only by the sacrifice of life for life was there any hope of redemption made possible. But as no life was equal to the life of man, for he was to have dominion over the rest of the animate creation, no life of bulls or goats could make atonement for him; they could only typify and foreshadow a life equal to and indeed higher than his own. Few incidents in Bible history are recorded with so much detail as is that regarding the flood, but as we are just gathering up the threads of the golden line of interest that carries our theme onward, until we come to the more specific details of prophecy and fact relating to Him who is the Desire of all nations, we can touch but very briefly on points that form the connecting links of the narrative.

The very chapter where God threatens to blot out both man and beast from the face of the earth (Gen. 6) reminds us that GOD is a God of covenant keeping truth, and that He would "*establish*" His covenant. That He could do so only by saving Noah alive is evident when the whole of His promise to "*establish my covenant*" is taken into account. See verse 18. Again, after the flood God repeats the promise to "*establish*

my covenant", and adds yet another promise to it. Gen. 9:9, 11.

Two things are clearly manifest here: first, a previous covenant had been entered into; second, Noah knew what that covenant was. Is it not significant that it was after Noah had offered a burnt offering unto the Lord that the promise to establish the covenant was twice repeated (verses 9 and 11)? Does it not indicate that there was a connection between the sacrifice of Noah and the sacrifices of Cain and Abel, as considered in our last chapter? Was not Noah's burnt offering an acknowledgement of his belief that God would keep His covenant regarding the One who would come to restore that life that had been lost through Adam's sin? The promise was given to Adam and his seed, and was "established" to Noah and his seed. Thus we see that God's purpose to bring the blessing of life—eternal life—through man is true, not through a process of evolutionary forces, but by the Man of His appointment through a chosen, definite line. It would seem almost as if God had anticipated man's evolutionary boast that the power to rise was in himself, as He swept away every channel of life but the chosen one through which the Seed should come.

In Gen. 8:21, after Noah had offered his burnt offering, it is recorded that "the Lord smelled a sweet savour", or as the margin reads, "a savour of rest". In Lev. 1:9, the chapter where the law is given relating to the continuance of the burnt offerings, the same expression, "a sweet savour unto the Lord", occurs; and several times where this phrase occurs in connection with the burnt offerings the margin gives the reading, "a savour of rest".

O, friends, do we not all know from bitter experience what sorrow and turmoil *sin* brings? Sure-

ly we do. Is it not good to know that all through the Mosaic economy these wonderful types foreshadowed to the Lord "a savour of rest" in holy anticipation of the time when through the Seed of Adam and Noah and others who should follow, we shall cast our burdens upon Him who said: "Come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take My yoke upon you, and learn of Me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and *ye shall find rest* unto your souls"? It is of Him we wish to "*learn*" through this series of studies.

CHAPTER III.

THE FATHER OF THE FAITHFUL

THE NEXT ITEM of interest is the call of Abram, and the promise to give the land of Canaan to his seed (Gen. 12:7), repeated again in the following chapter, including himself as well as his seed. Then follows Abram's rejection of anything from the hand of the king of Sodom, the language of his refusal being almost equivalent to a denial of the right of the king of Sodom to the things of which he claimed possession. But there was a higher note in Abram's refusal.

The reader is apt to forget the unquestionable fact that men had multiplied exceedingly in the time of Abram; that Sodom and Gomorrah were undoubtedly cities of importance; and that Egypt was already a nation possessed of its pharaohs. Moreover, all of these people were worshipers, not of the one true and living God, but of idols and deified men. These facts bring out somewhat the full significance of Abram's reply to the king of Sodom. It was not only a refusal to take gifts from the king of Sodom, as such,

but a refusal to have anything to do with an evil and wicked man. It was even more than that. It was an acknowledgement, bold and defiant, that the God whom Abram worshiped was no mere tribal God, but He was in actual fact "God Most High", the Maker and Possessor of heaven and earth. (Margin, R. V., Gen. 14:22). (It is exceedingly sad to have to record that men so prominent in religious and social circles as "Rev." Harry Emerson Fosdick, should seek to lead men to think that the God of Old Testament times was no more than a local deity, and to all intents and purposes simply an idol of the Hebrews. Abram's faith under such circumstances puts men like those to open shame.)

Abram fell under temptation while in Egypt, it is true, for he was but human, and Scripture recognizes the frailness of his humanity; but he came out of a land given over to idolatry unscathed in his allegiance to the one true and living God, as the incident under consideration shows. Reckoning up again the facts, it would appear that Abram thus stood *alone*. He had come up out of Egypt, that country which Scripture uses as a type of the world and all that is of it. Lot also had left him, having pitched his tent, not only "toward Sodom", but "as far as Sodom". (See R. V.) Can we wonder that "after these things"—viz., the incidents of Abram's testimony, God should visit him in a vision, saying: "Fear not, Abram: I am thy shield, thy reward shall be exceeding great"? Gen. 15:1. True as the rendering of the Authorized Version may be, the verse following bears evidence that the marginal reading of the Revised Version is the more correct, for Abram's question clearly demonstrates that the reward was still in the future. (Dr. Schofield, the world-wide noted scholar, maintains that the Revised Version is invariably more correct in

its marginal renderings. While this is not strictly the case, it is a matter well worthy the attention of Bible students.)

Now comes an intensely interesting sequence, for it shows how very real God Himself was to Abram. Note how the appeal of Abram springs from heartfelt desire and full faith that the One to whom he appeals *is able* to give—"O Lord Jehovah, what wilt Thou give me seeing I go hence, and he that shall be possessor of my house is Eliczer the Damascene?" (R. V.). It is, if I mistake not, the first time but not the last, that Abram uses that wonderful name "JEHOVAH"; and prefaced as it is by the exclamation, it reveals how intensely Abram felt. Old, well-stricken in years, he realized that he was soon to "go hence". What that was worth-while could be given to one under such conditions? Is it not possible to read "between the lines" that other thoughts engaged his mind? As the Seed promised to Adam, to Abel and to Noah, had been promised when death, the dread enemy, was about to make his final spring, so Abram realized his like position. In each case they stood alone—each in a different sense it may be—the only possible representatives through whom the "Seed" should come.

Imagine, if you can, the faith of these men. Knowing full well that they must "go hence" their faith in God was such (see Hebrews 11) that they could rest in hope, and "go to their fathers in peace" if they but had the assurance of JEHOVAH *that* through them the promised "Seed" might come. Abram had that promise—"He that shall come forth out of thine own bowels shall be thine heir." Years later that promise was in measure fulfilled; but when Matthew recorded in his Gospel that "*Jesus Christ*" was "the son of David, the son of Abraham" its fuller import

began to be realized, as testified by Paul the apostle in his epistle to the Galatians. Not only did God promise the land to Abram's "seed", but to himself also. Paul says, "Abraham believed God, and it was accounted unto him for righteousness." Thus we read that "in the self-same day" the Lord "*made a covenant* with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed *have I given* this land." The casual reader may not see that Abram himself is included in these words, but he certainly is, for how else could a "covenant" with the *living* God be carried out unless Abram himself was a *living* witness? Thus again meet together the issues of *life* and *death*, and we thank God that Scripture testifies—"He that is our God is the God of salvation; and unto JEHOVAH the Lord belong the issues from death."—Psa. 68:20.

The importance of this covenant with Abraham cannot be overestimated. Twenty years later it was "established" with more detailed pronouncement, and Abram's name was changed from Abram to Abraham. From that time on Abraham and Abraham's covenant with Jehovah came to be recognized as foundational in Jewish history, and fundamental for the life that now is and that which is to come. It is the theme of David in the Psalms, Psa. 105:9; of Jehoshaphat in the book of Chronicles, 2 Chron. 20:7; of Isaiah in the Prophets, Isa. 41:8; of Jesus and His disciples in the Gospels, John 8, etc; and of Paul and James in the Epistles.

The subject of circumcision, which is so closely allied to the covenant with Abraham, requires a little attention. To some the question is not one for public consideration, but can a matter of such national import be entirely overlooked? We think not. *Life* was first given to the *man*, and to him was also given the means and the responsibility of passing that life

on to future generations. In view of the covenant of redemption it was but fitting that the people through whom that redemption should come, should by some definite act recognize that the privilege of *life* and its continuance, was God-given. What would better calculate to impress upon the individual the importance of the covenant, than its attestation in his own flesh? Paul says, "To the pure all things are pure"; and it was he who also pointed out the fact that to some parts of the human body God has given "more abundant honour". Shall we then through lack of understanding the purpose, dishonor that honor? Could attestation in the flesh of any other portion of the human body have had equal significance regarding the continuance of *life*? Seven full days passed before circumcision took place; and seven is by many Bible scholars believed to stand for that which is perfect and whole. Thus we are assured that God lays claim to the whole life of the individual.

Linked up with the covenant of circumcision is God's promise to Abraham of a son in direct line of descent. As we intimated, the above covenant recognized God's ownership to the life of the individual; and God's promise to Abraham of a son in his old age was evidently definitely purposed to draw forth Abraham's acceptance of that fact. It is therefore significant that when the Lord "left off talking with him" concerning the promise, Abraham signified his belief in that promise by submitting himself and his household to the rite of circumcision.

One cannot pass by this incident without calling attention to the remarkable similarity of the announcement of the birth of Isaac and that of his great anti-type, *Jesus the Christ*. In each case the end sought was by miracle, and the name of the one to be

born was predicted before his birth.

That Sarah "laughed within herself" when the announcement of the coming birth of Isaac was repeated to Abraham in her hearing, is common knowledge to almost every Bible reader; but it would seem that few have noticed that Abraham had previously been guilty of the same. Possibly he had related to Sarah his want of faith in this matter when he explained to her, as he would obviously need to do, the ceremony required in recognition of God's gift of life. If so, and it is by no means improbable, then the seeming severity accorded to her would not be without point. But who that had attained a span of life measuring some fourscore years and ten, and had seen the grim hand of death invariably begin to claim the life forces of his victims, even before they had entered his gloomy portals, would not have entertained similar doubt under like conditions? That life should come from one already reckoned as dead was almost too much for her, and the reply given, while it may have carried in some measure a mild rebuke, also sought to "draw forth by question" a voluntary acknowledgement of God's ability to carry out the thing that He had promised, even though it might seem to be "too hard" or "too wonderful" to perform. No answer is ever needed to such questions that so obviously answer themselves, and the question put to Sarah, "Is anything too hard (or "too wonderful", see margin) for the Lord?" has been both question and answer to thousands upon thousands of God's people ever since.

Another beautiful thought comes to mind as we consider these things. If the rite of circumcision was instituted in order that the individual might recognize *life* to be God's supreme gift, then surely it was meant to teach also that *everything else* was in God's power

to give, and that “*no good thing* will He withhold from them that walk uprightly”. If we can in some degree realize the immensity of *God’s gift of life*, and the greatness of the “things that accompany salvation”—for life apart from those is surely unthinkable and meaningless—then we shall also in proportion, and in due time, come to understand something of His estimate of the One through whom such inestimable blessings come. Is it any wonder that as the vision of such a life becomes clearer as the ages roll on, and the horizon of that life is lit up with the prospect of its realization, is it any wonder, we ask, that men should hope and that women should pray that they might be along the line of the channel of its fulfilment, and that it should be counted a high honor to be in the direct line of descendants of Abraham, the friend of God? Nothing could be clearer than that God had promised that the Redeemer should thus come.

When we come to investigate later Paul’s attitude toward the covenant made with Abraham, we hope to find much of interest and blessing; and it will then be our purpose to link up Old and New Testament teaching on these particular fundamental truths.

We have often expressed the thought how wonderfully Bible record proves the existence of *but one* true and living God. Even in these few short chapters in which our study is only begun, we have briefly scanned history over many generations of mankind; yet over that vast intervening period of years we find that there is behind all things a oneness of purpose and plan, and a oneness of revelation that could not possibly be otherwise accounted for. Basic to this plan and to this revelation, is God’s pen picture of *Jesus the Christ*, His Son, stretching forward into the ages yet to come. Is it not, friends, a study worth-

while, and one in which no human story can touch it for vision, and not vision only, but realization, for God Himself is behind it?

In our next we hope to consider some special points of type and anti-type in relation to Isaac and to Christ.

CHAPTER IV.

ACCORDING TO HIS PROMISE

IN THE PRECEDING chapter we purposed considering some aspects in which Isaac typified the coming promised Deliverer. We have already noticed that in each case the birth and name were foretold; and that in each case also the life given was by special manifestation of divine power. Thus in each was demonstrated the fact that man by himself was helpless to accomplish the end in view.

Genesis 21 opens with the words "And the Lord visited Sarah *as He had said*, and the Lord *did* unto Sarah *as He had spoken*." We closed our last chapter with brief remarks relative to the everlasting nature of the God with whom we each have to do, pointing out how from generation to generation men realized that the *same* overruling Providence executed His purposes in such a manner as to leave no doubt as to His identity. Abraham, recognizing this, speaks of Him as the "Everlasting God". Gen. 21: 33. Two great characteristics of Him whom Abraham thus significantly names are represented in the verse which we have quoted above, as indicated by the words which we have placed in italics. Reading over that verse we must involuntarily call to mind the pregnant words of Paul in Romans 4:21, where speaking of Abraham he says: "Being fully persuaded

that, what *He had promised*, He was able also to *perform*." That promise and the performance of the promise as characteristic of Jehovah is beautifully set forth in Gen. 21:1, God "*said*"; and God "*did*".

If the reader will look up the word "promise" in Cruden's Concordance he cannot help being extremely interested in noting the number of references to the promises of God being according "as He had promised." Many instances occur in Moses and the Prophets, in the Psalms, in the Gospels, and in the Epistles. Time varied according to the circumstances of the promise, but the promise never failed.

Have we not here in the promise and the fulfilment of the birth of Isaac a beautiful type of Jesus the Christ? Both were born according to promise. In one case the time was comparatively short, in the other centuries intervened; but both were fulfilled at "the set time of which God had spoken". Gen. 21:2; Gal. 4:4. Habakkuk 2:2, 3 is a pointed and interesting comment on this: "Write the vision, and make it plain upon tables, that he may run that readeth it. For the vision is yet for the (R. V.) *appointed time*, but at the end it shall speak, and not lie: because it surely will come."

The sacrifice of Isaac is generally regarded as typifying the sacrifice of Christ. Types are but imperfect shadows of things to come, and therefore only in certain measures typify the reality. The words of Abraham, "I and the lad will go yonder and worship, and come again to you," are words full of meaning. Primarily they reveal to us the great depth of Abraham's faith in God. Steadfastly he set his face to carry out God's command, yet he had evident faith that in some way, he knew not how, God would restore Isaac to him, for the promise of Abraham to his men was, "We (myself *and* my son) will . . . worship,

and come again to you". He knew this must be so, for the God whose word shall not return unto Him void had promised to "establish" His covenant with Isaac, and "*with his seed after him*": and the question, "Is anything too hard for the Lord?" was probably brought fresh to his mind as he quietly walked the appointed way.

Isaac, too, had his thoughts, and his remarks indicate a knowledge of sacrifice beyond the knowledge of a mere child. He, too, must himself have had something of the same acquaintance with the God of Abraham as did Abraham himself. On no other consideration can we account for his willingness to give up his life when it was in his own power to resist its being taken from him. This is what Abraham called "worship"—laying all that he had upon the altar.

It is significant to notice that both worshiped—for did not Abraham say, "we"? Here is another aspect in which Isaac typified Christ Jesus. He willingly laid down his life at God's command, in full trust that that life would be restored to him, for Abraham must long ere this have told him that the promise was to him and "*to his seed after him*". Does not this remind us of the Scripture: "He shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand"? Isaiah 53:10.

In considering the story of the sacrifice of Isaac it is well to remember that the passion for life is the strongest passion given to animate creation. This is especially true in relation to human nature, for all that a man hath will he give in exchange for his life, and "greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." How great then must have been the love of Isaac for Abraham; truly a beautiful picture in miniature, of the love that Christ had for the Father. One has only to read

the gospel narratives to see the manifestation of this.

But another thought is linked up with this story of the sacrifice of Isaac. Next to the preservation of one's own life, is the God-implanted passion to pass on that life to others, and Isaac in the robust vigor of young manhood must have looked forward to the time when the promise should in part be realized that in *his seed* should the families of the earth be blessed, and that as the channel of its fulfilment he himself should share in its blessings; for to God's chosen people more than to any other, children were "an heritage of the Lord: and the fruit of the womb is His reward." To "be fruitful and multiply" was Jehovah's first command to mankind.

Yet still another thought is borne in upon us, and that is that God's purposed *time* must be taken into account—a fact often lost sight of. The promise of God to Isaac was sure, and what God had promised He most certainly would perform. God's promise to Christ was also equally sure, and thus type and Anti-type in full recognition of that promise gladly laid down their life that they "might take it again". That there is "natural law in the spiritual world" is a deeply significant fact; and when a believer becomes a "new man" in Christ Jesus, the command to "be fruitful and multiply" appeals to him with equal force and privilege.

CHAPTER V.

SERVING SELF OR SERVING GOD

HAVING TOUCHED briefly on interesting points in the lives of Abraham and Isaac as they come into contact with our theme, we come next to consider Jacob.

Human biography might be tempted to leave out of the reckoning in the royal line of descent such a name as that of Jacob, but not so in the Scriptures of truth. The name of Jacob is graciously linked with that of his father Isaac, and his more illustrious grandfather Abraham. Not only so, God called Himself the "God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob". He thus inseparably weaves into the covenant of promise the name of Jacob. We may very naturally ask, "Why?" Surely to show us, is it not, that salvation is not of works, but of grace? Look at the New Testament accounts of the genealogy of Jesus the Christ. Some great names are entered there—Seth, Abraham and David the king. But there also, are mentioned Rahab and Bath-sheba.

However, striking lessons are to be gleaned from some incidents in the life of Jacob, who, whatever his outstanding characteristics, did in some respects foreshadow in type and contrast the Savior who was to come of his line. First among these we may notice that of contrast. Both type and Anti-type knew beforehand God's purposes concerning them, but only so far does analogy apply, for like many another professing child of God, Jacob sought to bring about God's plans by his own methods and in his own time, and suffered severely in the attempt. Had he waited God's "appointed time", he would have obtained the blessing without entailing on himself and others untold suffering.

The contrast in the life of our Savior is marked indeed. Every step of His life, as the gospel records show, was taken in full harmony with the will of God, for He came, "not to do Mine own will, but the will of Him that sent Me." That this attitude of waiting upon God was to be characteristic of the Messiah is beautifully foretold in Psalms 40:7, 8: "Lo,

I come: in the volume of the book it is written of Me, I delight to do Thy will, O My God: yea, Thy law is within My heart." Because of this entire, faithful dependence upon God, being always ready to do God's will, God hath "highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name . . . "

One pleasing incident stands out in beautiful contrast to Jacob's past—the vision of the ladder reaching from earth to heaven, clearly showing that Jacob had at heart genuine desire to *again* get into touch with the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac. God meets him there, and assures him that He is that God—the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac. In proof of that fact He renews the covenant made to them with Him and includes him and his seed in that covenant of blessing. Gen. 28:13. Added to that covenant is a promise that touched the heart of Jacob to its core (verse 15), and elicited from him the willing sacrifice of himself and his possessions. (Verses 20-22.)

We would call particular attention to the latter part of this special promise. "I will not leave thee, until I have done that which I have spoken to thee of." Turn once more to the original covenant promise, and note the far-reaching effect of the, "things spoken of"; then turn to Numbers 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 it? or hath He spoken, and shall He not make it good?" The frequent repetition of the first personal pronoun in Genesis 28:15 must have assured Jacob how fully the fulfilment depended on Jehovah alone.

Many times have I wondered, and doubtless many others have also, what is the real import of the teaching of Jacob's vision. I cannot call to mind that I

have as yet seen an explanation of that vision that appears to me to be satisfactory; but that may be due to my limited acquaintance with the expository teachings of many great Bible students. The following thoughts may be crudely expressed, and will probably fall short of conveying to the reader all that their expression means to the writer, but they are now penned with the hope that they may be at least profitably suggestive. That our Savior when talking with Nathaniel (John 1:43-51) made evident reference to Jacob's ladder can I think be accepted without question. If that is so, then the application *that our Savior is represented by the ladder* is established.

It is then next in order to note carefully the detail. There surely must be some significant reason why the covenant of promise is so closely associated with the vision. That it in some way represented the promised seed—the Messiah—as we have already intimated, is the basic reason we do not hesitate to affirm. The first important facts mentioned relative to the ladder are that it was “*set up on the earth*” and that the “*top of it reached to heaven.*” A third fact is also mentioned—“*behold the angels of God ascending and descending on it.*” Here then is clearly set forth the humanity of the promised Messiah, in full keeping with the promise that He was to be of the “*seed of the woman*”—one of like passions with ourselves, of the earth earthy, and “*on the earth*”. Then note how beautifully it is stated that “*the top of it reached to heaven.*” The main object of a ladder is to bridge the intervening space from a lower object to a higher. That is just mankind's need. But no ladder, not even the best, can stand alone—no, not even the One whom that ladder represents.

Jesus Christ was constantly in communion with His Father—often spending whole nights in prayer;

and with marvelous results, for multitudes followed, multitudes believed and multitudes were healed. Yet even so we are forcibly reminded that *God did the works by Him*. Then what about the third point—the angels? The word “behold” generally draws special attention to a unique fact. Does it not do so here? Does the whole vision point forward to a time when *through Jesus Christ* angels and men shall co-mingle and converse because God’s will shall be done on earth as it is now done in heaven? Does it not also point forward to the fact of “angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto Him”? Read the record of His life on earth, and note how frequently angels ministered unto Him.

There is much, very much, in the life of Jacob that we might profitably consider in relation to our theme, but time forbids. Reading the story of his life one cannot but be struck with the sad conditions and circumstances that surround him because of his own weaknesses. So strongly is one impressed by this that the question is raised, “Why should so much that is sordid and evil be chronicled?” The answer to such a question does not lie on the surface. Like many another theme in God’s Word, a true conception of the purpose is impossible unless the whole subject is grasped. The life story of Jacob, as we read of it in Genesis is but the beginning or background of that which is to follow, for Genesis is a book of *beginnings*. Verse 23 in the book of Numbers, chapter 23, Revised Version, margin, is a beautiful confirmation of this thought—“At the due season it shall be said of Jacob and of Israel, What hath God wrought?” Both names are used here of the one individual, intimating to us that God had by no means overlooked the characteristics of that part of his life which so aptly applied to the name of Jacob.

The study of the uses in Scripture of the names of Jacob and Israel is one we cannot enter into here. As we would expect, the name Israel is by far the more frequent, but the uses of the name Jacob are both numerous and striking, as for instance, "the mighty God of Jacob"; "king of Jacob". What, then, may we say is the feature, other than that of being in the royal line of descent, that prominently connects Jacob with the promised Messiah? It cannot be that of type, for in no single instance does he foreshadow Him. Is it not *his own desperate need of a Savior?* Would not the very purpose of the Messiah have been lost sight of if God had not taken hold of such men as Jacob, placing their lives on record to typify that it was God's pleasure and God's purpose *through Christ* to redeem such men? We called attention to the fact that Jacob *felt* his need of God, and how God in answer to that need gave utterance to a special promise to be his God, and to be with him in all places whithersoever he went. Almost in the same words is that promise repeated to Jacob as a nation in Isaiah 41:10, 13, 14. Then comes in the following chapter (the chapter of the Messiah) God's answer as to how, and through whom, those promises will be fulfilled.

The changes of thought in Scripture are sometimes very abrupt, but always suggestive. In Psalms 146:1-4 we have a dire picture of the helplessness of the sons of men, and so far as they themselves are concerned no prospect awaits them *but the doom of death*. Suddenly the scene changes to the prospect of life and activity:—"Happy is he that hath the *God of Jacob* for his help, whose *hope* is in the Lord his God." In such a case what else can that hope be but "the hope" of *resurrection?*

Following Jacob, Judah becomes for a brief period

the pivotal center of our subject, and again, not in the sense of type but more directly that of prophecy. It will be noticed that as we proceed through Scripture the prophetic utterances relative to the Messiah become increasingly more distinct, both in relation to His coming and the character of His personality. Genesis 49:10 has generally been considered by Bible students to be the first mention of the Messiah by a specific name. According to Dr. Young, Rabbis Ben, Gannach and Kimchi give the meaning as "Prince of Peace". Some authorities affirm that it has reference here to the name of a place, and that it means the "place of rest". True, "Shiloh" is a place frequently mentioned in Scripture. It is not, however, until Joshua 18:1 that we find it so mentioned as the resting place of the tabernacle. But, in our opinion, its context both in the verse itself and those in immediate contact, establishes without question that here in Gen. 49:10 it has reference to personality, *and that personality the predicted Messiah*. The Revised Version makes two notable alterations in this verse. The first is the change of the word "gathering" to the word "obedience". This is further proof that the verse has unquestionable reference to the *Messiah*, for obedience can only be rendered to personality. The second change is that of the word "people" (singular) to "peoples" (plural). Thus we have prophecy marvelously condensed in this striking verse as the following items abundantly testify:

- (1) The promise of the Messiah;
- (2) His name Shiloh, "the Prince of Peace"
(see also Isa. 9:6);
- (3) His coming;
- (4) The place of His coming;
- (5) His lineal descent from Judah (see also Matt. 1:3; 2:6 and Heb. 7:14);

(6) To His own people, the Israelites;

(7) To the Gentiles, as indicated by the word "peoples."

The Revised Version is consistent in its rendering of the words "people" and "peoples"—the first standing for the chosen *people* of Israel, the second for the nations outside of her and the reader will find much profit in following these distinctions.

We shall see in later prophecies how marvelously exact is the wording of some of these prophetic utterances, thus demonstrating the utter impossibility of God's Word being of "human conception only", as some men of high standing in the churches are to-day proclaiming in the all-covering name of "science", so-called.

CHAPTER VI.

A STAR OUT OF JACOB

WE HAVE ALREADY observed that revelation concerning the Messiah becomes more detailed as time proceeds. It will also be noticed that Scripture makes His identity specific by a double method, namely, by choice and by elimination. For instance note the following:

(1) The Messiah must be of the seed of the woman: He must be human (Gen. 3:15); therefore, an angel cannot be the Messiah. Heb. 1:5; Gal. 4:4. About 80 times He is called by the evangelists, "Son of man."

(2) He must be of the seed of Abraham: a Hebrew. Gen. 12:1-3 and 14:13. One of any other race is thus ruled out. No Gentile claim is valid. Deut. 17:15; Matt. 15:24.

(3) He must be of the line of Isaac and Jacob (Gen. 17:19; 28:13, 14), not of Ishmael (Gen. 21:12),

nor of Esau. Gen. 25:23.

(4) He must be of the tribe of Judah: a Jew Gen. 49:8-10. Thus Israelite as well as Gentile is excluded, if not of the chosen tribe.

We may have occasion later to refer to this point. Even now it is clearly evident that a purposed gradual unfolding of God's revelation concerning the Messiah is intended, as indicated by the above mentioned facts. Then we have *added* from time to time features which in the aggregate can only apply to the One chosen of God: details which not only single out Jehovah's choice, but eliminate the possibility of application to any other claimant. Another point worthy of mention is that although Jehovah in His revelation to mankind proceeds from outline to detail, as an artist adds to his picture stroke by stroke of the brush, when once a detail is added He never leaves it behind; it is always carried forward as the promise extends. For example, the symbol of kingship is first introduced in Genesis 49, and is forever after retained as one of the characteristics of the Messiah.

Next in order, the prophecies of Balaam seem naturally to engage our attention, for both proclaim that rule, dominion and power are vested in the One to come. Balaam seeks to "curse Jacob" and to "defy Israel", but in seeking to do so he finds he runs counter to an *unchangeable fact*. God had *already* blessed Jacob, both conditionally and unconditionally, and God's purposes once uttered are *never repealed*. "I the Lord change not" is perpetually true; "therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed". Mal. 3:6. Paul later expressed much the same thought in other words when he said, "The gifts and calling of God are without repentance."

The whole story of Balaam is of intense interest,

200-1851

touching as it does on the covenants of promise and Israel's future as a nation; and one is tempted to linger in its consideration, but we must endeavor to confine ourselves to that portion which directly concerns our theme, namely, Numbers 24:17. (R. V.) "I see Him, but not now: I behold Him, but not nigh: there shall come forth a Star out of Jacob, and a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel". Some apply these words nationally to Israel; but in thus limiting its meaning they have failed to observe the words "*out of Jacob*", and *out of Israel*". Undoubtedly here, as in the prophecy concerning Judah, the reference is to a personal Messiah. Further confirmation of this is found by recalling the earlier prophecy in Numbers 23:9 where very similar language occurs, "I see Him . . . I behold Him". There it was the nation; here it is the person. A comparison of the two passages will clearly show that in the earlier verse it was actual, but in the second case it was prophetic. The reading of the Revised Version in Numbers 24:17 omits the word "shall" and reads, "I see him," instead of "I shall see him". It is thought by some that this omission shows that only in prophetic vision did Balaam see Him of whom he spake, and that no future vision was predicted by him. But do not the words added "but not now" and "but not nigh" clearly presuppose not only the possibility but the probability of such future occurrence? The latter, by itself, may not do so, but how about the former? If the former points to future fact, then the latter makes its realization of grave import indeed.

The whole incident of Balaam looms large on the sacred page. The memory of it is stamped deeply on the memory of God's chosen people. Moses, Joshua, Micah, Peter and Jude all make reference to it, and Balaam's action in seeking to "curse Jacob" and to

“defy Israel” is held up in solemn warning to the people of God in both the Old and New Covenants.

Balaam seems to have come suddenly upon the scene of Israel’s history under much the same circumstances as Melchizedek appeared to Abraham after his battle with the kings, but with very different motives and results. From the threads of history we gather that he was the son of Beor the soothsayer, but having heard of the fame of the doings of the God of Jacob in bringing the children out of Egypt, could no longer accept the gods which his father worshiped. That he had gained very considerable knowledge of Jehovah is evident from his language to the first messengers of Balak, and this is still more evident in Numbers 22:18 where he speaks of Jehovah as “the Lord *my* God”. When these facts are duly considered, the perverseness of the man in persistently seeking to curse the very people through whom he had gained his knowledge of “the most High . . . the Almighty” (note the language, 24:16) is apparent. He knew that God had already blessed Israel (chap. 22:12), and he knew that God was not a man that He should lie: nor the son of man that He should repent. (23:19). He also must have known that God’s word and God’s name were inseparable realities. See Psalm 138:2.

That Balaam probably knew much of God’s purposes to bless Israel seems more than mere conjecture. He twice uses the expression, “the vision of the Almighty,” when uttering his prophecy, evidently because he realized that within its concept there was that which no human vision can portray, for it stretches backward into generations past, as well as forward into generations yet to come. In spite of his own prophecy concerning his death he came to an ignominious end. We might draw profitable lessons from this fact, lessons alluded to elsewhere in Scrip-

ture; but the outstanding feature for us is that his wickedness was overruled to bring to the chosen people a never-to-be-forgotten message of One who should be both Star and Sceptre—the Guide and Ruler of God's peculiar people.

CHAPTER VII.

THE MESSIAH, A PROPHET.

WE HAVE IN OUR studies considered some remarkable men. Adam, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Judah are all outstanding names in the predicted genealogy of the Messiah: men who had each one come face to face with God's promise that through them in direct line of descent should come the promised Redeemer. Through these men what we might call "the vision of the Almighty" (for there is no vision like it) has been gradually unfolded before us, until we have not only the nation and the tribe, but also the family of the Messiah revealed to us.

Having come thus far we find that Scripture now begins to introduce *things of deeper significance than mere ancestral name and lineage*. These, important as they are in fulfilling God's promises to the fathers, touch only the connections of the Messiah. Hence at the very dawn of the family line His personal characteristics begin to be revealed also. Thus we see how strikingly beautiful it is that the first mentioned name of the Messiah (as we noticed in chapter 5) should begin with Judah. Still more beautiful is the fact that that name should be "Shiloh", meaning "Prince of Peace", linked though it is with the previous intimation of rule and authority as indicated by the sceptre.

Having thus a definite procedure set clearly be-

fore us, we find that the Divine Record next makes use of specific occasions in bringing before God's people, and us also, the fact that He has not forgotten His promises or His covenant. Man's extremity is God's opportunity. This is remarkably illustrated in the passage of Scripture that now claims our attention, namely, Deuteronomy 18:15-18.

Moses had been warning the children of Israel of their natural proneness to succumb to surrounding circumstances which would result from their own disregard of God's commandments, and he exhorts them to "be perfect" (or sincere, see margin) with the Lord their God. In our Authorized Version these words are considered to be the close of the subject, and a new passage commences with the next verse. But thanks be to God, if I may reverently say so, the Revised Version omits the sign of the paragraph, and verse 15 is thus linked on to the previous one. Moses knew, as any true teacher of the Word of God does to-day, that the injunction just given would be impossible in their own strength. How splendidly appropriate, therefore, is the dramatic and bold declaration contained in his utterance: "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto Him shall ye hearken". That these words apply to Christ as the Messiah is testified by Peter the apostle in Acts 3:22, and by Stephen in chapter 7:37 of the same book; and indirectly by Luke who is the author of the book of Acts. If utterances concerning Him had in the past been lacking in clearness of detail and unambiguity of language, there is no lack of them here, for expressing thought could scarcely be more definite and distinct.

Before considering this verse in detail it may be both wise and profitable to first examine something

of the character of those who made its application to the Messiah, and their reasons for so doing; for if the credentials are trustworthy we may confidently draw our conclusions as to its meaning *in all its parts*. We need to establish these points so that the foundations of our exegesis may rest firmly on scriptural authority and not on any man's interpretation; and Scripture interpretation can only be properly understood by the language which Scripture uses.

In our statement above we called to mind the fact that the Apostle Peter was one authority for applying these words of Moses in Deut. 18:15 to Jesus Christ our Lord in Acts 3:22. Note the circumstances under which Peter rehearsed these words of Moses. He and John had just been the means of healing the lame man at the Beautiful Gate of the Temple. A crowd gathers, and to that crowd Peter, himself a Jew, appeals on the same footing nationally, addressing them as "ye men of Israel"; and in short, pithy words he reminds them that as a nation they came into being through the "God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob". Having thus gained their hearing he gains in boldness of speech. Recognizing in the ever-increasing crowd many of the unruly element who were present at the crucifixion, he definitely charges them with the crime of killing the "Prince of Life", and testifies then and there that he and John were witnesses of His resurrection.

His next appeal is a threefold testimony to the witness of the prophets (see verses 18, 21 and 24) that God had testified through them concerning "*His Christ*" (verse 18, R. V.) Note the expression; for it is a remarkable one. Seeing that his appeal to the Scriptures was finding acceptance among many, he pleaded with them for repentance that their sins might be blotted out. Then as a fitting climax he

quoted these words of Moses, for he well knew the esteem in which Moses was held by the devout Jew. In spite of the fact that Jesus Christ had but recently been crucified as a malefactor, so cogent was Peter's appeal to the Hebrew Scriptures, and so definitely to the point was his citation of these words of Moses, that 5000 men of that vast audience then and there accepted the word spoken. We cannot stay but to merely suggest that the converse side be fairly considered. Would Peter have dared to apply these well-known words of Moses to *Jesus Christ*, to such a representative gathering of the "men of Israel", had Jesus Christ *in reality* been but one of three malefactors who were crucified together? The answer to that question is that *the whole life of Jesus Christ*, and Peter's presentation of the Scriptures, showed conclusively that He was no malefactor, *but was truly that Prophet spoken of by Moses*.

Take also the testimony of Stephen. No man, excepting one devoutly learned in the Hebrew Scriptures, could have uttered such a remarkable chain of evidence respecting God's dealings with the people of Israel. Into that evidence he also introduced these same words of Moses. And who were his hearers? The high priests, the elders and the scribes: men who knew Moses' writings, but were not able to refute Stephen's application of them.

In this prophecy of Moses we have predicted a new title indicative of a new office of the promised Deliverer. He is to be a prophet, one who speaks for another. The title is now usually understood of one, who through God, foretells the future. That it includes that is unquestioned, but it comprises much more, for Jehovah does not limit His interest in the sons of men to momentous happenings of future events, hence "God . . . spake in time past unto

the fathers by the prophets.”—Heb. 1:1. We can make no mistake when we let Scripture interpret its own definitions, and we fortunately have in the Word of God a clear indication of what Moses himself understood by the use of this title as descriptive of the Messiah. Moses certainly had not forgotten the first time that “the anger of the Lord was kindled against” him. Ex. 4:14. In almost the very words of this passage where the Lord God appoints Aaron as the “prophet” of Moses, Moses in Deut. 18:18 proclaims the office of that Prophet whom “the Lord . . . will raise up.” Comparison of the passages is well worth while.

Surely in these portions of Scripture the salient points are that *supreme* authority is vested in *but one Personality*—the LORD JEHOVAH, and delegated *by Him* to whomsoever He will. That Christ Himself thus understood the office of prophet, even when applied to Himself, is evidenced by His own remarks in John 3:34.

We hope to touch more briefly on other vital considerations of this unique prophecy in our next.

CHAPTER VIII.

FROM AMONG THEIR BRETHREN

WE WILL NOW BRIEFLY consider one or two other important pronouncements which occur in the prophecy of Moses (Deut. 18:15) concerning the coming of Messiah. Here Moses states that the Prophet was to be “from the midst of thee”, “of thy brethren.”

In an earlier chapter we noticed how in various ways the identity of the One who should come might be established, and in the instance given it would be

observed that the promises so made were then primarily made to *individuals*, the names of some being mentioned in the opening sentence of the previous chapter. Here the promise is carried forward *to the nation*, for it is to the people of Israel as a nation that Moses now speaks, and the pledge is re-affirmed that *from them*, and *not from the Gentiles*, shall the Messiah come.

To some, the expression "from the midst of thee" would seem to cover the fulness of these promises, and the words "of thy brethren" would, to them, be but a reiteration of the same fact clothed in different language. Not so, however. Both expressions are vitally necessary to prevent the possibility of a false claimant having seeming authority for his claim. "Strangers" (see earlier chapters of Deuteronomy) sojourned in the "midst" of Israel, and under certain conditions shared their national blessings, thus by the words "of thy brethren" those who had not renounced their allegiance to the nations from whence they came were excluded.

Further, these words "of thy brethren" are significant of yet another important point. They established without question that the Messiah appointed of GOD should be in line with God's own law of unmixed generation, in *contrast*, as we have so often pointed out, to the heathen ideals so outstandingly prevalent in the nations surrounding them.

Again (words almost fail to express the thought in mind), God in the beginning created man that he might "have dominion", and God's plans and purposes for man were great. In proof of that, and in proof of the fact that He had not Himself changed, is this promise we are now considering. God's creative purposes have ever been *progressive*. True, angels were first created, true also that even now men

are "lower" than the angels (see Psa. 8:5), but Scripture undoubtedly verifies the fact that it is only for a "little while" (see Heb. 2:7, margin R. V.). Surely then in choosing ONE "from among" the sons of men, as the Redeemer of men, God Himself thus proclaims that, *in purpose* now, man is yet to be *in fact*, the *crowning masterpiece of His creation*; and in thus carrying out His designs does He not place high honor upon man? Does it not, moreover, give undoubted evidence that, if truly consecrated to Him, man is *the best means available* for the purpose of man's redemption? This last thought may be startling, but will I think, stand the test of investigation.

The next point of interest in this prophetic utterance is the statement "like unto me". Two inspired quotations from this passage are given us in the New Testament—one by Peter, the other by Stephen in the book of Acts. If we accept Dr. Scofield's assertion that the marginal readings of the Revised Version are more generally correct than the translation given in the text, we shall find a rendering given that appears to convey the true thought in the mind of the speaker; for had Moses' conception of Him of whom he spake been no higher than that of Balaam, the alien prophet (which indeed was no mean conception), even then he would scarcely have made himself the pattern of the ONE whom God predicted through the wonderful types and shadows of the tabernacle and its service. The verse would then read, "as He raised up me", instead of "like unto me". Moses not only believed but knew that God had raised him up, and nothing in the whole life history of our Savior is more clearly revealed than the fact that He also believed that God had sent Him. In each case it was the certain knowledge of that fact that inspired them in all their actions.

Following this comes a most important declaration

from God concerning the relationship of that Prophet between Himself and those to whom He is sent: *I "will put My words in His mouth, and He shall speak unto them all that I shall command Him"*. Note the contrast of the pronouns used in the verse under examination, "I" and "my", "his" and "he", and "I" and "him". How intelligent men and women can in the face of so much definite language proclaim their belief that God and Christ are one and the same personality is certainly difficult of comprehension. Every Scripture which they bring forward in support of their claim, if properly analyzed and interpreted according to the meaning of the words used and the context in which they are placed, does not proclaim their view, but definitely upholds Bible statement that "I am the Lord, and there is none else, there is no God *beside Me*." Under no other conditions would these same men interpret language as they do the Scriptures of truth.

In direct harmony with this statement of Moses JESUS CHRIST Himself said: "For I have not spoken of Myself; but the Father which sent Me, He gave Me *commandment*, what I should say, and what I should speak."—John 12:49. Other passages where similar testimony is borne by Him who is "the Way, the Truth, and the Life" will be found in John 3:34; 7:16; 8:28; 14:10, 24.

CHAPTER IX.

THAT I MAY KNOW THEE

DEUTERONOMY, chapter eighteen, verse fifteen, would to many seem to be the only direct communication that Moses had from God concerning that Prophet of whom He spoke. Yet anyone who will

take the trouble to consider must be greatly impressed with the extent of the knowledge that Moses must have possessed. For instance: the underlying purposes of God in the slaying of the passover lamb; the uplifting of the brazen serpent in the wilderness; and the smiting of the rock could scarcely have been unknown to him of whom later Scripture testified, "He made known His *ways* unto Moses. His *acts* unto the children of Israel". There is deeper significance in the knowledge of a person by his ways, than what we know of him by his acts. One bespeaks close communion, the other intermittent acquaintance .

The three incidents above mentioned are so well known to the average reader that we have not included them in our remarks. Nor have we refrained because we feel that the limit of truth regarding them has been attained, but because the vastness of our subject compels us to pass by much that we would otherwise consider with profit. Further evidence that the knowledge which Moses had of the promised Messiah must have been extensive, is found in the study of the tabernacle and its services. The marvelous structure of the tabernacle; the exactness of detail both of that which was to be included as well as excluded in its construction; and the unquestionable fact that every one of these details was planned with a view to immediate use as well as to the future application of an event and events to be enacted hundreds of years later, must surely be incontestable proof that a super-human Power conceived it and gave to Moses the "pattern." Thus all things considered it would seem not improbable that more was revealed to Moses of the fulness of the "Gospel of God" in Christ, than to any other of His servants in either Old or New Testaments.

Just here may be appropriate a few words regard-

ing Moses personally and relative also to that Prophet whom God had said was to be "like unto" Moses. Both physically and intellectually Moses must have been an ideal man. Even before his leadership of the children of Israel he "was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians". That surely was no mean attainment. Added to that is the achievement of leading and controlling a whole nation through exceptional circumstances of trial, and giving them a code of laws that has never been and never will be surpassed in any age of human endeavor. His presentation of the tabernacle and its services, and his keen insight into future events, reveal a mind of uncommon greatness; yet the grace and humility of his personality were such that no suspicion of self-consciousness seems to be entertained by him. He knew more than others. Yes. But he knew also that there are vast oceans of knowledge where the horizon ever recedes. He knew, too, that if he knew more it was because of his closer contact with Him who knows all things, and his yearning cry was, "Shew me Thy ways that I may know Thee."

In this he was truly a type of the Messiah whom he predicted, who from constant communion with His Father and His Father's Word grew daily in wisdom and knowledge. No man needed prayer less, yet no man prayed more than He; and never did man speak as He did. Like Moses there was in Him a grand unconcern as to what others might think of Him apart from His message; but where He and His message are inseparably linked together there is a dignity of character and a finality of expression that render anything but reverent approach impossible.

We can only briefly touch upon a few of the most helpful topics suggested by the tabernacle and its services, and we feel sure that even so our readers will

in some measure realize how very close must have been the fellowship of Moses with his God, second only in its sacredness to that of Him whom these beautiful types foreshadow.

The *need* for man's *redemption* is made plain by the very first transaction necessary in the building of the sacred structure: the placing of the foundations. The silver sockets weighing one talent each, for supporting the pillars of the tabernacle, were obtained from the half shekels offered by every man of 20 years and upward as a "*ransom for his soul.*" "The rich man shall not give more, and the poor shall not give less." Thus we see, as we saw in the very beginning, that it is the soul or *life* of the individual, and consequently the individual himself, that is at stake. Hence, in that respect all men are alike before God.

Not only so, but surely in specifying those of 20 years and upward, the fact is recognized that redemption is a solemn covenant between God and the individual, the individual man thus acknowledging his *need* for salvation. In this he also acknowledges that all other men who thus require a ransom to redeem their own lives are on the *same footing of helplessness* as himself to accomplish the purpose; and that his help is not in *man* but in *God*. Thus God graciously allows man, under certain conditions, to lay the foundations upon which is based the structure of the Gospel. Put into one word, that basis is "*repentance*" toward God, exemplified by the act (as all attitudes of mind must be) of presenting the half shekel.

CHAPTER X.

TYPES IN THE TABERNACLE

NEXT TO FOUNDATIONS, the nature of the building and the entrance thereto are important features of any structure and frequently convey to the outsider the purpose for which it is erected. The door, or gateway, is especially indicative of the value placed upon that which the whole edifice is to protect. Sometimes indeed, altogether another objective enters into the whole plan, that is, to impart to those who come within its range of vision certain truths or ideals suggested by its peculiar construction. Careful study will show that all these features, and perhaps others, entered into the building of the Tabernacle and its court.

One noticeable feature in the construction of the tabernacle is that practically all the woodwork was overlaid with gold. This was not seen from the outside, being covered by curtains, but it must have presented a view of splendor inside; a fact truly significant of the believer and the unbeliever. Commentators generally agree that *gold* is typical of Deity, and that which is divine and imperishable; and that *wood* represents that which is human and corruptible.

There is possibly yet another thought involved. Wood is indicative of life forfeited, and unless covered completely by that which is imperishable, its end is destruction. Everything in the tabernacle made of wood must therefore remind those inside that but for the goodness of *God* their own life stands in jeopardy.

The central object of the Tabernacle was undoubtedly the Ark of the Covenant, and it was around this unique center that the whole structure of the Tabernacle and its court was erected. No building ever

was fashioned from materials of such striking contrasts. Pillars of brass and curtains of linen formed its sole protection from those outside its precincts. The gateway, while evidently designed by its special coloring to prevent any mistake regarding the way of entrance, was made of the same fabric.

Seeing, as already mentioned, that the Ark of the Covenant was the pivotal center of and reason for the erection of this unique edifice, we cannot do better than give it brief consideration first. This consisted of a wooden chest without top, about four feet two inches long, two feet six inches wide, and as deep as it was wide. It was covered inside and out with plates of beaten gold, and a crown of gold was attached all around the top. Within it was placed the testimony; the two tables of stone on which were written the Ten Commandments. A cover called the mercyseat with two cherubim was made for the Ark of one piece of beaten gold. This fitted over the top just within the crown of gold. There are few, if any, commentators who dispute that we have in this a manifest picture of the Lord Jesus Christ. The wood surely points to His humanity—His essential self—for it is the wood, not the gold, that really forms the Ark. The gold which *covers* the Ark, outside and in, possibly indicates that divine power, the power of God, covers as does a garment the weakness of His humanity. The only abiding thing within the Ark is the Word of the Living God. How beautifully this fact calls to mind the words of the Lord Jesus both prophetic and actual: "I delight to do Thy will, O my God: yea, Thy law is within My heart," Psa. 40:8; and "I came . . . not to do *Mine own will*, but the will of Him that sent Me".—John 6:38. The crown of gold betokens the kingship of Christ; and here may be fittingly called to mind the express injunction for the kings of

God's people to know God's Word, and to do it. See Deuteronomy 17:18 and 19; Joshua 1:8. Note also in 2 Kings 11:12 (R. V., margin) how the crown and the testimony are beautifully linked together. Had our Savior not lived up to these injunctions He could not have expounded "from Moses and all the prophets, the things concerning Himself."

Brass pillars seem to stand for strength and ensilver from the same source as were the sockets of the durance; and the fact that each one is "capped" with Tabernacle reminds one of the "helmet of salvation". Further, that each pillar is linked together by a fillet of silver is surely indicative of the union that should exist on the common ground of redemption, of which the silver is typical.

Next let us view the Door, our Gateway, and we shall find as in all edifices of note, so here, there are special features having unique objective characteristics, and perhaps with enhanced significance. Several important and outstanding ideas are at once suggested to us, each claiming equal recognition. Perhaps that which appeals most to the outsider is that it answers the purpose of a gate in the simplest form possible. A curtain offers at one and the same time the most simple form of exclusion and the easiest method of access that can be devised. A "little child" can open the folds of a hanging curtain, yet there is sufficiently indicated by its presence the right to grant or deny both entrance and exit. Jesus Christ said, "I am the Door". How glorious beyond thought is the fact that access to eternal life through Christ is typified by a curtain instead of by a gate with bars and bolts. Though made of the *same material* as the hanging of the court (linen), thus indicating one chosen from among the people, there is no possibility of mistaking it, for the colors blue, pur-

ple and scarlet combine to make it unique; and by these colors are indicated the divine, kingly and sacrificial character of our Lord Jesus Christ. The four pillars to the gate suggest an entrance open to the whole world—"God so loved the world . . . ". All tribes, nations, peoples and tongues make entrance by the same gate. The four pillars like the four horns of the Altar evidently typify this truth. The curtain into the holy of holies, unlike the others, had gold woven in its fabric, signifying how Christ as our High Priest had *entered into glory*, there to make intercession for us; and it is only as we pass through to the other side of the rent veil that we inherit the fullness of the blessing of the Gospel of Christ.

For want of time and space we feel that further search into this deeply interesting subject must be carried on by the reader himself, and it is hoped that sufficient interest has been aroused to induce extended study. No single finite mind can grasp the varied aspect in which God has presented "His Christ" to us in these pictures of the tabernacle, but the varied aspects thus brought together make individual appeal to individual minds.

We then, like the material for the tabernacle, must first be "gathered together", Matt. 18:20; Rev. 7:9; "joined together"; then "framed and builded together"; for then shall we "caught up together", that in that glad resurrection day we may "live together" with Him.

It was our thought to enter somewhat into the subject of Christ typified in the sacrifices, but further consideration seems to point the way that this will be best left to the individual student. We will therefore next survey briefly some important allusions to Christ in the Psalms. Then we hope to touch upon the grand prophecies of Isaiah and others concerning

this great theme until we come to the actual life of Him of whom it is our joy and privilege to write; and it is our earnest hope that though this study is extensive in scope, interest may be sustained throughout.

CHAPTER XI.

THE MESSIAH OF THE PSALMS

WE PROMISED to next consider some important allusions to Christ in the Psalms. Wishing to see what others might have to say on this interesting topic I wrote to a ministerial Baptist friend asking the loan of any work which he might have bearing on this theme. The book sent had a special chapter on the Psalms, and in it the author affirmed that this portion of the Bible which Christians so much love, had nothing to say of eternal life; that it knew nothing of a purged conscience; nor did it know anything of the Holy Spirit's indwelling. Needless to say, I was not surprised to find that no reference whatever was made to Him who "asked life of Thee, and Thou gavest it Him, even length of days for ever and ever", Psa. 21:4, nor was there the slightest illusion to that beautiful passage: "Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean: wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow", Psa. 51:7; neither was there any reference to that heart-felt prayer of David: "Cast me not away from thy presence; and take not thy Holy Spirit away from me." Psa. 51:11.

All through the history of God's chosen people the Psalms of David have been a strong source of comfort and joy in the varied circumstances of human life. Can it be that He who is Himself said to be the Sustainer and Giver of our joy has no place in these matchless songs of joy? It cannot be, for Christ Him-

self said: "All things must needs be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, *and in the psalms, concerning Me*"; and those who heard these words said, "Did not our heart burn within us, while He talked with us by the way, and while He opened to us the Scriptures?"

That there is a tendency among commentators to seek for allusions to Christ in the Old Testament, and perhaps especially in the Psalms, which have no real basis except in their own imagination, is perfectly true; and one is often the victim of keen disappointment when thus seeking their assistance. For instance, Psalm 33:6: "By the word of our Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath of His mouth", is very frequently quoted as having reference to Christ. Anyone at all acquainted with Hebrew parallelisms of Scripture would surely vehemently repudiate such an idea, for the latter part of the verse is but the repetition of the first in another form.

Before taking up the study of individual Psalms, a short general sketch of the book may be of interest. That it is really composed of five books is now a matter of common knowledge:

Book 1. Chapters 1 to 41, corresponding with Genesis, have special reference to man.

Book 2. Chapters 42 to 72, corresponding to Exodus, have special reference to Israel.

Book 3. Chapters 73 to 89, corresponding to Leviticus, have special reference to worship.

Book 4. Chapters 90 to 106, corresponding to Numbers, refer chiefly to things earthly.

Book 5. Chapters 107 to 150, corresponding to Deuteronomy, have special reference to God's Word.

Two corresponding lines of thought run through both the Pentateuchs: that belonging to the individ-

ual; and that having reference to the nation of Israel, and to other nations as they incidently come in contact with Israel.

Not in outline only is there similarity between what we might call the Pentateuch of Moses and the Pentateuch of David. If we have not in Psalm 1, as some think, the actual story of events in Eden, the foundation facts are there. Man is introduced. Good and evil, righteousness and life are set before him. Obedience to "the law of the Lord" results in being like "the tree planted by the rivers of water whose leaf doth not wither." Disobedience results in death, for "the way of the ungodly shall perish". Like Genesis also is the same sudden change in Psalm 2, from the individual to the national in open rebellion against God.

Some have sought to claim from this Psalm proof of the preexistence of the Son of God, but in Acts 13: 32, Paul quoting therefrom speaks of it as a "*promise to the fathers*", which promise he says was fulfilled in JESUS CHRIST. The words, "Yet have I set My king upon Zion, the hill of My holiness", and "Thou art My Son; this day have I begotten Thee", must therefore be regarded as in keeping with Romans 4:17, where Paul says God "callesth those things which be not as though they were". Verse 12 is of special difficulty to some. A scriptural explanation of "Kiss the Son" will be found in 1 Sam. 10:1, where the rite is shown to be that of expressing allegiance to the one *anointed of God to rule*, an event in the life of Christ yet future.

Two or three significant renderings in the margin of verse 1 are worthy of note. First, the change of the word "heathen" to "nations", for there will be few professedly heathen nations in the day of the Lord's wrath. Second, instead of the word "rage", the words "tumultuously assemble themselves" is

clearly a better translation of the original, and aptly describes the gathering together of armies bound together by treaty. Third, it is evident that the word "imagine" does not sufficiently convey the full force intended, as does the word "meditate". Fourth, it is the "peoples" as distinct from "the people" to whom specific reference is made.

Psalm 16:9-11

Here is another well-known Messianic utterance, part of which is quoted by both Peter and Paul as being prophetic of the resurrection of Christ. Here is in the Gospel in miniature, actually found in the Old Testament: life, death, and resurrection to life everlasting. It is interesting to note the change in the Revised Version in verse 9 from "rest in hope" to "dwell in safety". The former words carry with them to some minds a tinge of uncertainty as to the outcome; and that the Speaker Himself has still some part in the matter, for "hope" must surely be the product of life. Indeed some do affirm that Christ was the means of His own resurrection; John 10:17 and 18 being the basis for their belief, overlooking the fact that it is manifestly impossible that a dead person can take back, of his own power, the life that was lost. More than twenty times do the Scriptures positively affirm that it was GOD who raised Him from the dead. How beautifully in accord with Scripture fact are the words of this Psalm, "My flesh also shall *dwell in safety*, for THOU wilt not leave my soul in Hell . . . THOU wilt shew me the path of life"

Yes, we are glad to record the fact that Christ took His life again, but from whom? "He asked life of Thee, and THOU gavest it Him, even length of days for ever and ever."

Psalm twenty-two is perhaps one of the most prominent of the Messianic Psalms, for there we have some of the prophetic utterances of the Christ in the bitterest hours of His human experience.

Can we attempt to fathom the depth of feeling contained in those words, "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" Look back over His ministry as He journeyed on His "Father's business" and daily sought to do His Father's will. Look back on the days and nights spent in prayer and intimate communion with Him whom He told His disciples was His God and their God also. There is published, I believe, a Bible bearing the title, "The Emphasized Bible", showing to the reader the correct words on which emphasis should be placed. But to one who has passed any appreciable distance along life's pathway there will be little difficulty in rightly placing the emphasis here. Surely it will be, "My God, My God, why hast *Thou* forsaken Me?" In the Garden all forsook Him and fled. He could understand that, for was He not "touched with the feeling of our infirmities"? Paul said, "All men forsook me", but in the joy of realization he added, "The Lord stood by me". Oh, the contrast! We speak of agony of mind, but surely the bitterest cup of all must be that He who knew no sin must Himself be forsaken of God because He bore the sin of others. Up to the very last He had realized the presence of God, as is evidenced by His prayer in the Garden, but now when the guilt of your sin and mine was actually upon Him, God had to forsake Him that He might redeem them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.

But for a moment let the curtain drop over this awful scene, and let us again ask the question, "Who is He?" Some wishing to do Him honor say that

He is God—the great “I AM”—the one and “only true God”—“He that liveth for ever and ever.” To whom then does He raise this awful cry, “Why hast *Thou* forsaken *Me*?” They tell us that God died. Who, then, is represented by “*Thou*”, and to whom does the “*Me*” refer? Paul tells us “He was obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.” Reverently we ask, to whom was God obedient?

Passing over other verses let us now turn to verse 30: “A seed shall serve him; it shall be accounted to the Lord for a generation.” It was to the Jew a distinguishing mark of God’s favor that his “generation” might be well accounted. Jesus Christ had none, but God accounted to Him a seed that should serve Him, even the seed of Abraham by faith—“a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and peoples”; and, as we shall see later, the Scriptures add, “He shall *see* His seed, He shall prolong His days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in His hand.”

Psalm 45:6—“Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: the sceptre of Thy kingdom is a right sceptre” is the next important allusion to Christ to gain our attention. This is frequently quoted in support of the doctrine that Jesus Christ is God in the strictest sense that that word conveys. We need to give it careful consideration. Apart from Paul’s citation of it in Hebrews 1:8, as having direct reference to Christ, the context itself as contained in verse 7 (and also in Heb. 1:9) gives abundant evidence that the word “God”, as applied to the one spoken to, is used in a different and subjective sense to the one spoken of. Few realize that the Hebrew word “Elohim” here translated “God” is applied not only to the one true and living God, but to angels, also to idols, and under certain circumstances even to men; hence the context

alone can decide the import of its particular use. It must therefore be apparent to the most casual thinker that to apply the words "*thy* God" in any reference whatever to Him who is "God over all" would be contradictory in the extreme, for God Himself owes allegiance to none.

Psalm 72: Time forbids consideration of the many detailed references to Christ in the Psalms, but we cannot pass by those in the seventy-second Psalm. On most of these comment is needless. Clear and concise in expression, their appeal is vibrant with human experience and expectancy. For instance: verse 4, "He shall judge the poor of the people, He shall save the children of the needy, and He shall break in pieces the oppressor"; 7, "In His day shall the righteous flourish; and abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth; 14, "He shall redeem their soul from deceit and violence: and precious shall their blood be in His sight." This last is a very probable reference to those who suffer death for His sake. If so the next verse as rendered by the Revised Version is a beautiful comment; 15, "And *they shall live*; and to Him shall be given the gold of Sheba, and men shall pray for Him continually, they shall bless Him all the day long." Verse 17, "His name shall endure for ever: His name shall be continued as long as the sun: and men shall be blessed in Him: all nations shall call Him blessed." The marginal rendering of this verse is exceedingly interesting and is given as the direct rendering of the Hebrew. "His name shall be— shall be as a son to continue his father's name for ever." To some minds there is suggested in the first part of this something in the nature of a blank check, that is, His name shall be: "*Jèsus*", "*The Door*", "*The Way*", "*The Truth*", "*The Life*"; and the second is ample vindication of the truth that 'all

power is *given* unto Him.

Psalm 89:19—“—Then thou spakest in vision to Thy Holy One, and saidst, I have laid help upon one that is mighty, I have exalted one chosen out of the people.” Verse 27—“Also I will make Him My first-born, higher than the kings of the earth.”

Psalm 110: Another remarkable Messianic Psalm, the first verse of which Christ Himself made use of to confound the Pharisees when He asked them directly and pointedly, “What think ye of Christ?” “Whose son is He?” They say unto Him, “The Son of David.” Tactfully Jesus admitted their answer as correct and skillfully followed up the advantage thus gained by asking, “If David then call Him Lord, how then is He his Son?” The Pharisees left the question unanswered. It is remarkable that Matthew, Mark and Luke record the incident, but John omits it. Many to-day endeavor to make use of the passage to prove the *Deity* of Jesus the Christ, failing to see that two distinct Hebrew words are used for the word “Lord”. The first has direct reference to Jehovah, and this is made clear in the translation by printing the word in capitals, LORD. The second use of the word is the translation of the Hebrew word that implies homage to one who may be God, angel, or man, whoever may be the one spoken to. Apart from any knowledge of Hebrew, the casual reader surely must observe that two personalities are necessarily involved, for one speaks and the other is spoken to. Both, therefore, cannot be an actual fact the one God. Scripture is clear that Jesus Christ is the son of David; but Scripture is also abundantly clear that God (the *only* true God) has “*given* to Him a name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow.” Hence David rightly calls Him, “Lord”.

Verse 4: "The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek." In Hebrews 5:5 Paul quotes this passage in proof of the priesthood of Christ. Thus we have added to the honor of Prophet and King the honor of Priesthood, and it is interesting to note how steadfastly these three aspects of the Messiah are kept in view by the Sacred Record.

CHAPTER XII.

THE MESSIAH OF THE PROPHETS

Isaiah 7:14

WE NOW COME to the study of our subject in that portion of Scripture known to us as "The Prophets"; and we hope to verify our earlier remarks that as revelation proceeds the predictions concerning the Messiah increase not only in their number, but also in their interest and significance. We may further add that in some instances they embrace subjects relating to both the first advent and the second that is yet to take place. The prophets of Israel rank high in literary attainment. Even if that alone is the point of comparison with the great of other nations, they stand without a peer; but when the subject matter of which they write is also considered, it cannot be denied that they are unparalleled in the world's classics. The themes upon which they touch are both varied and sublime, and the language by which the message is borne wafts as on snowy pinions from the very precincts of the Almighty, bringing man into touch with his Maker. Greatest among themes which vibrate from their inmost soul is the wonderful truth that the Creator of the starry host above them, can stoop down to "reason together" with men concerning their sin;

and that the LORD JEHOVAH hath "laid upon Him (the Messiah) the iniquity of us all."

One of the peculiarities of Scripture prophecy is that it often conveys a message for the time present that has for its purpose also the foreshadowing of a greater event yet to come. Such seem to be the case in this instance. Matthew is the only evangelist who cites this prophecy as having reference to the Christ. For that reason, and because of the evident reference that Isaiah 7:14 has to events then happening, some have endeavored to maintain that Matthew's application was not justifiable. Still another objection raised is, that although His name was to be called Emmanuel" was not used during his human ministry His earthly life was He called by that name. How is this to be accounted for? Two possible explanations occur to one's mind, both of which seem to be appropriate.

The first is that though the actual name "Emmanuel" was not used during His human ministry, its meaning, "God with us", was amply exemplified in the title, "Son of God", which was made use of by Himself and by others. John 10:36; Mark 5:7; Matt. 14:33.

Further evidence that Jesus Christ was not the son of Joseph is borne out by the facts that the writers of the New Testament (27 books in all) regarded the Lord Jesus as the Son of God in a sense which they accorded to no other person in any period of the world's history. Ten of the books speak of Him fifty times as "the Son of God", "the Son of the Highest", and fifteen refer to Him eighty-six times as "the Son", or as "His Son", or "My Son" in relation to God. Thus in the New Testament we have one hundred eighty-six direct references to the divine sonship of *Jesus the Christ*. Six times only is He spoken of as "the

son of Mary", the "son of Joseph", or as the "son of the carpenter". Sixteen times is He spoken of as "the son of David". That He should, on occasion, naturally be identified as the son of Joseph is but additional evidence of the sincerity of the writers of the New Testament in recording facts. Even in our own time a child known to be of different blood to his "parents" is by common custom and courtesy recognized as belonging to them. The question has been asked, "Whom did Mary mean when she said, 'Thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing?' " The reply is given by asking another question, "Whom did Jesus mean when He said, 'Wist ye not that I must be about My Father's business?'" "

Again, can anyone read the life story of Jesus Christ without observing how frequently, and how sincerely and naturally He spoke of his Father. Whom did He mean? Certainly, not Joseph. Did any other man so speak before or since? Truly they said, "Never man spake like this man." That God in a number of instances in ancient times intervened to impart fertility to women who were barren is abundantly attested in the Scriptures. There was Sarah the wife of Abraham, Rachel the wife of Isaac, and Hannah the mother of Samuel. Others might be mentioned. The same God who, by His Spirit, visited and blessed the women of old to make them fruitful, caused Mary to conceive by the "power of the Highest".

"Orthodoxy" maintains that owing to the virgin birth two distinct natures, human and divine, were thus combined in the one person of our Savior, each being able to act and speak independently of the other, "sometimes as God, sometimes as man". We hope to touch upon this interesting topic when we come to the gospel narratives.

It will be noticed on reference to the margin of the Revised Version that Isaiah 8, in the Hebrew, has 23 verses, and that chapter 9 begins with verse 2 of the English translation. Thus Matthew, in citing this passage, in order to give full force to his message quotes Isaiah 8:23 and 9:1. Like many another writer he realizes that the subject matter of a picture is often greatly enhanced by the background upon which it is drawn; hence the background is taken from Isaiah 8, while the picture itself is contained in chapter 9. Let us look briefly at the history contained in these verses. The land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali, Galilee of the Nations, is the specified arena of interest. In the days of Asa king of Judah, the people of this district were carried away captive by Benhadad king of Syria, casting over the land a shadow as "the shadow of death". So lasting was the blight thus given to the district that even centuries later, in the time of Christ it was thought impossible that "any good could come out of Galilee," John 1:46; 7:41, 42, 52. But although as in the present day, those who should have known did not know, it was nevertheless, very definitely foretold that "a great light" should shine upon and shine forth from Galilee.

But why call it "Galilee of the nations"? Was it not because other nations had been planted there by Benhadad? Thus is accounted for the scorn of the people of Israel for the land of Galilee, and the cause of their failure to be a blessing to the people within their gates.

But God Himself had not forgotten the "land of the shadow of death". The prophet Isaiah, after speaking of trouble, darkness, and anguish, closes the chapter with these words as rendered in the Variorum Bible: "Yet (it doth) not (continue) dark, where

(now) is affliction; as in the former time He brought to shame the land of Zebulun and the land of Naph-tali, *so in time to come* He bringeth it to honor, even the tract by the sea, beyond Jordan, Galilee (or the district) of the nations." "The people that walked in darkness have seen a great light; they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined." Many of the references to the Messiah which the Pharisees themselves accepted were not so specific as this, yet they emphatically declared (John 7:52) that "out of Galilee ariseth no prophet".

But why is this passage so detailed in description? Why say "beyond Jordan"? Is there not a hint here that He who "came to His own and His own received Him not" will yet fulfill the promise to Abraham that in him shall all nations of the earth be blessed, even those "beyond Jordan"?

We now come to that well-known prophecy of Isaiah 9:6—"For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of peace." Many Scripture prophecies are spoken both in the present and the future tense; often in the present tense so as to indicate thereby the certainty of fulfillment. Yet, while thus making use of the present tense, the future tense also frequently occurs, and in such a manner as to show clearly that all parts of the prophecy do not come to pass simultaneously. Note how this is the case here: "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; . . ." This portion of the prophecy is spoken in the present tense. Again we would ask, Why? Is it not because it has reference to that portion of it which has already been revealed; and mainly because the prophet desires to express his belief that a promise of Jehovah

once given may be regarded as in the realm of practical accomplishment. The actual fact itself is, therefore, spoken in the present tense; the things that are to spring from it are revealed in their true futurist aspect. Viewed in this light we can see that the text divides into two natural divisions; and realizing what we now know, but was then not understood, it is not difficult to see that two distinct periods of the life of the Messiah are here referred to.

It is from this verse that those who advocate the underived deity of the Lord Jesus (for if He was "co-eternal with the Father" it could not be otherwise), seek to draw the proofs for their proposition. In their eagerness to give glory to Him whom the Father has already glorified, and will yet glorify, they fail to note a crucial weakness in their application of Scripture statement. The very part of the prophecy which they quote to prove that the Messiah (Jesus Christ) was and is GOD—GOD ALMIGHTY—when carefully read actually disproves their contention; for if their hypothesis were true the names mentioned *would already be His*, and it could not therefore in any right sense be said that He "*shall be called*" by them. Commentators favoring the "orthodox" view have almost invariably endeavored to connect the first of these names with the margin of Judges 13:18, with the obvious objective of affirming the preexistence of the Messiah. Several important considerations conspire to prove the error of this conception. We have already noticed one, and it is formidable; but others of equal force line up along side of it.

Judges 13:18 has reference to "an angel of the Lord" and, according to Hebrews 1:5, "unto which of the angels said that He at any time, Thou art my son . . .", cannot possibly apply to the Messiah. Further, it will be noticed that each of the names men-

tioned in Isa. 9:6, is a compound name. The first name is therefore Wonderful Counsellor. Moreover, Judges 13:18 gives no mention of a *name* in either text or margin.

The child has been born, and in a double sense the Son has been given to the sons of men, and to the sons of Jacob in particular; but not yet has He been called by these names, which, like all other Hebrew names, are of characteristic and definite purpose. So truly is this the case that we feel justified in extending the consideration of this prophesy, and we anticipate that the interest of the reader will be drawn forth in reverent acknowledgement that such a remarkable prophecy "came not by the will of man."

CHAPTER XIII.

THE MESSIAH OF THE PROPHETS

Isaiah 9:6

IN OUR LAST chapter we pointed out that the names in this verse which are applied to the Messiah *were to be His*; they had not in any sense been His, nor were they applicable to one then existing. That these names do not prove JESUS CHRIST to be the One whom Scripture represents to be the "ONLY true God", as so many to-day are endeavoring to teach, is borne out by several considerations apparent to anyone who will give careful study to the language of this remarkable prophecy. The very opening of this wonderful 6th verse of the ninth chapter of Isaiah, declares that the Messiah here spoken of is Himself a Gift, and therefore He cannot be the Giver of all good gifts, as a contemporary magazine states in its Christmas issue. The fact that the Messiah "is given", instinctively calls to the mind of the reader that much

loved and well known verse, John 3:16, "God so loved the world that he GAVE his only begotten Son. . . ."; and most reference Bibles connect these two passages by the marginal references. The words, "For UNTO us a child is born, . . ." also emphatically demand the recognition of a Giver, separate and distinct and superior to the Son who is given.

But apart from these evidential facts, the names themselves present added testimony that He of whom they are spoken is not, and cannot be, identical with Him who thus presents His Son. The verse following shows plainly that the names given have reference only to a period prophesied of the Messiah that did not obtain during any portion of his first advent, which was the period of His humiliation and not the period of His exaltation and kingship. True, during the time of His earthly ministry His identity as King of the Jews was clearly established; so much so that even the common people recognized Him as the "Son of David". And when Pilate placed the inscription at the top of the cross, "This is Jesus the King of the Jews", both the actions and language of those who opposed Him evidenced that it was no new claim. But, even so, the Christ was then only generally known by the *name* which was in keeping with and descriptive of the character of the mission for which His first advent was designed. Matt. 1:21.

That the names of the Messiah, to which we are about to direct special attention, do not apply now, and, therefore, cannot rightly be applied in the manner so commonly done, is proved, if the reader will carefully observe that they are given subsequent to the statement, "the government shall be upon his shoulder". It is when that has taken place that the Scripture adds, "And his name SHALL BE CALLED Wonderful Counsellor, mighty God, everlasting Fa-

ther, Prince of Peace.”

Not once in the Gospels, or in any of the Epistles are these names applied to the Messiah as *names* given to Him. Other instances occur in Scripture where GOD has predicted the name and character of the individual before his birth; and in each case it has been fulfilled literally. Why not so here; for the language is quite as specific? “Has he not said, and shall he not do it?” Surely the one who accepts this promise and purpose of JEHOVAH will be among those who will be privileged, in the day of its realization.

Now then, let us come to a brief consideration of these names by which, as Scripture declares, the Messiah “shall be called”. Let us take them in the order in which they are named, though in passing it may be well to call the attention of the reader to the obvious fact that the last mentioned could not at any time be appropriately applied to Him who is GOD alone, nor does Scripture ever so apply it.

The first in the list is, as we have already stated, “Wonderful Counsellor”. This rendering is given in the margin of the Revised Version and is also upheld by the following noted commentators: Dr. H. Ewald, Dr. A. Knobel, and Rev. Dr. T. K. Cheyne. Taking this translation as correct for the reasons stated, it is interesting to note that it embodies in the personality of the Messiah that very characteristic for which King Solomon prayed so devoutly on his accession to the throne of Israel, and for which he received the approbation of Jehovah.

Of the four names mentioned in this prophecy, probably that of

MIGHTY GOD

has drawn forth the greatest amount of comment.

Barnes, the noted and widely approved commentator, renders these words, "Strength of God", and when we consider that the name is given *by* GOD *to* the Messiah, and that in Genesis 31:29 the same word is translated "power", we can readily see the correctness of such a rendering; for only by the power of GOD could the GOD-given Messiah become the

"WONDERFUL COUNSELLOR".

Dr. W. Gesenius gives us the rendering, "Mighty Hero", and not without reason; for the same Hebrew word is applied to Nimrod, to Joshua's 30,000 men and even to false gods, showing evidently that, like most other words, it has both primary and secondary meanings of varied significance. When "the government shall be upon his shoulder", how beautiful and appropriate to know that He to whom GOD gives wisdom for Counsel, He also gives Strength.

"THE EVERLASTING FATHER"

How JESUS the Messiah, Himself the SON of GOD, could rightly be called "The Everlasting Father", must be a puzzle to any Bible student whether he be considered "orthodox" or otherwise. It is, therefore, not surprising to find several renderings put forward by Hebrew scholars; men of unquestioned ability and character. The Revised Version gives as the marginal reading, "Father of Eternity"; and Dr. Scofield says the marginal readings of the Revised Version are to be preferred. The Chaldee renders the expression, "Man abiding for ever"; the Vulgate, "Father of the future age". In this connection, it is interesting to note that kings have often been called the "Father" of their people. Bishop Louth gives the translation, "Father of the everlasting age". Thus, by careful comparison the basic meaning surely is not

difficult of apprehension, and in a sense in which no other individual can be, JESUS CHRIST will be "the Father of the Everlasting age".

"THE PRINCE OF PEACE"

This is the fourth and last name given in this wonderful prophecy. If it be true that GOD reserves His best until last, then surely this is the best name of the four, and it is only when "the government shall be upon his shoulder" that the culmination can be peace. But before the government can be upon His shoulder, something else must be there first. Let the reader turn to that beautiful parable of the lost sheep in Luke 15:5-7. We read in Exodus 23:20, 21 that GOD'S name was to be in the angel who was promised. It is stated that this angel could not pardon transgression. If true of him that GOD'S name was in him, then how much more true must it be of the Messiah who was foreshadowed by type and prophecy as the one through whom transgression should be forgiven! Viewed in this light the difficulties disappear.

The prophecy becomes more real, more understandable, more true, because in harmony with God-given revelation, and more precious because He who put His shoulder to bear the burden of our sin will yet carry the government there and the issue will be peace—peace everlasting in the everlasting ages, "and his name shall be THE PRINCE OF PEACE."

CHAPTER XIV.

WOUNDED FOR OUR TRANSGRESSIONS

HEBREW NAMES are generally full of interest, and Bible names often have considerable signifi-

cance as well as interest. Isaiah, means "Salvation of God", or "God saves", either of which is appropriate and significant of the theme of the book. For some years past the author has endeavored to give prominence to the thought that Salvation is of God. So many, in their desire to give honor to Him "who died for us", seem to forget this great fact that "God saves." This wonderful thought is not only conveyed by the name Isaiah, but it permeates the whole book. In other parts of Scripture, God seems to stand, as it were, behind His representative; but here in this supreme matter of the salvation of man when the time has come for a deeper and fuller revelation, God Himself stands forth in the grandeur of His majesty. Can we wonder, then, that this book of Isaiah is without a peer in the realm of literature, sacred or profane? It opens with a picture of SIN almost unparalleled in its pithy portrayal; it ends with its destruction in language that can leave no dubiety of its ultimate fate; but in between these extremes there is given us a plan—GOD'S PLAN—of *Salvation*.

Little by little we have been watching the gradual unfolding of the story of Him who is the pivotal center of its circumference, until in our human weakness we have felt the need of Divine interpretation in relation to its achievement, even though so far, "the half has only been told".

We cannot stay to quote all that is said of the successful carrying out of that which is foretold of the Messiah, who, up till now, at any rate, in regard to his nature is never represented in any other than human relationship. These facts are beautifully harmonized in Isaiah 11:1, 2.

That the Messiah is to be of "THE STOCK OF JESSE" is put in all the baldness that language can display,

and then, lest human reason should stagger at the greatness of the task laid upon Him, Jehovah reveals the fact that "the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, and the spirit of knowledge and the fear of the Lord, and he shall be of quick understanding in the fear of the Lord." Again in chapter 42, verse 1, God Himself speaks as if this were already done—"I have put my Spirit upon him" Later, in the 61st chapter, part of which was quoted by our Lord, the source of power to be manifested by the Messiah is again given—"The Spirit of the Lord GOD is upon me"

It is a wonderful study, the study of the Spirit of God. Job makes known to us the fact that GOD by His Spirit "garnished the heavens", 26:13. David declares that its presence is universal. Psa. 139:7, 8. And Paul of that same Spirit testifies that "in him (GOD) we live and move and have our being". Acts 17:28.

It is often contended that Jesus Christ (the Messiah) is the Creator of heaven and earth, but in this 42nd chapter of Isaiah GOD Himself lays claim to that honor, stating that He who created the heavens and the earth, also was the GIVER and *sustainer* of the Messiah who was to come, and that His glory (the glory of creation already spoken of) would He *not* give to another. Verse 9 is of particular interest in this connection: "Behold the FORMER things *ARE* come to pass . . ." What "former things", if not the things of creation already referred to? ". . . And NEW things DO I DECLARE; before they spring forth I tell you of them." Again we ask, What "new things" are referred to unless it be those just declared relating to the Messiah?

Very brief allusion must be made to the 49th chap-

ter before we may pass on to that well known passage, Isaiah 53. That the early verses of this chapter have reference to the Messiah is generally conceded, especially so verses 5 and 6. In verse 5 the obvious inference is that the Messiah is called of GOD from the very commencement of His being. All through prophecy, as here, the primary mission of the Messiah is to "the tribes of Jacob". But GOD regards that as "too light a thing" for so faithful a "Servant", and further promises Him that He should be GOD'S salvation "unto the ends of the earth". The writer does not think that *in this instance* the word "earth" (*eretz*) is limited to any geographical *portion* of the earth as we now understand the word. Doubtless the word has more limited usage than is generally supposed by many Bible students, but such an interpretation would be entirely out of place here; for in that case the comparative extension of the honor would be extremely small. The present wonderful increase of knowledge, and the breaking down of all barriers between nation and nation encourage the belief that the prophecy will be literally fulfilled the world over.

We come now to the 53rd chapter of Isaiah. Probably no other passage among the prophets has made both Jew and Gentile to gaze in bewildered wonderment at its predictions. That it has definite reference to the Messiah cannot be questioned, much as the Jew would like to contest it. The passage really begins at the thirteenth verse of the previous chapter, and the designation there of the Messiah as GOD'S "Servant" identifies it with the prophecies we have just considered. It is interesting to note the change of the Revised Version from "prudently" to "wisely", and the high esteem in which wisdom is held as being a prominent characteristic of Him who is the theme of

our studies. Hitherto the varied aspects of prophet, priest, and king, have each had share in prophecy. That of Sin-bearer has been shadowed in type and is now foretold in fact, and that, too, with a precision and definiteness not exceeded in any given phase of prophecy. The uppermost thought throughout the passage is that the suffering was not on His own account, but for the sins of others: "He was wounded for OUR transgressions, he was bruised for OUR iniquities, and the chastisement of OUR peace was upon him, and with his stripes WE are healed." "For the transgression of my people was he stricken". "He shall bear THEIR iniquities". "He bare the sin of many and made intercession FOR THE TRANSGRESSORS".

These are some of the expressions occurring in a short passage of about 8 or 9 verses. Did time permit, much, very much, interesting comment might be made on this absorbing passage of Scripture, which is a marvel of condensed statement concerning the Messiah. We can only stay to point out some of the most remarkable features in the prophecy. Whether verse 4 can be interpreted to mean that the Savior suffered much sickness and pain may be open to question. We are, however, given at least one scriptural interpretation in Matthew 8:17. There, the evident meaning is that He bore them away, and in exactly that same sense did He bear our iniquities. Thus is taken away one of the main supports of the doctrine that JESUS CHRIST was by nature "*sinful flesh*".

Verse 5. "He was wounded for our transgressions." Variorum Bible tells us, He was "pierced for our transgressions" is the literal rendering of the Hebrew.

Verse 8. Here the study of the various possible renderings is well worth while. The underlying thought seems to be that none of His generation (con-

temporaries—Variorum Bible) considered (cared) that He was *cut off* from the land of the living, even though the sentence of DEATH was really due to them—not Him.

Verse 9. Variorum rendering—“Men appointed his grave with the wicked and with the rich man his tomb.” The Revised Version—“And they made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death.” Quoting on the authority of another, the word “rich” is in the singular and the word “wicked” is in the plural. (*Note*— If any reader can suggest why the word “death” in this verse, is in the margin said to be “deaths” the writer would be pleased to have the information. Reference is given to Ezek. 28 :8, 10, but no explanation.)

Verse 10. “It pleased the Lord to bruise him.” Why? One can only conjecture the reason to be that GOD looked beyond the suffering to the glories that shall be revealed. Paul did the same, for he said, “If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable.” If Christianity is a fact, IT IS A GREAT FACT, for the life that now is, and “*for that which is to come.*”

CHAPTER XV.

THE MESSIAHSHIP OF JESUS

THE SPIRIT OF THE LORD GOD is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted; to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord.”
Isaiah 61:1-2.

Recently a correspondent made the surprising statement that "It is not our business to analyze but to accept what the Scriptures teach." One can readily understand that such a declaration will find wide concurrence because of the seeming loyalty it expresses for the Scriptures. The real question is, however, if blind acceptance of any statement can in the best sense be considered as honoring the One who made it. Loyalty of that kind does not generally result in a robust or an intelligent faith. It is perfectly true that we *are* called upon to accept what the Scriptures teach, *but thank God there is another fact that is equally true.* God Himself does call upon us to "reason together" with Him; and no faith in God's Word is ever made the weaker because of reverent and careful analysis. We get a splendid illustration of this in the verse heading this chapter. The wording is sublime; and meditative consideration of the meaning of its various parts, first separately then collectively, cannot be otherwise than invigorating.

The message is put into the mouth of the Messiah by Isaiah the prophet, and the deep reverence of the speaker is apparent at the very outset. Twice in the same sentence does he seek to draw attention to the greatness of the One of whom he speaks by pointed reference to Him by name; thus incidentally showing his own identity to be distinct from and dependent upon the One to whom he thus pays fitting tribute. In other words, he seems to say, "The works that I do are *not mine*, but His"—"the Spirit of the Lord God is upon me"—"the Lord hath anointed me"—"*He* hath sent me to bind up the brokenhearted." Doing the works of God by the power of the Spirit of God, He, unlike the first Adam, rejected the temptation "to be as God" (see Gen. 3:5, R. V.)—"he considered it not a thing to be grasped to be equal with God.

but made himself of no reputation.”

We may sometimes be asked what proofs we have of the Messiahship of Jesus the Christ. We would reply that we have much here in the fulfilment of this very verse. Of what other prophet of God could it be said that God had anointed him for the purpose of preaching “good tidings to the poor”? (See margin.) Were not the messages of those who had gone before the Christ largely messages of denunciation and of warning against the rich and those who had misapplied the blessings of God? Note the contrast. The Messiah was to preach “*good tidings*”, and that “*to the poor*”. The question then comes, “Did He?” Christianity deals with facts, so again we ask, “Did He?” One has but to read the simple stories of His life by Matthew, Mark, Luke and John to be convinced that He did. Again and again and again is the record made that “great multitudes followed him”; and it is distinctly stated that “the common people heard him gladly”. No man ever had such audiences because no man ever had such a message—a message of *life to dying men*. Take the next—“He hath sent me to bind up the brokenhearted”. Here the reader will find a reference to Psalms 147:3—“He healeth the broken in heart and bindeth up their wounds”; margin, “grief”. Then call to mind that “he was a *man of sorrows and acquainted with grief*”. Little or nothing is known of nearly twenty years of the life of our Lord, but it is significant that that period of His life was spent in the district which had gained the unenviable reputation of being “the land of the shadow of death—Galilee of the nations.” Twenty years is no small portion in molding the life of any man. The circumstances that will harden most lives will draw out the sympathy of others, and “acquaintance with grief” can be made either a millstone of de-

spair to one's self, or through God a means of practical compassion for others. We all know how the sorrows of others touched the heart of the Lord Jesus as shown in the cases of Mary and Martha, the widow of Nain, yes, and even the thief on the cross.

But we are not yet done with that wonderful verse. The next commission given to the Messiah is "to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound". The full significance of the first part of this statement can hardly be understood without a careful reading of Exodus 21 and Jeremiah 34, wherein is depicted the departure of the children of Israel from Jehovah's law of liberty for every man and every woman in servile bondage to his fellow-man. With regard to the latter part we notice that two possible renderings are given in the Revised Version; and that although the revisers have relegated to the margin the words "the opening of the eyes" and have retained in the text the words "of the prison", they have been careful to put the latter phrase in italics. Surely this would tend to show that there is indicated here relief from mental and spiritual bondage as well as from the physical bondage of the oppressor. It is well known that when reading this passage in the synagogue at Nazareth, our Lord did not read further than the words, "to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord." He had *not* come *then* to proclaim "the day of vengeance of our God". Reference to the margin of this second verse will give us a reading which is full of interest: "the year of Jehovah's good pleasure"; and if the reader will turn back to Leviticus 25:9, he will there find abundant reason for a very satisfying explanation of such a happy consummation as "the year of the Lord's good pleasure", for there *atonement* and *liberty* are ordained of Him.

CHAPTER XVI.

JESUS THE KING

BEHOLD THE DAYS COME, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and he shall reign as King and deal wisely, and shall execute judgment and justice in the land. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely, and this is his name whereby he shall be called JEHOVAH-TSIDKENU."—Jeremiah 23:5-6, R. V.

In earlier chapters it was pointed out how things were foretold of the Messiah, which, taken together, could only apply to one individual, for the possibility of all predictions made concerning Him finding their complete fulfilment in more than one person is beyond conception. It was thus made clear that in the setting forth of so many characteristics of the coming Messiah, it was God's purpose to put His identity beyond all question, and in this way frustrate the claims of others. In the chapter preceding this one we observed that prophecies concerning the Messiah in Isaiah 61 were fulfilled in Jesus Christ in a most remarkable and literal manner, thus adding further testimony to the truth that Jesus Christ, and Jesus Christ only, was the rightful claimant. This point definitely established, the inevitable result is that other prophecies concerning the Messiah must have their application to Him. A further point is brought out by a careful study of the statement that if the literal fulfilment of prophecies is admitted proof of the Messiahship of JESUS CHRIST—and we cannot see how tangible and evidential proof can be otherwise obtained—then other prophecies which are admittedly Messianic, and are as yet unfulfilled, must of necessity

find their fulfilment in the same literal manner.

With these preliminary remarks we can now come to close grips in the study of the passage heading this chapter, of which Bible students are unanimous in declaring its undoubted reference to the Messiah. There is widespread belief among certain sections of the professing church to-day that the second advent of the Lord Jesus Christ has already occurred: that He is already here; the claim being made that the advent took place in 1874. Another group, perhaps the largest, has practically given up such hope. They do not expect, and do not look for the return of Jesus Christ. In fact, any such event is emphatically denied. The best answer that can be given to both these schools of thought is to call their attention to the facts already stated; for apart from these even they are without definite proof of the Messiahship of Jesus who is called the Christ, and without which their own faith in Him is devoid of basic value. Have they failed to grasp the momentous issue that if their faith in *Jesus as the Christ* has for its foundation prophecy fulfilled, and fulfilled literally, and if this passage which we are now considering is also Messianic, *then it, too, must be subject to the same literal interpretation?* Such a conclusion is irresistible and incontrovertible. It therefore becomes imperative to inquire, "What in these verses is actually predicted of the Messiah?"

The first prediction is that He shall be a righteous Branch of the house of David. This, it will readily be granted, can have no reasonable fulfilment except in actual fact. Therefore the very nature of the prediction is established at the outset. It was because some of David's descendants were not righteous that the kingdom was overturned, its subjects scattered and carried captive to foreign lands. The next thing

predicted is that "he shall reign as king and deal wisely", and that wisdom shall be manifested in the execution of judgment and justice in the land.

Let us recapitulate for just a moment. We have already granted certain very important facts, namely, that we could only know of the identity of Jesus Christ as the Messiah from prophecy fulfilled literally; also, that without question this particular prophecy has direct reference to the Messiah, and consequently to *Jesus Christ*. The question next in order is, "Have the events there recorded ever taken place?" The only possible answer is a most emphatic, "No"; for history past or present affords no record of them. True, Jesus Christ did claim His right to kingship both as to lineal descent and in fulfilment of prophecy concerning Him. That the claim had basis in the fact is also evidenced by Pilate's inscription on the cross, and the direct testimony of others. But it is one thing for a person of royal descent to claim the right to kingship, and altogether another matter for him to actually *reign as king*.

Not only is it predicted that the Messiah (Jesus Christ) shall reign as king, but the statement is added that He shall reign as king "in *the land*". Of the land referred to there can be no question, for, "in his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel (see also 33: 16) shall dwell safely."

In spite of the plain prophecies with reference to the land of Palestine and the city of Jerusalem in particular, only recently a religious journal, the circulation of which approaches millions, openly declared that "these events shall take place in America, and not in Palestine as many suppose."

It therefore needs no "special elucidation of a difficult passage" to determine the meaning of this prophecy, for its language is plain and its message is

clear: so clear that a child may understand, look forward to and pray for its glorious consummation.

Events to-day in the land of Palestine may truly be likened to a fig tree putting forth its leaves, so that we may know that summer is nigh, even at the doors; and we cannot refrain from recalling the closing words of the prelude to this little book: "Blind must he be who cannot read the writing on the wall, in that the kingdom is preparing, and the King *already lives.*" When that King comes, as come He *must, if this prophecy, like others, is to have fulfilment,* we have the assurance that He will deal wisely, and that judgment and justice will be executed by Him.

Just another thought ere we close the study of this unique passage. Reference has already been made in earlier articles to the names given to the Messiah, and to the fact that some of them are yet to be His when "the government shall be upon his shoulder". The same truth is stated in almost identical language here. In Isaiah 9:6 the statement is made that "the government shall be upon his shoulder, *and his name shall be called Wonderful Counsellor*" In Jeremiah 23 we are told "he shall reign as king, . . . *and this is the name whereby he shall be called, JEHOVAH-TSIDKENU*". If the passage in Isaiah 9:6 is to be fulfilled in Jesus Christ, we believe that in Jeremiah 23:5, 6 must also be. There is, however, a parallel passage in chapter 33 where Jeremiah applies the name JEHOVAH TSIDKENU to the city of Jerusalem. There is no necessary discrepancy, for both facts may quite possibly be correct. Christ Himself calls the city of Jerusalem "the city of the great king", (Matt. 5:35); and it is not at all improbable that with a change of rule and dispensation that Jerusalem will also change its name.

In studying these prophecies and finding their ful-

filment to be literal, in the certain knowledge of truth already fulfilled, we have the added pleasure that they are themselves *the guarantee* of that which is yet to come, continually pointing forward to the dawn of a yet more glorious day.

CHAPTER XVII.

BUT NOT FOR HIMSELF

DANIEL 9:26 WAS MENTIONED as one of the passages for our consideration ere we close our study of this great theme in the Old Testament Scriptures. It is not with any special claim of understanding Bible prediction regarding the chronological order of predicted events that we attempt to comment thereon. We would rather refer the reader to other writers for such information.

This is, perhaps, one of the most outstanding chronological predictions in the whole Bible. Here is foretold in precise language the time of the Messiah, His death, the reason for His death, and the resultant historical events subsequent thereto. Here we would ask, "What other religion can produce a single fact which was actually foretold of its founder?" Some would endeavor to harmonize Christianity with other existing and preexisting religions by seeking to draw comparisons with them; but we would again point out, as we have pointed out before, that the strength of Christianity lies not in its comparisons with other religions, but rather in its contrasts to them.

There is no ambiguity about the statement that the Messiah shall be "cut off", although a modern commentator of wide repute says, "The meaning of this phrase is far from clear." Anyone who will give reasonable heed to Old Testament phraseology will

have no difficulty in coming to the conclusion that the death of the Messiah is here predicted, and that in this instance, at least, to say nothing of others, those who complain of ambiguity of Scripture prediction have no just cause for complaint. Clearly enough the death of the Messiah was predicted centuries before His birth.

The richness of meaning contained in both the Hebrew and Greek languages is well known among Bible students, and we could earnestly wish that ordinary Bible readers appreciated this fact more. They would then see a beauty and depth of meaning in many Scriptures, where now, to them, seeming contradictions balk their progress in Scripture interpretation and the fulness of the divine purpose is obscured from their view. Then, instead of seeking to limit the divine revelation to one translation, they would thank God for the variations that give added viewpoint of the same truths without in any way whatever subtracting from their fundamental veracity. Some of these may be found in the margins of any version, each giving what is considered by the translator a legitimate substitute for the words in the text. By careful, prayerful study of these, not only will a richness of meaning be sometimes added to the subject under consideration, but if the rendering which brings the passage into harmony with the *definite and unalterable* language of Scripture elsewhere is adopted, many a doctrinal difficulty will find its solution, to the great joy of the Bible student. Therein is this verse just such an illustration. The phrase, "but not for himself", is altered by the Revisers to "and shall have nothing"; and the reading of the Authorized is entirely omitted both in text and margin. It should not be difficult to understand, for the statement that after being "cut off" *he shall have nothing* is a tru-

ism so obvious that if any other rendering imparts additional information, its claim to recognition would seem to be greater. Two alternative renderings are given in the *Variorum Bible*, the first of which is also given in the margin of the Revised, thus, "There shall dies without issue. He has, therefore, "no successor", There are strong reasons in this instance for retaining the text of the *Authorized Version*; for the whole trend of all the predictions, both typical and prophetic, of the sufferings and death of the Messiah is that of representation. This was specially noted when *Isaiah 53* was under consideration. Further corroboration for adopting this as the primary interpretation is found in the remarkable utterances of *Caia-phas* that "it was expedient that one man should die for the people."—*John 18:14*.

The other two renderings mentioned are significant and worthy of notice. In them the additional truth is conveyed that not only does the Messiah suffer death representatively, but that in doing so He dies without issue, He has, therefore, "no successor", as indicated by the second rendering to which we have just made reference. These facts when taken in conjunction with our previous study that the Messiah is yet "to reign as king" in the land are certainly pregnant with meaning; and they call to mind *Psalms 21:4*—"He asked life of thee, and thou gavest it him, even length of days for ever and ever." He will therefore need no successor.

Following this statement of the death of the Messiah, we have given us, in perhaps the most precise language that history affords, the resultant issues that follow, namely, the invasion of the land and city; the destruction of the city and sanctuary, the cessation of the ritual of the latter; the enemy coming in like a flood; and a "decree of desolations" (see *Variorum Bible*) which have been in the process of fulfilment

during this Gentile age.

How wonderfully are sorrow, pain, and suffering interwoven with ultimate joy and blessing predicted in this prophecy of the prophet Daniel! The evil is pictured briefly, it is true, but with no sparing hand; but underlying it all and permeating it all is the fact that the Messiah shall be “cut off, *but not for himself*”; for He “did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth”—1 Peter 2:22. “He was wounded *for our* transgressions he was bruised *for our* iniquities: and the chastisement of *our* peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed.” “He hath poured out his soul unto death: and he was numbered with the transgressors; and he bare the sins of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.”—Isa. 53: 5, 12. “For the transgressions of my people was he stricken.”—Isa. 53:8. How very striking are these predictions when compared with the words of Caiaphas, “It was expedient that one man should die *for the people.*” For their rejection of Him the nation was stricken also, but only “until that determined shall be poured out upon the desolate.”

By again looking at the alternative rendering of the last passage we have brought before us the remarkable fact that while God uses the “desolator” for the carrying out of His purposes in the punishment of His people, He none the less holds him responsible for unwonted attack upon the nation of His choice. The time will come, as it has in the past in lesser degree, when God will judge the nations that have not done justice to the descendants of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, who, with the Messiah as their recognized and rightful King, will yet be the center of blessing to the whole earth.

CHAPTER XVIII.

FROM BETHLEHEM TO GOD

MICAH 5:2 IS, as we intimated in an earlier chapter, the last chosen Scripture for consideration of this topic. "But thou Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth *have been* from of old, from everlasting."

There has been in the passages that have engrossed our attention regarding the Messiah, one uppermost thought expressed, and that is the kingship or rulership of the Messiah as a definitely appointed King over Jehovah's chosen people. The same thought is uppermost here. Many are not able to see why Bethlehem should be chosen as the birthplace of the Messiah; and few probably know that this little city is more than once spoken of in Scripture under another name, viz., Ephratah, which name is supposed, by some, to have been given by Caleb after the name of his second wife. However that may be, it is certain that from thence came the beginnings of God's covenant with David. Referring to his promise to build a house for God, and God's promise to him that of the fruit of his body God would set upon his throne, he says in Psalms 132, "Lo we heard it in Ephratah." Bethlehem, however, is the name by which it was best known and loved, for it called to the mind of the devout Jew such conspicuous names in Hebrew history as Rachel, Boaz, Samuel and Ruth. But Bethlehem is known by yet another name which has linked it for all time with those things which are of vital interest to the House of Israel. It is called the *City of David*.

Like many another scriptural prophecy, there is combined in this both the plain and that which is in some degree obscure. That there is here predicted that which is to come forth out of BETHLEHEM, a ruler for God's people Israel, there can be no dispute, for this fact stands out as the main theme of the prophecy. So definite is the language of this portion of the prophet's utterance, that when Herod inquired of the Chief Priests where the Messiah was to be born, there was no hesitancy whatever in naming Bethlehem as His birthplace. It is the next phrase, "whose goings forth have been from of old from everlasting", that has caused division among Christians; some maintaining that a preexistent state of life from all eternity is here predicated of the Messiah; while others, believing that the birth (or beginning of the life) of the Christ is so explicitly revealed in other passages of Scripture in a manner entirely inconsistent with such an idea, seek to find from other Scriptures an explanation that will bring the whole into harmony.

The principal phrases here relied upon for belief in the preexistence of the MESSIAH are—"whose goings forth" and "from of old, from everlasting." It is always advisable to seek from an author's own writings the meaning he attaches to any particular phrase. Have we then in the Book of Micah anything equivalent to either of these phrases? Yes, in chapter 7:20, the words, "from the days of old" are from the same Hebrew words used in Micah 5:2. In that passage the reference is clearly limited to the days of "our fathers", and as the subject matter of both is practically identical, the same limit of time is attached. But a passage of Scripture which very definitely confirms this view is to be found in Amos 9:11 (where the raising up of the House of David could scarcely be told in language more parallel to that of Micah

5:2. That the words "from everlasting" in Micah 5:2, have not the significance of eternity, will be found by reference to the margin, where the reading is "from ancient *days*," thus bringing the chronological aspect of the matter well within the limits of Bible history. This is an important point; for if such is the case then it is equally clear that if the "goings forth" here referred to are actual personal appearances of the Messiah, the prophecies quoted definitely make allusion to them; and the records of them will be found in the Scriptural records of Israel's past.

That there are what are known as the "Theophanies" of the Old Testament is very generally believed, but as it is also believed that these appearances were angelic (Christ appearing in the form of an angel) Heb. 1:5, would seem to settle the question that such could not "at any time" be the case. Other Scriptures also would seem to deny the supposition, and *evidence*, not inference, is essential where vital truths are at stake. Had such appearances really occurred, it would seem to be incredible that Paul or other apostles should not mention them. What then are the "goings forth" referred to in our text? The writer would frankly acknowledge that the answer to that question has occasioned him much thoughtful study and considerable enquiry. While some of the suggestions given have in a measure been helpful, the writer has not had the heart satisfaction that they fully answer the difficulties. There are two, if not three suggestions that may each individually give satisfaction to some, one appealing to the mind of one, the other to the mind of another, and the evidence of them all combined will be to others threefold proof of the correctness of our conclusions.

The first is that "goings forth" refers to the various occasions of prophetic utterance concerning Him

who should come, and to the foreshadowings in type and ceremony of the varied aspects of His life and character.

The second view is that the Messiah being recognized again as God's Son, both in the Old and New Testaments, His "origin" (as the word is said by some authorities—viz., Drs. Gesenius, Ewald, Hernig and others, to mean) was in God—God Himself eternal. This view is, I believe, advanced by Lesser the noted Jewish commentator. The first and second considered together certainly have weight.

But there is a third explanation which the writer feels the more natural when actual scriptural comparisons are made. The Hebrew word from which "goings forth" is derived, is in Young's Concordance said to have the meaning of "outgoings", and some assert that it is the place of outgoings that is referred to. This is remarkably confirmed by reference to 1 Chron. 5:16, where "goings forth" is given as the marginal reading for "borders". It will be noted that the whole passage is addressed to Bethlehem—"Thou Bethlehem"—and that Bethlehem is for the moment the center of interest, for Bethlehem is singled out among the thousands of Judah as the birthplace of the Messiah. Attention is further called to the facts that her "goings forth" or "borders" had their origin in "ancient days" or "days of old". Bearing these thoughts in mind, and keeping in view what has already been said relative to these phrases, Micah 5:2, might be correctly translated as follows:

"But *thou* Bethlehem Ephratah, whose goings forth (or borders) have been from of old from ancient days; though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of *thee* shall come forth to me, *He that is to be Ruler* in Israel."

With such a translation and interpretation, har-

mony reigns throughout, and when the following facts are re-considered this will be more apparent :

1st. Bethlehem is being addressed throughout, "Thou Bethlehem".

2nd. The passage is limited as to time by the phrases "ancient *days*", and "the *days* of old"; thought of eternity being thus debarred.

3rd. That it is the PLACE of "outgoings", "origin" or "borders" which have been from "days of old". Thus the reference is clearly to the antiquity of Bethlehem, and not of the Messiah.

4th. The Ruler was to come forth *from* Bethlehem *unto* God, not from God unto Bethlehem.

The study of the *living* Christ, the Christ of the New Testament, should be of even greater interest than the one we have pursued in these pages, that of the Christ of the Old Testament, interesting as that has been. Nothing approaches so closely to the hearts of men and of women as the *living, throbbing personality* of One who has actually lived, actually died, and now actually *lives again* on their behalf. No story of man can ever touch it for sublimity, for no man has ever done what has been done by Him to whom God gave the Spirit without measure.

