

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

*THE MESSIAH OF OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECY
AND APOCALYPTIC AND THE CHRIST OF
THE NEW TESTAMENT.*

“ I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.”—*MATT. v. 17.*

As the University Statutes prescribe as the subject of this Sermon¹ a consideration of the Jewish interpretation of prophecy regarding the Messiah, and its fulfilment in the New Testament in the person of our Lord, it is incumbent on the preacher to define, at the outset, the method he intends to pursue.

First, then, he has to decide whether he is to treat of Jewish interpretation prior to the Christian era, or of Jewish interpretation subsequent to it. If he elects to adopt the latter alternative, he must confine his attention to the consideration of the Old Testament passages messianically applied in Rabbinic writings, such as the Targums, the ancient Midraschim and the two Talmuds. Moreover, as these passages were all but exhaustively collected in recent years by Dr. Edersheim, the preacher has the materials on his subject ready to hand, and by their help could discharge his duty in the present instance with little pains to himself, but with still less profit to his hearers. For as the passages in question are collected from writings which range from the first century of the Christian era to the seventh or later, it is clear that they do not represent the exegesis of any one age, and no truly coherent conception of the Messiah and the Messianic Kingdom could be constructed from them. But even if such a construction were possible, it would be profitless to attempt it. The materials are valueless owing to the theory of inspiration and the

¹ Preached before the University of Oxford, Jan. 26, 1902.

peculiar rules of interpretation prevalent in later Judaism. The theory of mechanical inspiration dominated the Rabbinic mind in an almost unintelligible degree. This theory impressed an infallible character on each and all the parts of the Old Testament, even on its individual words and letters, and made its statements, however discrepant, all equally authoritative, and all equally true. But this theory of inspiration is all that is admirable in comparison with their rules of interpretation. It would not be much of an exaggeration to say that by means of these rules a skilful Talmudist could deduce from any Biblical passage whatever almost any conceit he pleased, and the justice of this statement could be sustained in no little degree from the later Jewish interpretation of Messianic prophecy.

I have therefore decided to ignore Rabbinic interpretation on this question, and to devote our thoughts to pre-Christian Judaism, and especially to the contributions made to our subject in the last two centuries before Christ, when inspiration had not as yet forsaken Palestine, and when through the mutual interaction of a vigorous religious life and thought, developments were made and permanent results achieved in this province.

I propose therefore to notice, first, the salient features and developments of the Messianic hope in Jewish prophecy and apocalyptic, and next the actual views of the Messiah, which the Jews entertained at the beginning of the Christian era.

By so doing we shall gain on the one hand a representation embracing the permanent elements of the Messianic hope in Jewish prophecy and apocalyptic, and on the other hand we shall be able to compare the actual fulfilment of this hope in our Lord and the nature of the fulfilment that was looked for by contemporary Judaism.

Before entering on this subject it is hardly necessary to

premise that our investigations are based on the inductive or critical theory of inspiration, and not on the mechanical—that ancient legacy of Judaism. The critical theory examines the several books of the Bible as it would any other document, and studies each by itself and in its historical environment with a view to ascertaining its character, message and date. By no other method can we arrive at valid results. It is true, indeed, that theologians as a rule disown the theory of mechanical inspiration, and yet how frequently are they guilty of the evil of textmongering, which is its logical offspring, of the rending of passages from their contexts, and the wresting from them of meanings which they could not possibly bear.

To return, the books of the Bible, when rearranged by criticism in their original order of composition, appear no longer as detached units, standing often in unintelligible isolation from each other, but as articulated members in a coherent and organic movement of spiritual evolution, in which God's purposes take concrete form in an ever increasing degree.

It is from this standpoint that we address ourselves to our subject. The dates assigned to and possibly the names connected with certain of the Old Testament developments are provisional, but their provisional character does not necessarily affect the cogency of the conclusions.

Now, if we would understand Jewish Messianic prophecy in relation to its fulfilment in the New Testament, we must study first the Messianic Kingdom or the Kingdom of God as foreshadowed in that prophecy, and next the characteristics of the expected Messiah. The subject is immense: we must therefore confine ourselves to the salient characteristics of each conception.

First then as to the expected Kingdom. In pre-prophetic times this expectation, so far as we can discover, was fixed

on the future national blessedness, that was to be introduced by the day of Yahweh. According to the popular conception which was current down to the eighth century and later, this golden age was to be merely a period of material and unbroken prosperity, which the nation was to enjoy when Yahweh overthrew Israel's national enemies. In this pre-prophetic period Monotheism was non-existent in Israel. Israel had its own Deity Yahweh, just as the neighbouring nations had their own deities, and Israel questioned the existence of the latter just as little as that of the former. Originally the sovereignty of Yahweh was conceived as conterminous with His own land and His own people, and His interests as absolutely identical with those of Israel. Though Yahweh might become temporarily estranged, He could never forsake His people, and to them were confined all His redemptive acts and gracious purposes. This very ancient view of Yahweh was still the popular one in Israel in the eighth century, as we learn from the Prophet Amos. But this low nationalistic conception of God was overthrown by the monotheistic teaching of the great eighth century prophets. Yahweh, they taught, was the God of all the earth and there was no God beside Him. As such all nations were His, and they no less than Israel were the subjects of His judgments and His redemptive purposes. Yet the old nationalistic claims, that Yahweh considered Israel only, survived side by side with the prophetic monotheism, which logically rendered them nugatory and anachronistic, and of these claims even some of the prophets made themselves the mouthpiece.

Thus we come to distinguish two lines of prophetic succession in Israel. The first is that which frankly accepts monotheism with the universalism that naturally flows from it, that is, the inclusion of the Gentiles within the sphere of Divine judgment and Divine blessing. The second is that which accepts monotheism yet illogically

excludes either wholly or in part the Gentiles from God's care and love, and limits His gracious purposes to Israel alone.

Of the former attitude, Jeremiah may be taken as the typical exponent: of the latter, Ezekiel; and thus these two great prophets of the exile may be regarded respectively as the spiritual forerunners of Christianity and Judaism.

But abandoning for the present the consideration of this radical difference in the Hebrew prophets, let us turn to those expectations in which they were agreed. The chief of these, we find, was the establishment of God's actual reign on earth. All or nearly all the pre-exilic prophets teach the advent sooner or later of this Kingdom. It was, they universally agreed, to be introduced by a national judgment—collective judgment for collective guilt—limited in its scope according to earlier prophecy, but world-wide according to the prophets of the seventh century and onwards. Over this Kingdom either God Himself was to reign or the Messiah. This Kingdom itself was to last for ever and its scene was to be the present earth according to pre-exilic prophecy.

With the two great prophets of the Exile the Messianic expectation enters on a fresh stage of development. Before the Exile the nation was the religious unit, and the individual as such had no religious worth and could not approach God except through priest or prophet. But with the deportation of the nation to Babylon and the overthrow of the temple and its settled order of priests and sacrifices, the individual came of necessity into direct and immediate relation with God, and henceforth constituted the religious unit. Man must stand face to face with God: God's law must be written on man's heart. The new teaching thus proclaimed a Kingdom of God *within man*. This kingdom within man was not indeed to be a substitute for the Messianic Kingdom, but a preparation. The spiritual

transformation of Israel, individual by individual, became henceforth an indispensable condition for entrance into the coming Kingdom of God. On this condition of entrance into the kingdom all post-Exilic prophets are at one, but, as we have already seen, they were utterly at variance as to the destined comprehensiveness of the Kingdom.

Jeremiah held that it was to embrace all the Gentiles, who should enter it by conversion: Ezekiel and his successors that even those Gentiles who survived the judgement were to be excluded from it for ever. Thus Jeremiah and Ezekiel founded or rather re-founded two very diverse schools of development. Jeremiah taught universalism, that is, that God's gracious purposes embraced all mankind, and that Zion was to be the spiritual mother of the nations: Ezekiel taught particularism, that is, that the Jews only were the objects of God's love. Thus in this otherwise noble prophet of the Exile, the heathenism of primitive Israel survives so far as to represent God's attitude to the Gentiles as that of an omnipotent and merciless deity.

This view of Ezekiel tends at first sight to shock the reader; but he soon comes to condone it, when he reflects that Ezekiel's heathenism in this respect is as nothing compared with the inexpugnable heathenism of one great branch of the Christian Church, which would exclude from the Kingdom of God on earth not heathen communities as did Ezekiel, but Churches of Christ no less Christian than itself; and whereas Ezekiel's ostracism of the non-Israelite was limited to this life only, the Latin Church would condemn to eternal destruction the members of other Churches of Christ, which are no less fruitful than itself in good works and are indefinitely richer in knowledge and wisdom.

But to return. Let us emphasize the two chief notes of the kingdom enunciated in the prophetic school of Jeremiah and his successors: First, the Kingdom was to be *within man*: religion was to be individualized: God's law to be

written on man's heart (Jer. xxxi. 31-35): man's soul was to be the dwellingplace of the Most High: "Thus saith the high and holy One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is holy: I dwell in the high and holy place with him that is of a contrite and humble spirit" (Isa. lvii. 15).

Secondly, the Kingdom was to be *worldwide*, embracing all the nations of the earth.

It is now our task to trace the development of the third note of the Kingdom. Hitherto prophecy had looked forward to the present earth as the scene of the Messianic Kingdom, but about the middle of the fifth century a new view appears on the horizon in Isaiah lxx.-lxxvi., for which the past indeed had made some preparation. Not the earth in its present condition, this later prophet declares, but a transformed heaven and earth were to be the scene of the Kingdom. If the traditional text is correct, this transformation was not to take place instantaneously and catastrophically, but gradually, advancing *pari passu* with the spiritual transformation of man. In the course of this spiritual and physical transformation the wicked were apparently to be gradually eliminated from the community. The righteous were to attain the full limit of their years—no doubt 1,000—and the sinner was to be cut off prematurely at the age of 100. This peculiar view reappears but twice more in Judaism in the Book of Jubilees, and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs which belong to the second century B.C.; but though it did not hold its ground it prepared the way for the next and final form of this eschatological hope, which furnishes the third chief note of the Kingdom. This final form arose about the close of the second century B.C., when in the growing dualism of the times it was borne in alike on saint and sage that this present world could never be the scene of the eternal Messianic Kingdom, and that such a Kingdom demanded not merely a new heaven and a new earth akin in character to

the old, but a new and spiritual heaven and earth, into which flesh and blood could not find an entrance. Here at length we have arrived at the third note of the Kingdom. The eternal Messianic Kingdom *can attain its consummation only in the world to come*, into which the righteous should enter through the gate of resurrection.

To recapitulate: we have now the three chief notes of the coming Kingdom of God. First, this Kingdom was to be a Kingdom within man—and so far to be a Kingdom realized on earth. Secondly, it was to be worldwide and to ignore every limitation of language and race. Thirdly, it was to find its true consummation in the world to come.

Let us now turn to the New Testament and inquire if the Kingdom introduced by our Lord possesses the three notes of Old Testament prophecy and apocalyptic. The matter can be dispatched in a few words; for these three notes summarize in the shortest possible way the actual characteristics of the Kingdom established by Christ. Thus in answer to the Pharisees asking when the Kingdom of God should come, our Lord declares: "The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, Lo here! or There! for lo! the Kingdom of God is within you" (Luke xvii. 20, 21). Again, Christ's Kingdom is universal. "The Kingdom of God," declares our Lord speaking to the Jews, "shall be taken away from you, and shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof" (Matt. xxi. 43); and "many shall come from the east and from the west, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the Kingdom of heaven: but the sons of the Kingdom shall be cast into outer darkness" (Matt. viii. 11, 12). Elsewhere in the Parable of the Sower He states that "the field," that is, the scene of the Kingdom's activity "is the world," (Matt. xiii. 38). This second note of the Kingdom follows naturally from the first. If character is the sole qualification for admission into the Kingdom, then wherever that char-

acter is found there the Kingdom of God is already actually present. Finally, it was to be consummated in the risen life. "The Son of Man shall send His angels, and they shall gather out of His Kingdom all things that offend and them that do iniquity . . . Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the Kingdom of their Father" (Matt. xxii. 41). This is the Kingdom of God come "with power" as St. Mark (ix. 1) describes it.

We thus see that the Kingdom established by Christ corresponds in its deepest aspects to that foreshadowed in the prophetic and apocalyptic writers. It embodies the permanent elements in the past development and fuses them into one organic whole.

Not so however with Judaism. Still clinging to their claims as the only true Church of God, the Jews could not accept the universalism of the greater prophets or this universalism as embodied in the teaching of Christ. God was the God of the Jews only, they held, and of the Gentiles only so far as they were admitted to Judaism. There was no hope either here or hereafter for the world outside the Jewish pale. Thus the Jews, by refusing to part with the unspiritual particularism of the past, unfitted themselves for the reception of the higher revelation of the present, and whilst seeking to exclude the Gentiles from the Kingdom of God succeeded only in excluding themselves.

This must be the natural nemesis of all such exclusiveness or particularism in Judaism or Christianity.

We have now dealt with the chief characteristics of the expected Kingdom. We have next to deal with those of the expected Messiah. Here our attention must not be fixed on points of detail, nor must we seek out the manifold instances of minute correspondence between this hope in the Old Testament and its realization in the New. It would be an *ignoratio elenchi* to press the fulfilment of special predictions as proofs of the Divine guidance of

events, where we regard the whole movement as divine. Here again our views of the expected Messiah must be drawn from the broad view of prophecy as a whole.

But greater difficulties beset the study of this subject than that of the Kingdom. Biblical critics are divided as to the date when certain of the chief factors of this expectation arose. Thus some would bring the prediction of the ideal King down to Exile times. But on the present occasion we may safely waive the consideration of such questions, and address ourselves forthwith to the main question before us, that is, the relation of the Messiah to the Kingdom of God. The student of the New Testament naturally looks on these two ideas as strict correlatives. To him the Messianic Kingdom seems inconceivable apart from the Messiah. But even a cursory examination of Jewish prophecy and apocalyptic disabuses him of this illusion. The Jewish prophet could not help looking forward to the advent of the Kingdom of God, but he found no difficulty in conceiving that Kingdom without a Messiah. Thus there is no mention of the Messiah in Amos, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Joel, Daniel: none even in the very full eschatological prophecies of Isaiah xxiv.-xxvii., or in the brilliant descriptions of the future in Isaiah liv. 11-17, lx.-lxii, lxv.-lxvi., which spring from various post-exilic writers. Nor is the situation different when we pass from the Old Testament to the subsequent Jewish literature. The figure of the Messiah is absent altogether from the Books of the Maccabees, Judith, Tobit, the Book of Baruch, certain sections of the Ethiopic Book of Enoch, the Slavonic Enoch, the Book of Wisdom, the Assumption of Moses. Hence it follows that, in Jewish prophecy and apocalyptic the Messiah was no organic factor of the Kingdom. Sometimes he was conceived as present, but, just as frequently, as absent. When he was absent, the Kingdom was always represented as under the immediate sovereignty of God. Thus Jewish

prophecy and apocalyptic represent the Kingdom either as under the direct rule of God, or else of the Messiah as God's representative. Judaism carefully differentiated these two conceptions, and never represented the Messiah's jurisdiction as trenching on the divine, save in a single production of the first century before Christ. The supreme prerogatives of forgiveness, of judgement, of lordship over death, were always reserved in Judaism to God alone. We shall return to this point when we come to deal with the fulfilment of these expectations in the New Testament.

Having now recognized that the Messiah was not an organic factor of the Kingdom, we must shortly consider His chief characteristics in Old Testament prophecy and apocalyptic. We may consider these under the usual distinctions of the ideal King, the ideal Prophet, and the ideal Priest.

The prophecies which centre in these three conceptions are no longer submitted, as they were in the past, to the perverted ingenuity of commentators and preachers, who seemed to believe that prophecy consisted of a series of riddles and conundrums, the interpretation of which was to be achieved by the cleverest guesser. Such a view no longer prevails. We do not now suppose that the prophets had definitely before them even the chief events of Christ's life, as Dr. Sanday points out in his *Bampton Lectures* (p. 404) or any distinct conception of that great Personality. What they saw in prophetic vision was the ideal figure of King, or possibly of Prophet or of Priest, figures suggested by the events of their own days, and projected into the future and that a future ever close at hand. Where the Messiah is expected it is all but universally as the ideal King. The personal ideal Prophet is nowhere distinctly sketched, but is rather to be inferred from the great picture of the prophetic nation portrayed by the second Isaiah. These two

hopes were never combined in Old Testament prophecy. Indeed prior to the advent of Christianity, Jewish exegetes seem never to have apprehended the Messianic significance of the suffering Servant of Yahweh. The idea of a crucified Messiah was an impossible conception to the Judaism of that period.

But the indistinctness which attaches to the expectation of the Messiah as prophet does not attach to that of the Messiah as the ideal Priest in the Old Testament. This expectation, which did not arise earlier than the second century B.C., is clearly attested in the 110th Psalm. The older exegetes indeed held that this Psalm spoke of the ideal Priest of David's line, and they assigned this Psalm to the authorship of David. This date and interpretation, as Dr. Driver shows (*Literature of Old Testament*,¹ p. 385) can no longer be sustained, and the Psalm is now referred by many of the ablest scholars to Maccabean times. While some are of opinion that Jonathan the brother of Judas, and others that Hyrcanus the son of Simon, was the subject of this Psalm, Dr. Cheyne, in his Bampton Lectures, has advocated with superabundance of argument, that it was addressed to Simon the Maccabee, after that he had been constituted "ruler and high priest for ever," by a decree of the nation, in the year 142 B.C. (Macc. xiv. 27 sq.). A remarkable confirmation of this view has lately been brought to light by Bickell, a distinguished Roman Catholic scholar, who has recognized that the first four verses of this poem form an acrostic on the name Simeon. That Simeon or Simon, according to its Greek pronunciation, was regarded as introducing the Messianic Kingdom appears also from a passage in 1 Maccabees xiv. Finally, we may remark that the only Jewish high priests, who ever bore the title "priests

¹ Only once more in the Old Testament is this expectation referred to, i.e. in Jer. xxx. 21, which, according to Duhm, belongs to the Maccabean period.

of the Most High God," were the Maccabean—a title which they assumed as reviving the order of Melchizedek when they displaced the Zadokite priesthood of Aaron.

We have therefore in this Psalm a combination of the two offices of priest and king in the person of Simon. These titles were most probably used by its writer in the hope that the Messianic Kingdom would be established in Simon's days. If now we pass from Jewish prophecy to Jewish apocalyptic we find analogous expectations.

The chief authorities for Jewish Messianic expectations in the second century B.C. outside the Canon are the older sections of the Ethiopic Book of Enoch, the Book of Jubilees, the main body of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, and 1 and 2 Maccabees. In studying these works the reader is at once struck by the all but entire absence of the figure of the Davidic Messiah or the Messiah descended from David and Judah. Where this hope is expressed (Eth. En. xc. ; Jub. ; Test. Jud. 24) it is practically without significance, and its belated appearances seem due mainly to literary reminiscence. And yet this century is far from wanting in descriptions of the Messianic King ; but His descent is no longer traced to Judah but to Levi. This expectation is clearly set forth in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. How can such a novel expectation, so much at variance with all the past have arisen ? There can be hardly a doubt that it was owing to the descent of the great Maccabean family from Levi. Around the various members of this family every thing that is noble in the Jewish history of the second century revolves. Is it a matter for wonder, then, that the zealous Jews, who were looking for the speedy advent of the Kingdom of God, thought that this Kingdom was to be introduced by the Maccabees, or even that the Messiah himself was to spring from this family ? At all events an apocalyptic visionary, who wrote when Judas the first great Maccabee

was still living, held that Judas would go on warring successfully against Syria and the Gentile nations, till the Messianic Kingdom was ushered in by God. But Judas fell in 161. The fulness of the times had not yet come. The place of Judas was forthwith taken by his brother Jonathan, who assumed the high priesthood in 153, and in him, possibly, the Messianic hopes of many in the nation centred for a time; but Jonathan fell by his sword in 142, and the hope passed on to Simon, the subject of the 110th Psalm. Simon was the first Maccabee whose high priesthood was recognized by the entire nation, and this they did in words which significantly described him as "ruler and high priest for ever." A hymn describing the Messianic blessedness of his reign is preserved in the Sadducean work 1 Maccabees xiv. 8 sqq.

Then did they till their ground in peace,
And the earth gave her increase,
And the trees of the field their fruit.

The ancient men sat in the streets,
They all communed together of good things,
And the young men clad themselves gloriously but not with garments of war. (So Syriac).

For every man sat under his own vine and figtree,
And there was none to make them afraid."

A still nobler Messianic hymn of the second century is found in the Testament of Levi 18.

Then the Lord will raise up a new priest,
And to him all the words of the Lord will be revealed
And he will execute a righteous judgment on the earth in the fulness of days.

And the glory of the Lord will be uttered over him
And the spirit of understanding and sanctification will rest upon him,
And he will give the majesty of the Lord to his sons for evermore.

And there shall none succeed him for all generations for ever
And in his priesthood all sin shall come to an end
And the lawless shall cease from evil.

Simon was succeeded by John Hyrcanus in 135, and this great prince seemed at last to realize the expectations of the past; for according to a contemporary writer Hyrcanus embraced in his own person the triple office of prophet, priest and civil ruler (Test. Levi 8), and a statement to the same effect is found twice in Josephus. It is said, moreover, in the former second century authority that Hyrcanus "would die on behalf of Israel in wars seen and unseen" (Test. Reuben). But alas for the vanity of human wishes! This most highly gifted member of the Maccabean family was also the last that could in any sense be regarded as noble and religious. From henceforth the Maccabeans became Sadducean in the most evil sense of that term.

From the second century B.C. we pass to the first, and witness a revolution in the expectations of the people corresponding to that in the character of the Maccabees. As the Maccabees in the second century were leaders in all that was best in religion and in morals, so the Maccabees of the next century were foremost in godlessness and immorality. The Messianic hopes of the nation accordingly relinquished the thought of a Messiah of priestly descent and fell back on that of the kingly Messiah, sprung from David, and this expectation soon held the field without a rival. But the warlike character of the Maccabean priest-kings left its impress, and not for good, on the revived hope of the Davidic Messiah. Thus in the Psalms of the Pharisees, which belong to this period, the Messiah is conceived as embracing in His person all the patriotic aspirations of the nation: He is, it is true, the righteous ruler of Israel, but He is no less assuredly the avenger of their wrongs on all the heathen nations. The Pharisaic

party was henceforth committed to political interests and movements, and henceforth, in the popular doctrine, the Old Testament Messiah, the Prince of Peace, became a Man of War. Such a doctrine, it is true, was offensive to some of the noblest Pharisees, such as the author of the Assumption of Moses, who, writing in the early decades of the Christian era, lifted up his voice in protest against the leavening of religion with earthly political ideals; but he protested in vain, and the secularization of the Pharisaic movement culminated in the fall of Jerusalem.

We now come to the New Testament, where we must try to determine the relation that exists between the prophecies of the Messiah in the Old Testament and their fulfilment in the New. We need not linger long over them. We have already seen how Christ's Kingdom realized all that was permanent and best in Old Testament prophecy. It is needless to urge that, as the ruler of such a spiritual Kingdom, He gave the fullest consummation to the Old Testament ideal of the Messianic King, who reigned in righteousness over a regenerated people. And we can understand how as the ruler of such a Kingdom He of necessity held aloof from and opposed unto the death the low and earthly expectations of the nature which we have briefly traced above. Next as regards the prophetic office, it is sufficient to point out that till the advent of Christ no thought of Judaism seems to have connected with the Messiah the greatest picture of the prophet in the Old Testament, that of the suffering Servant of Yahweh. These two conceptions of the ideal King and the ideal Prophet or Servant of Yahweh appear in the Old Testament to be outwardly antithetic and incapable of coalescence in a single personality. But when we turn to the New we find that these two ideals of the past have by a spiritual synthesis been reconciled and fulfilled in a deeper unity, in the New Testament Son of Man. As to the priestly office, we have

seen that the connexion of this function with the Messianic hope was of late origin. Notwithstanding, it was taken up and fulfilled by our Lord in its deepest aspects. His coming death was to be a ransom (Mark x. 45) for the sins of many and His priesthood to be realized in the freewill sacrifice of Himself.¹

We have now sketched roughly the characteristics of the Messiah and the Messianic Kingdom in the Old Testament, and touched still more briefly on their fulfilment in the Christ of the New. But even if we had done this in an absolute completeness, it would still be obvious that these Old Testament ideals fail to exhaust the fulness of Christ's claims and personality. Possibly a purely human personality could have given a fairly adequate fulfilment of the above threefold office of king, prophet and priest. The Jews at any rate had no difficulty in recognizing such a fulfilment in John Hyrcanus the Maccabee, though the prophetic gift in his case is synonymous merely with the predictive, and hence falls absolutely short of the true prophetic ideal.

All the Old Testament ideals, then, though realized in one personality, cannot justify the tremendous claims made by the Son of Man in the New. For whereas the Messianic Kingdom in Old Testament prophecy and apocalyptic is just as frequently conceived without the Messiah as with Him, in the New Testament the Messiah forms its divine Head and Centre, and membership of the Kingdom is constituted first and chiefly by a living relationship to Him.

Thus our Lord allows no rival claim, however strong, to interfere between Himself and the soul of His disciple. "He that loveth father or mother more than Me is not worthy of Me" (Matt. x. 37); "If any man cometh unto Me, and hateth not his father and mother and wife and children, he cannot

¹ The priestly office of the Messiah might be deduced from that of the suffering Servant of Yahweh, but this was not the original conception of the writer.

be My disciple " (Luke xiv. 26). Again this imperious claim to devotion extends to the life of the disciple in its deepest issues: "Come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest" (Matt. xi. 28). Only through Him can man have access to the Father: "None knoweth the Father save he to whom the Son willeth to reveal Him" (Matt. xi. 27 ; Luke x. 22).

As other claims which are without any parallel in the Old Testament prophecy of the Messiah we should mention first His claim to judge the world: and next to forgive sin; and finally to be the Lord of life and death. In the Old Testament these prerogatives belong to God alone as the essential Head of the Kingdom and appear in those prophetic descriptions of the Kingdom which ignore the figure of the Messiah, and represent God as manifesting Himself amongst men. Here then we have the Christ of the Gospels claiming not only to fulfil the Old Testament prophecies of the various ideals of the Messiah, but also to discharge the functions of God Himself in relation to the Kingdom.

If to the synoptic conception of Christ to which we have confined ourselves hitherto we add the Johannine and Pauline, the parallel between the relation of Christ to the Kingdom in the New Testament and the relation of God to the promised Kingdom in the Old becomes still more complete.

It is needless to press this subject further. We shall only add that though in the gracious Figure depicted in the New Testament we have a marvellous conjunction of characteristics drawn from the most varied and unrelated sources in Old Testament prophecy and apocalyptic, yet the result is no artificial compound, no laboured syncretism of conflicting traits, but truly and indeed their perfect and harmonious consummation in a personality transcending them all. So far indeed is the Christ of the Gospels from

being the studied and self-conscious realization of the Messianic hopes of the past, that it was not till the Christ had lived on earth that the true inwardness and meaning of those ancient ideals became manifest, and found at once their interpretation and fulfilment in the various natural expressions of the unique personality of the Son of Man.

R. H. CHARLES.