

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1931

Saving Faith in the Old Testament

Frederick L. Miller

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_millerf@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Miller, Frederick L., "Saving Faith in the Old Testament" (1931). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 662.
<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/662>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

SAVING FAITH IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

A Thesis
presented to the faculty of
Concordia Seminary
St. Louis, Mo.
by

Frederick L. Miller

in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree
of

Bachelor of Divinity

Saving Faith in the Old Testament

1. The Problem: Since faith in Christ is absolutely indispensable for salvation; and since by faith in Christ the people of the O. T., like those of the N.T., must have been saved, since there is salvation in no other name (Acts 2, 42): we must be able to find this faith expressed or implied in the O.T. There is sufficient testimony in the N.T. for this faith of the people of the Old Covenant, and so for Christians our problem is no problem; but when we deal with Jews, and when we consider the matter historically, we are thrown upon the O.T. alone, and from that alone we must prove our propositions. From this standpoint the writer read through the O. T. cursorily several years ago, and he was struck by the scarcity of expressions on the faith of the people of God. When these occurred, he found them too general to be fixed on the Messiah. He was likewise struck by the total absence of all explanation of the "types" of the Messiah, which are so often used as testimony for the faith of the Jews. Ecclesiastical bywords dwindled: "Faith" occurred only once; and "Messiah", referring to Christ, only six times, three cases of which are doubtful! Accordingly he set himself the problem of investigating the O.T. to find "faith" in it; not general faith, but saving faith, specific faith in the Messiah.

2. Sources: The only primary source is the O.T. We shall stress the Pentateuch both because of its date* and because of its importance to the Jews, who considered all the rest of the O. T. merely exposition of the Pentateuch**. Without further proof we shall assume that the Massoretic text is the correct one, the

*We consider it the first book of the O.T. canon.

**Kohleth rabba 63d: Wenn Israel würdig gewesen wäre, so hätte es auszer der Thora keiner weiteren Offenbarung durch die Propheten und Kethubim bedurft. Taanith 25: Is etwas geschrieben in den Kethubim, was nicht angedeutet wäre in der Thora? Weber 79

true Word of God. To enter upon emendation theories and LXX errors in the case of any of our proof texts would carry us too far afield. Moreover, we shall also assume that the written Word was the clearest exposition of revelation of which the prophets were capable. We hold that Isaiah, for example, could not speak more definitely of the Messiah than he did. He could not possibly explain his own prophecies as we explain them today in the light of the N. T. He had reached the limits of his knowledge of the Messiah in his book. --

As secondary sources we shall use the N.T., the Apocrypha, and the Targums. The N. T. and the Apocrypha will be used for historical testimony only; and the Targums cautiously, since they do not accurately represent the views of the true Israelites.

3. Method: Since the Hebrew for believe is the hiphil of יָדַע, we shall examine this word, together with pertinent derivatives, very closely both for its essential meaning and its contents, studying each passage in which it speaks of faith in God. In the same way we shall treat its synonyms, אָמַן and אָמַן. This is the chief work of this paper.

In the second part we shall then glance at O.T. theology about sin and its remission, justification, righteousness; at a representative type; and especially at Messianic prophecy: For if we can establish that the whole view of the O. T compels one to include Christ, we shall have gained our point, even though "faith" itself is not definitely defined. We shall illustrate from certain confessions of the patriarchs. Here, naturally we shall have to proceed in a rational way; for we are trying to use the O.T. to compel Jews to go to the N.T.

I

4. Etymology and essential meaning of יָדָא: The root meaning of יָדָא, as it is found in various Semitic languages, it to be firm, to be reliable. It occurs in three conjugations: qal, niph'al, and hiph'il. In the qal only that active and passive participle are found; the active denoting one who is firm, the support, the master: the nurse (Ru. 4, 16 of Naomi), the foster-father (Est. 2, 7 of Mor-dicaï). The passive participle (only in Lam. 4, 5) denotes those who are supported, those who are raised. -- The niph'al is only partially passive. It has a large number of meanings, in all of which the root meaning is evident; but the passive sense appears in the meanings to be confirmed, to be established; then, to be durable, faithful, trusty. Thus 2 Sam. 7, 16: The throne of David's descendant is established forever. Is. 1, 21: Jerusalem was once a city that was faithful to Jehovah.

In a general way we can say that the hiph'il is the causative of the qal, 'to be firm'. 'To believe' means to make something your support, your firm basis and foundation. This is an active-causative sense. It corresponds exactly to the Greek πιστεύειν and the English 'believe'. The hiph'il is construed with אֶל, בְּ, עַל, and מִן. The prepositions אֶל and בְּ rule out the declarative sense, 'to declare one firm', on the analogy of דָּבַר אֱשֶׁר, 'to declare righteous'. And the construction with עַל is the very strongest: 'To believe in' means 'to build upon', to ground one's self in'. Moreover, we distinguish between a civil and a religious usage of יָדָא. That is civil usage when the object of believing is worldly affairs or men. The religious usage occurs when the object is God or sacred matters. According to Gesenius, יָדָא occurs 50 times in the

canonical books and once in the Apocrypha. Deducting the parallels there are 17 instances of the civil and 19 of the religious usage.

The civil usage of יִדְמַן: There are a few instances in which the meaning 'to believe', 'to make (something) the firm foundation' are doubtful. In Job 39, 24 it is argued that the meaning ought to be 'stand fast'. The construction is with בְּ. "And not does it believe when the trumpet sounds." The horse is charging and it does not rely on the sound of the trumpet; i.e., it doesn't heed it. Hence, believe is correct. -- The correlate of יִדְמַן is a word, a sound of some kind, a speech, a promise. Whenever the object is a person, we have the pregnant construction; i.e., the person stands for his promise or his words. Thus Ju. 11, 20: Sihon did not believe Israel; i.e., the promise of Israel not to destroy anything in his land. בְּ (in the sense of בְּ) introduces the statement believed. Thus Ex. 4, 5: They will believe that there appeared unto you Jehovah. The rather weak construction with בְּ occurs most frequently in the civil usage. It has the meaning of 'leaning on' to support one's self with the belief. Thus Gen. 45, 26: Jacob's heart fainted, for he believed them not. He did not accept their word as true and support himself on it, and thus strengthen his heart. The construction with בְּ denotes limited reliance; but with בְּ it is unconditional reliance. This is brought out especially by 1 Sam 27, 12: וַיִּבְרַח דָּוִד וַיָּבֹא אֶל-אֲחִישׁ בְּיָדָיו: And Achish believed David. Although David was an Israelite, Achish trusted him unconditionally, grounded himself upon his faithfulness, because he seemed to have cut himself off from his own people by ravaging their country. That this was unconditional reliance is shown by the fact that Achish made him "keeper of his head." -- All of this is important to show

just what the conception of the Jew was of believing. But it is in the religious usage that we expect to find saving faith expressed; and therefore we shall consider each passage more carefully.

5. Religious use of יָצָא: In a general way the points derived above hold here, too. They may be summarized as follows:

- 1. יָצָא always means 'to make something one's firm support or foundation.'
- 2. According to the religious usage the object of faith is always directly or indirectly God.
- 3. The correlate of faith is always a word, and here especially the word of prophecy.
- 4. הַ and הֵ are applied to show a weaker and a stronger relation respectively.
- 5. We shall attempt to establish that the foundation of faith in the O. T. is Christ, the Messiah.

a) Gen 15, 6 is the first passage in which יָצָא occurs. The situation is this: Abraham, returning from his victory over Chedorlaomer, was disturbed, perhaps on account of the possible consequences of his attack, more probably on account of his childlessness. When God appears to him and encourages and strengthens him, He forbids him to make Eliezer his heir, and promises him a race of descendants that shall be like the stars in number. This, as well as the rest of the occurrences of the chapter, takes place in a vision (Gen 15, 1: וַיִּרְאוּ). But in v. 6 follows an historical notice: "An he believed in Jehovah and He counted it to him righteousness." This is a detached statement. The הֵ is a הֵ consecutive and does not bind the sentence to the promise of the preceding verse alone. "Believe" cannot here mean that Abraham simply thought, this promise of earthly seed is going to come true; believed in the sense that we believe some report. But it means he made Jehovah his foundation and did that continually as a matter of habit (*). As its correlate, יָצָא

*Cf. Gesenius Grammar 112 ss; so also Driver and König.

has a word. But in this case the word is not Gen 15, 5 only, but all the promises of God. It is significant that כִּי, the strongest preposition, is used. Abraham grounded his faith in God, יְיָ, the God of mercy, the "I am that I am" and "I am with you," the unchangeably Gracious. Also by this name reference is made to the many promises which Abraham had received: By tradition he heard Gen. 3, 15. Directly he had received Gen. 12, 3: "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." These plainly Messianic passages are included by the כִּי יְיָ. And that Abraham understood them to be Messianic will be brought out in the next section (*). And in Gen. 15, 5 the seed of Abraham, which was to be as the stars of the heaven, was not only the carnal seed--that's evident from God's statement about Ishmael, Gen. 21, 12--but especially the spiritual seed, the children of Abraham in the sense of faithful believers.

This faith God counted to him for righteousness. חָשַׁב has the meaning of reckon, count, account, think, credit. In no way does it indicate that Abraham was in himself righteous. So if faith was accounted to him, there was not any merit in his works. Not his blind obedience (Gen 12, 4), not his courage due to trust in Jehovah in the time of trouble (Gen. 14, 14), but his faith was counted to him for righteousness. Hence, it is ridiculous to think that חָשַׁב here means simply assensus, agreeing that God was telling the truth. This is fiducia in the mercy of God wrought through the promised Seed of the woman. חָשַׁב is the proper conduct, rectitude, integrity. The Robinson translation of Gesenius' Lexicon explains "counted it to him for righteousness" as "held it as a proof of his upright sincerity and piety." But this does violence both to חָשַׁב and to צְדָקָה. As the words stand, they mean that God counted Abraham righteous because of his faith.

* Below, P. __. For Christians, Jo. 8, 56: "And saw it."

This sense is emphatically brought out by St. Paul in Rom. 4 and Gal. 3. In the former passage Paul is speaking to Jews--if not exclusively at least partially. He is trying to bring proof for his statement that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law (Rom 3, 28) and that this faith rests upon Christ (Rom 3, 24). He would have been cutting his own throat with his argument, if his Jewish correspondents had not understood this passage to mean faith in the Messiah. And what has he to say of the righteousness of Abraham? "To him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly his faith is counted for righteousness."

Another argument, that this righteousness was imputed, is set forth by st. Paul in Gal. 3, 17ff. The Law of God was not yet proclaimed when this imputation of righteousness was made. Hence, Abraham's righteousness was not from the Law. Nor had the covenant yet been established with circumcision as its sign (Gen 15, 18). Hence, it wasn't the covenant that brought righteousness. It was faith and faith alone, that was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness. Did that faith embrace only the promise of a large family? Not at all! Abraham recognized in his promises of seed a continuation of the promise to Eve. the Seed that should crush the serpent's head, the Seed which Eve thought she had born when she brought forth Cain, which she called "Lord."

b) The next passage in which יְהוָה occurs is in Ex. 4, where God appoints Moses to deliver the children of Israel. It is significant that here the Angel of the Lord is dealing with Moses. The Angel of the Lord it is, who says "I am that I am." No created an-

gel could make this assertion, even as representative of Jehovah. And even if he could, the Angel of the Lord cannot be a created angel because he allows men to worship him (Ju. 6, 20), which not even the great angel of Rev. 22, 9 allows (cf. v. 13); hence, He is Jehovah. But He is distinct from Jehovah, because in other passages He speaks of Himself apart from Jehovah (Gen. 22, 16; Ju. 6, 12; Ju. 13, 16; but especially Zech 1, 12). Therefore He is Christ, the Savior, the Messiah.

Here, then, Moses is in direct contact with the Messiah. And Moses knew that the Angel of the Lord was the Messiah. It is even very possible that "Angel of the Lord" was one of the names of the Redeemer in those days, because Jacob calls Him that name in Gen. 48, 16: "The Angel which redeemed me from all evil." "Messiah" occurs for the first time in 1 Sam 2, 10. Other possible names were "Seed of the woman," (Gen. 3, 15); "Shiloh" (Gen. 49, 10); and perhaps מָשִׁיחַ (derived from Gen. 48, 16).

Moses first says, "They will not believe me." וְלֹא יִשְׁמְעוּ אֵלַי. Here it is not the person but the word of Moses that they would not make the firm basis of their faith. And the word of Moses was the word of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Ex. 3, 17: I will bring you up out of the affliction of Egypt unto a land flowing with milk and honey." Now God is the God of the promise: "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed. What but this promise and the preaching of the Word held the Israelites together during the time between Joseph and Moses? So when it says (v. 31), "The people believed," it means that they made the statement of the Lord their foundation. In this the intellectual conviction

and the confidence in God are implied. For signs were performed to convince them. They had been under the impression that God had forsaken them. By these signs and especially by the report of Moses they were reassured of God's attentive care, and of His grace. It was the God of their fathers that was speaking to them, the God who had promised them a Messiah.

c) Ex.14,31: And the people feared the Lord, and believed in Jehovah and in Moses, His servant". Here the imperfect אֱמַנּוּ with ב is used again. God had delivered them from the pursuing Egyptians by covering the latter with the Red Sea. This deed filled them with fear before the holy Judge of the ungodly. They recognized themselves as part of the ungodly. Hence here faith is opposed to works; for Israel was conscious of its unrighteousness, of the fact that God might as well have overwhelmed them. But they also believed in God, their deliverer and Moses, the mediator, God's servant. As so often, the statement of faith is here absolute. But what can it mean when Israel believes in Jehovah? Their faith certainly included more than the mere deliverance from bondage in Egypt. It included faith in the covenant. בְּרִית, covenant, is usually a pact, an agreement. But when it is made with God, it is merely a promise on God's part. The covenant to which the children of Israel were referred is the one that is stated in Gen.17,2-8: God promised to give them the land of Canaan, but that was only a type of the everlasting covenant, because as a people they had a glorious future mission to all peoples, Gen.49,10. He would be their God and they would be His people. No mention is made of any specific time; as long as He is God, so long

he will be their God. Since He is God in eternity, so eternally will He be their God. Moses bears witness to this again in his psalm of deliverance: Ex.15,13 - "Thou in thy mercy hast led forth the people which thou hast redeemed: thou hast guided them in thy strength unto thy holy habitation". And after speaking of the fears of the people whom He would drive out before them, he continues in v.17: "Thou shalt bring them in and plant them in the mountain of thine inheritance, in the place, O Lord, which thou hast made for thee to dwell in, in the sanctuary, O Lord, which thine hands have established". That "redemption" refers to deliverance from temporal and eternal dangers and troubles is clear from Gen.48,16: "The Angel who redeemed me" where bondage is not even thought of; and Job 19,25: "I know that my Redeemer lives", where eternity is directly involved. That Redeemer was the object of faith of the Israelites whenever it is said of them - "they believed in the Lord".

d) Num.14,11 - "How long will this people provoke me? How long will it be ere they believe me for all the signs which I have shewed among them?" וְכַתּוּב בְּמִצְרַיִם לֹא יָאִמְנוּ בִּי בְּכָל הַמִּטּוֹת אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתִּי בְּמִצְרַיִם. The spies had reported so on the gigantic inhabitants of Palestine. The people openly murmured yea wailed and wished themselves back in Egypt. When Caleb and Joshua told them to trust in the Lord, they wanted to stone them. They did not believe in God's promise. No matter how many obstacles arise, no matter how impossible the fulfilment may seem, they ought to have believed and trusted in the bare word.

Num.20,12 shows that God includes minor details in the

faith which He wants of His servants. He has told Moses to speak to the rock and it would give forth its water. (Num.20,8). Moses asked: "Will we fetch you water out of this rock?" Num. 20,11 and he struck it twice with his rod. The Lord says: "Because ye believed me (אֵי) not to sanctify me before the children of Israel, therefore ye shall not bring this congregation unto the land which I have given unto them". Of course, there is no direct reference to the Messiah in this "believe"; but since in such minor details God required of His servants to stand firmly upon the basis of His promise He certainly must have demanded faith in respect to His universal promises. Doubting even is unbelief.

Deut.9,23 is practically parallel to Num.14,11. But it brings out a new phase. Moses tells the children of Israel of the same incident: "Then ye rebelled against the commandment of the Lord, your God and believed Him (לֹא) not, nor hearkened to His voice". The opposite of believing is rebelling.

e) II Kings 17,14-15 speaks of the downfall of Ephraim. The context tells how time and again these people were warned to keep God's commandments. "But they did not hear and they hardened their necks as the necks of their fathers who did not believe in Jehovah their God" : אָמְרוּ לֹא תִשְׁמָע בְּרִיאתוֹ אֱלֹהִים . Hardening their necks, קָרְנוּ עֲרִיבִים , (German - hartnaeckig sein) means "to be stubborn". As a rule it is connected with not hearing, especially not hearing reproof (Prov.29,1). (It is not the same as 'hardening the heart' ((Ex.7,3;Deut.2,30;15,7;Ps.95,8;Prov.28,14;II Chron.36,13)) because it is joined to this in II Chron.36,13. Hence hardening of the heart is stubbornness in not allowing God

to turn the heart toward His Word ((II Chron.36,13;Ex.7,3)); but hardening the neck is stubbornness in a proud, unbending way. The former is the sin against the Holy Ghost; the latter is rebellion against God which may be permanent or merely temporary. This rebellion is the opposite of believing.) It is not quite synonymous with "hardening of the heart", but it comes very close to that. Both are grievous rebellions against God. And both are unbelief. The Jews did not hear, or if they did hear they were stubborn, they hardened their necks, resisted, did not accept. Why? Because they did not believe in Jehovah their God. They did not allow their prophets to reprove them, not because they thought the prophets weren't speaking the Word of God, but because they didn't believe in God! They did not make God the firm foundation of all their actions. Verse 15 tells us that they turned to vanity and went after the heathen, i.e., practiced idolatry. Again, we have no direct reference to the Messiah; but again the Messiah is not excluded. Faith in Jehovah includes faith in the Messiah.

f) II Chron.20,20: "Believe in the Lord your God, so shall ye be established; believe His prophets (בְּדַבְרֵי), so shall ye prosper!" says Jehoshaphat to Judah as he goes to see the fulfilment of the promise that he will win over Moab and Ammon without fighting. This passage definitely connects "believing in Jehovah" with "believing in His Word" which comes through the prophets, and particularly with the words of promise. For our purpose it is not necessary to enter upon the play on words in the exchange of the Nif. and the Hif. Exactly the words of the first part of the verse would be: "Make

Jehovah your God, your firm foundation and you will be established, made firm". Only by believing will they actually have something firm under them. And what are they to believe especially in this case? The king goes on: "Believe His prophets and you shall carry out your business; you shall succeed. נלץ in the Qal means eindringen, durchdringen, gelingen; here it is used in the Hpih.: durchfuehren, durchsetzen, zu Siegfuehren, be successful, be prosperous, to put something through, to win the victory. נלץ interests us a little more. In view of the fact that the "prophets" did not concern themselves exclusively with the religious affairs of Israel, but also prophesied in civil affairs as here (vv.14-17), we do not approach any closer to our object by this passage than by the previous ones. And yet, in view of the fact that the prophets concerned themselves mainly with spiritual affairs, and that they were publicly commissioned to proclaim the word of God, to explain the existing Scriptures, as well as to tell the future, they bring us close to the Messiah. For of Him was their chief message. Of Him they spoke and prophesied, to Him they pointed also by means of and in connection with civil affairs. This we shall see very clearly when we treat Is.7,9. Jehoshaphat was using this good opportunity to bring his people to the true worship. He wanted them to be established absolutely, not merely against Ammon and Moab. It was in line with his general policy (2 Chron.17,3.4.6;20,3.4) to establish the worship of Jehovah. Hence, now he uses this opportunity to impress upon Israel that the spiritual side is everything for success. So after all this reference to the prophecy is a reference to

spiritual prophecy and one step toward Messianic prophecy. In the Psalter our instances are not so illuminating because they are often in disjointed sentences.

g) Ps.27,13: "I had fainted unless I had believed to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living". ל is the sign of the inf., not preposition with יְדַמְתִּי. גִּבּוֹר means beauty, glory of God, happiness, cheerfulness, goodness of God (Guete Gottes). In Ps.25,7 it is parallel to רַחֲמֵי, the grace of God, and Delitzsch calls it plainly the ἀγαπή. In Ps.31,20 Delitzsch says גִּבּוֹר "ist der Inbegriff des Guten welches Gott den Seinen zum fortwaehrendem, immer vollerem Nieszbrauch aufgespeichert". Accordingly גִּבּוֹר also includes יְשׁוּעָה of v.1. יְשׁוּעָה is help, deliverance, salvation, especially from God. In Is.51,5 יְשׁוּעָה is brought together with רַחֲמֵי and made parallel to יְשׁוּעָה which is יְשׁוּעָה. In Ps.85,7 it is joined with grace and certainly points to eternal salvation: "Show us thy mercy, oh Lord, and grant us thy salvation". "God of salvation" is a regular phrase: Is.17,10; Mi.7,7; Hab.3,18 and salvation refers to eternal salvation. (Ps.18,47 is doubtful, but since it is parallel to "rock", it looks also upon eternity.) "Horn of salvation", the expression which Zacharias uses of the Messiah, has a Messianic meaning in 2 Sam.22,3. David had a promise that he would see, (i.e., experience) this goodness of the Lord in the land of the living (while he was yet alive). And since he made this promise, which is Messianic, his firm foundation, his heart did not faint, fail. But to get back to our יְדַמְתִּי, we find it here closely connected with Messianic expressions.

h) In Ps.78 "believe" occurs a number of times. The psalm is a review of Israel's history, and it shows the unbelief of the 'Fathers'. Faith consists in building upon God's promises, "setting hope in God", "not forgetting the works of God", and "keeping His commandment"; i.e. holding fast His Word. They were a rebellious nation, these infidels, and "their spirit was not steadfast with God". לֹא אָמְנוּ בְּיְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ. And in v.22 we read: They did not believe in (ב) God, and they did not trust in His salvation. Here אָמְנוּ and אֱמַנָנוּ are set parallel. And here occurs the word of the Messianic hope יְשׁוּעָה, salvation. (Gen.49,18.)* That was the worst crime of the fathers: they did not make God their foundation and they did not trust in His salvation. Faith according to this parallel cannot be mere knowledge, it can also not be mere assent to the statement of another; but it means reliance upon, a blind trust in God and His salvation, His redemption through the Messiah. V.32 shows that this unbelief is sin. That the miracles of God are mentioned is metonymy for God Himself. Ps.106,12 and v.24 brings the story of Israel in the Exodus once more without special new features.

i) Ps.116,10: The translation is much disputed, but according to the LXX St.Paul quotes: ἐπίστευσα διὸ ἐλάλησα; Delitzsch objects that אֱמַנָנוּ is made equal with אָמְנוּ in this translation. Strictly speaking it ought to be translated: "I have believed because I am speaking". But by this the sense is not changed because the speaking is a sign of what goes on in the heart, the believing. Delitzsch's translation: "Ich glaube nun wenn ich sprechen musz, Ich bin gebeugt gar sehr", taking אָמְנוּ

as temporal, "when" is permissible but not necessary. But believing is absolute in either interpretation; whether speaking is the sign of faith, or an appearance simultaneous with faith. Note that this faith goes back logically to vv.5-9: "Gracious is the Lord and righteous; yea, our God is merciful". The grace (חַסְדִּים) of God consists in not rewarding us according to our iniquities but in removing our transgressions from us as far as the east is from the west (Ps.103,8-12); and His righteousness is His keeping of promises. Certainly here we have a close approach to the messianic idea. For God is gracious through Christ. (Gen.3,15). It is, as we shall see, strictly O.T. theology to find the Messiah behind the forgiveness of sins.

j) Ps.119,66 : "Teach me good judgment and knowledge; for I have believed thy commandments", לְמַדְתִּי. Here we come into contact with the mediaeval Jewish view of the Messiah and faith: Faith in His coming and in His redemption did not exclude legalism. The Messiah would not take away personal sin. He would be a leader, as the Millennialists think of Christ in the kingdom of a thousand years. Albo says that faith in the Messiah would curtail the full significance of the Law in salvation. The teaching about the Messiah is the doctrine of hope. Man is justified by his own righteousness before God. The Messiah will bring temporal blessings to the righteous. Faith in the Jewish sense is knowledge and assent to the Law of God. Ps. 119,66 seems to support this view.—But while we concede that צִוְוָה usually means command, yet it also has the wider meaning of "instruction", "direction", and "rules" in general. צִוְוָה means to arrange (anordnen) as well as to command. And so it

here means they believed in the direction of God. This is brought out by the following verse: "Before I was afflicted, I went astray; but now have I kept thy Word". This is not a boast of David's that he was fulfilling the Law because this is inspired self-analysis and therefore infallible. It would, however, conflict with Ps.143,2 if it were meant to convey the idea of perfection. More of this, however, in the second section.

k). Is.7,9b is one of our strongest passages. As far as the wording goes, it is parallel to 2 Chron.20,20; but in its context it says much more, for while in 2 Chron.20,20 reference is made only to the word of prophecy in general, we here find וְדָבָר directly connected with the definite Messianic prophecy: "Behold, a virgin shall conceive and bear a son and shall call His name Immanuel". The situation is important. Rezin, king of Syria, and Pekah, king of Ephraim, united against Judah. Ahaz, the king, and his people were moved "as trees of the wood are moved with the wind". But Isaiah foretold: "It shall not come to pass!" He added that within 65 years Ephraim would be totally destroyed. Syria, too, would be as weak as Rezin, its head. But as for Judah: אִם לֹא יִבְרָא יְהוָה אִם לֹא יִבְרָא. If Judah would not believe, it should also not stand. Believe stands absolute. What should they believe? The following vv. give the answer. Ahaz was to ask God for a sign to prove His promise. Ahaz refused because he was afraid, and he did not trust in the Lord. He wanted no signs from this prophet. Then the Lord Himself gave him an old sign that was traditional throughout the history of Israel. It is merely a restatement

of Gen.3,15. The God who had promised the Messiah, the enemy of Satan, the Deliverer from sin, He would surely carry out this comparatively insignificant promise of deliverance from Rezin and Pekah. "Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son and shall call His name Immanuel". If you don't believe this old sign of the mercy and grace of your God, you shall not be established, you shall perish like Ephraim and Syria. That v.14 is clearly Messianic will be shown hereafter. Whether it was understood by Ahaz and most Israelites is an entirely different question.

1) Is.28,16 likewise connects a prophecy of the Messiah with an exhortation to believe. The scornful infidels among the Jews, trusting in Egypt, scoffed at the prophet: "We have made a covenant with death and an agreement with hell". Assyria would not be able to harm them because of their lying. So they trusted in this diplomacy and Egypt. But now God gives them a sign as he gave Ahaz. At first it is altogether a promise: "Behold, I lay in Zion a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner stone, a sure foundation". This stone is not Zion, the church, for it is laid in Zion; nor could it be Jehovah, for He laid it; nor could it be any human agency, for it was to be a sure foundation: and therefore it can refer to the Messiah only, the corner stone in Zion. "He that believeth, shall not make haste". He that relies upon this Cornerstone in Zion, shall not make haste to flee. Here the Messiah is made the basis of faith. As for the covenant with and agreement with hell, God disposes of that in the next two verses: A storm shall come up and sweep away the lies by its fury and wash (overflow) full the hiding places of

falsehood, and shake the unbelief, and silence the mockery, and rock the security of the covenanters. Assyria shall take Ephraim. But he that believeth on the foundation stone in Zion he shall not flee, he shall be safe in the storm.

m) Is.43,10 - "Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord, and my servant whom I have chosen: that ye may know and believe me and understand that I am he". God summons Israel to testify that He is the true God. God has chosen them to know Him, and believe Him (ב), and to understand clearly that He is the true God. And he wanted this established as a guarantee that He would carry the promise of vv.1-7 Redemption, Preservation, and the Gathering of Israel.

n) Is.53,1: "But who hath believed our preaching". The greatest prophecy of the O.T. is preceded by a rhetorical question about the faith in the message, the preaching. V.7 is adversative to v.15 of chapter 52. There the gentiles were mentioned, now come the Jews. The preaching is that of 52, 13-14, but also that which follows. אֵלֶּיךָ here is used with ב: Who has put confidence in our preaching, who has leaned on it for support? "And to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed". "Arm of the Lord is the strength of the Lord, which He uses to carry out His redemption. To reveal the arm of the Lord means to show forth the Lord's work, preach it. Here, then, the object of faith is clearly stated to be "Messiah", and specifically the suffering Messiah, upon whom the Lord laid the iniquities of us all.

6. Derivatives: אֵלֶּיךָ. The A.V. translates אֵלֶּיךָ as with "faith", only once, in Hab.2,4; and even in that passage

the meaning is contested. Gesenius says that it should be translated "Treue, Zuverlaessigkeit". Luther quite frequently uses "Glaube", but inaccurately. Hab.2,4 is really the only passage in which the meaning "faith" is tenable. The first part of the verse refers to the Chaldeans and says of them: "Behold his soul which is lifted up, is not upright in him". Self-reliant, victorious, the Chaldeans were turned with pride to a trust in themselves and to haughty indifference for their Superior. Their soul is not upright in them. But וְיִשְׂרָאֵל אֵלֹהֵינוּ. Here the וְ is adversative. אֵלֹהֵינוּ is not fixed on the Israelites but stands generally in contrast in to the unjust, proud Chaldeans. וְיִשְׂרָאֵל is combined not with אֵלֹהֵינוּ (He who by faith is just shall live) but is with אֵלֹהֵינוּ (the just- by faith he shall live.) Hitzig insists that it ought to be translated "Aber der Gerechte wird durch seine Redlichkeit leben". But this passage evidently looks back to vv.4.12 and 13 of the first chapter. It depicts the relationship of man to God. Hence it is that state of mind which relies in God, firm trust: immota acquiescentia, firma fiducia, tenex adhaesio. And that is faith. Delitzsch who has made a thorough study of the verses lists the following points against Hitzig's interpretation: a) The situation is waiting for the fulfilment of a prophecy or oracle, (v.3); faith rather than uprightmess is required. b) The sufferings and tribulations of the Chaldean invasion and conquest are contrasted with אֵלֹהֵינוּ. The Jews were afraid of destruction, life was promised them. c) The pride of the Chaldaeans is paralleled with nothing if not with the faith of the righteous. Their pride raised them above God; faith subordinated the righteous to God. d) There is

an evident reference in these words to Gen.15,6. e) In 1,5 Habbakuk uses יִדְרֵא. If there is any argument from language, it argues for the translation "faith". f) All the versions have "faith". In spite of its errors the LXX is correct in this point; the Jewish interpreters also construe it so. St. Paul uses it twice, always as πίστις; likewise the author of Hebrews (10,38).

The personal ending refers to the believer, because אֲחִיבֶנְךָ is not transitive. אֲ is the א of the instrumental cause, the real reason. The result is contained in its cause. אֲחִיבֶנְךָ, live, refers to escape from the destruction which the Chaldaeans were spreading around them, indeed; but it goes farther and includes eternal death (1,12 we shall not die.). Ezek.33,11 brings out this meaning of "live".

Now what does "faith" here include? Promises of God, promises which had by this time become amazingly plain. No doubt in those days when the government of Judah seemed to be ended, the famous promise of Gen.49,10 about Shiloh was before them. They certainly must have looked for the Deliverer, the Son of David who would be the Davidic Lord (Ps.2), who would build for David and Judah an everlasting temple.

This expectation of the Messiah is not read into the text. For v.3 tells us that God says to Habbakuk: "For the vision is yet for the appointed end, and strives after the end, and does not lie: if it tarry, wait for it; for it will come, it does not fail". אֲחִיבֶנְךָ "for the end" is a synonym of "latter days", i.e., the days of the Messiah's kingdom. The fight between the Chaldaeans and Israel is prophetic of the fight

between the kingdom of the Messiah and the kingdom of the oppressors. Faith establishes the kingdom of God in this battle and gives life to the believers in the midst of death.

Synonyms: a) אמין is partially synonymous to אֶמְצִיא inasmuch as it has the idea of firm reliance. # It differs from "believe" inasmuch as it does not have a word as its correlate, and in that it emphasizes a blind and unreasoning confidence. The people trust in idols (Hab.2,18) in vanity (Is.59,4). The passages in which this word is used however, bring out much clearer than those with אֶמְצִיא that work-righteousness was not sanctioned in the O.T. and that it was just as truly false religion in the O.T. as in the N.T. The folly of relying on one's own righteousness is very clearly shown Ezek.33,13: "When I shall say to the righteous that he shall surely live; if he trust to his own righteousness and commit iniquity, all his righteousnesses shall not be remembered; but for his iniquity that he hath committed, he shall die for it". Again, the very opposite of O.T. faith is brought out by Jer.17,5: "Cursed is the man that trusteth in man and maketh flesh his arm (i.e. makes man his strength), and whose heart departeth from the Lord".

Trusting God is everywhere commanded, especially in the book of Psalms and in the Prophets. Trusting is connected with God and once directly with the Messiah. In Psalm 40, which is Messianic, it is brought into close relationship. Ps.40,3 says: "Many shall see it and fear and trust in the Lord". They shall see the wondrous work of God in the Messiah (His humi-

In all it occurs 120 times (according to Young). In the A.V. it is rendered with "trust" 87 times.

liation and exaltation); and shall fear (rather reverence) God, and shall trust in the Lord, evidently for their salvation. Trusting in the mercy and salvation of the Lord is an ever recurring idea. And in some passages it is directly contrasted with trusting in wealth, in strength, and in one's own self.

Of the host of passages that could here be cited we choose the following ones as the most striking: Ps.31,5.6: "Into thine hand I commit my spirit, thou hast redeemed me, O Lord of Truth. I have hated them that regard lying vanities, but I trust in the Lord". It is true that the preceding verse speaks of a net of the enemies, and the psalm is considered as a prayer of David for deliverance from Saul, and so points more directly to a deliverance from temporal evils. But נַפְשִׁי is used of the soul or rather the life principle, the immortal part of man. Delitzsch therefore says: "Er befiehlt seinen Lebensgeist Gotte, aber nicht um nicht zu sterben, sondern um sterbend nicht zu sterben, a.h., sein in Gottes Hand geborgenes geistliches Leben in unvergaenglicher Kraft und Klarheit wiederzuempfangen". Redeem is the translation of קָדַם, to buy free, to set free, to deliver. Note that the perfect is used. It is the prophetic, or confident perfect. יְהוָה בָּרַךְ is the God who fulfills his promises and whose revelation is true. He is the opposite of אֱלֹהֵי-אֲוֵרָה, vanity of lies, idols, false gods. And the followers, שֹׁמְרֵי-אֱוֵרָה, or rather the guardians of these the true believer hates, (~~naturally because of their office, not because of their person.~~) But upon (בָּרַךְ) Jehovah he has trusted, namely that Jehovah will take care of his soul and keep it from the nets of spiritual as well as temporal enemies. Note the dependance on God for salvation.

Ps. 49, 6 brings out the inability of man to do anything of himself. "They that trust in their wealth and boast themselves in the multitude of their riches: None of them can by any means redeem (קָדַם) his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him (בְּקָרָו) for the redemption (פְּדוּתוֹ) of their soul (נַפְשָׁם) is precious (יָקָר: schwer sein, teuer sein), and it ceaseth forever (לְעוֹלָם וָעַד). These last two words mean that the one who tries to redeem his brother simply must give up forever, because he can't do it. Luther struck the sense better than A.V.: "Dasz er's musz lassen anstehen ewiglich." The implication is: if a rich man can't redeem his brother in captivity, he wouldn't be able to redeem himself, if he were a captive. After the weakness of man is brought out very forcibly, the psalm continues in v. 15: "But God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave." פְּדוּתִי מִיָּד-מְאוֹל: This certainly refers to eternal redemption; for the psalmist knew that also the pious die the temporal death. Here he expresses hope that he will, by God's grace, escape the eternal death, the hand of Sheol.

Of all the passages, the most important one in which קָדַם is used is Is. 12, 2. In chapter 11 Isaiah had been speaking of the Root of Jesse and of redemption in His day. He had described the Messiah in unmistakable terms as the one upon Whom the Holy Spirit (Spiritus Septiformis) should rest, and how He would rule in His kingdom, and how the Rest (מִנְחָה) from all nations should flock to Him. And now Isaiah goes on: "And in that day thou shalt say, 'O Lord, I will praise thee: though thou wast angry with me, thine anger is turned away, and thou comfortedst me. Behold God is my salvation; I will trust, and not be afraid: For the Lord Jehovah is my strength and my song; he also is become my salvation." This

is the song of thanksgiving of the redeemed. Through the Messiah they profess themselves to be comforted, through Him God's anger was turned away. God is their salvation. Since this blessing is in chapter 11 ascribed to the rule of the Messiah and here to God, we can see that the believers of the O. T. united God and the Messiah here, as so often otherwise in the Messianic prophecies and appearances (cf Angel of the Lord). They trust and are not afraid; i.e., they believe in the Messiah and therefore fear no ill. Accordingly, this passage, when taken in its context, is the O.T. version of "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself."

b) נָצַח: נָצַח has the general meaning of waiting upon, waiting for. It is even used of lying in wait in order to spring upon unawares. But when it goes over to the idea of "hope in" it bears on יְדַבֵּר. Whenever it is said that a person waited upon God, the implication is that he was not disappointed. Again and again this trust was rewarded, and the believer was not compelled to be ashamed (e.g., Is 49, 23). Waiting on the Lord differs from trusting in the Lord, inasmuch as it emphasizes the patience; *from believing in the Lord, inasmuch as it emphasizes the future.

"Waiting on the Lord," like "trusting in the Lord," is often brought together with the forgiveness of sins in such a way that we must consider the latter the result of the former. So in Ps. 25, 5-7 "Thou art the God of my salvation; on thee do I wait all the day. Remember, oh Lord, thy tender mercy and thy lovingkindness... Remember not the sins of my youth nor my transgressions." David waits on the God of salvation, who is merciful and does not remember transgressions; i.e., who graciously forgives sins. ** The same idea

* So in Prov. 20, 22: Say not I will recompense evil, but wait on the Lord, and He will save thee.

** See also Ps 39, 7.

occurs in Ps 130, 5: Here יָרַד is used in a strict sense of our English "wait," for it is explained in v. 6 as being the same as the waiting of a restless wakened person for the morning, longingly, yet confidently waiting for its coming. So "waiting for the Lord" means trusting in His merciful forgiveness of sins and in His redemption (vv. 7-8). In v. 3 the unworthiness of man to earn redemption is expressed. But inspite of that, there is redemption for those who wait on the Lord; longingly, confidently trusting in His help, which as yet they do not see.

Gen. 49, 18 is worthy of special notice, because the Targums (Jerusalem and Jonathan) see a reference to the Messiah.* Jacob foresaw what struggles the children of Israel were going to pass through as the children of God. He, therefore, turns to Jehovah, not for himself but for them, with the words: "I wait for thy salvation, O Jehovah." If the Targums see the Messiah in this relatively general exclamation, are we not justified in holding that the believers of the O.T. saw Him in that host of plainer passages that we find throughout the O.T.?

c) Other synonyms: We could carry our examination further by looking at the terms יָרַד, יָרַד, יָרַד, all of which mean "to hope, to wait for." Also words meaning to be strong, to be courageous, like צָרַח and צָרַח; or "to find refuge, to hide" יָרַד; or even "to know" יָרַד are synonyms of יָרַד. But none of these shed any further light on the Messianic side of faith. All that they show is that faith is not as rarely mentioned in the O.T. as it might seem. In one way or other these synonyms apply to show that O.T. children of God were indeed believers, trusting in the mercy of God.

* "Not for the deliverance of Gideon, the son of Joash, does my soul wait; for that is temporary; and not for the redemption of Sampson, for that is transitory; but for the redemption of the Messiah, the Son of David, which Thou through Thy word hast promised to bring to Thy people the children of Israel: For this my soul wait

7. Summary: The points thus far gained may be summarized:

1. Faith is a common concept in the O.T.
2. It is counted for righteousness (Gen. 15, 6).
3. It is opposed to work-righteousness (Ez. 33, 13).
4. It brings forgiveness of sins and salvation (Jer 17, 5 and 7).
5. It relies upon the mercy and loving-kindness of God in the Messiah (Is 28, 16; 53, 1; 12, 2; Ps 49, 15). It is, therefore, essentially the same faith as that of the N.T. children of God.

II

8. The O.T. conception of sin: We shall now briefly examine the theology of the O.T. with the purpose of finding the Messiah's place in it. Such a discussion properly begins with the O.T. doctrine of sin. In Gen. 2, 9 we read of the tree of טֹב וְרָע. This is the first suggestion of sin in the Bible. רָע is the most general word for sin. What the tree was is difficult to say: Probably it was simply a test tree, the knowledge of evil arising from disobedience to the command of God. More specific reference to sin is found in Gen. 4, 7, where חַטָּאת is used. This is the commonest expression of the O.T. for sin. It denotes deviating from the way of God, missing it. עִוָּן denotes the character of an action as crooked, perverted (from עָוָה, bent over, or wrong); hence, it is stronger than חַטָּאת, denoting a crime. Its Greek equivalent is ἀνομία. It occurs for the first time in Gen. 15, 16, "the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full." Still worse is מַעֲצָה, rebellion, A.V.: transgression, trespass). It occurs for the first time in Gen. 31, 36, when Jacob asks Laban, "What is my trespass, and what is my

sin that thou so hotly pursuest after me?" Its distinctive feature is found in Job 34, 37: "He adds to his sin rebellion." רָשָׁע is wickedness, the opposite of צַדִּיק. אָרָן is evil in its worthlessness. Other synonyms as אֲוִיָּא, חַטָּל, אֲנָנָא, חַתָּלָא, and וּסְבָר, can merely be mentioned here. Man's sin had its origin in Eden with the eating of the forbidden fruit. It consisted in disregarding the clear will of God. From there on it spread and grew worse: Soon after, we have the hatred and murder of Cain, and then the springing up of a race of ungodly children of men. The pious were drawn away by the evil about them, so that God found "that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually" (Gen 6, 5). Even after the flood, when all the survivors were presumably pious men, God said of them, "The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth;" and the trait soon showed itself in Ham. By the eighth generation after Shem, only a very small minority of men still seek God.

At the very introduction of sin into the world we find a strong consciousness of it, the feeling of guilt. Not only does v. 7 of Gen. 3 apply here, but also vv. 12-13. After Adam and Eve had sinned, their eyes were opened, and they became ashamed of their condition. Later they excused themselves to God with half-truths. Hence, with sin came guilt. *

Another new element that came with sin was fear, namely fear of punishment. The command of God had contained a threat: "The day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Accordingly, the first people hid themselves to escape the wrath of God. The relation of friendship and trust between God and man was broken. From

* Cf. also Gen. 4, 13 f.

their hiding before God we can see that they understood from the outset that punishment was the necessary result of sin. And it was not light punishment, but the highest penalty, death.

As sin increased, man seemed to lose more of the consciousness of the guilt and punishment of sin; but there was always his conscience to waken him. "Conscience" is not mentioned in the O.T.; but it is such an elemental human trait, that we can assume its presence without further proof. Various crimes, that are recorded, are followed by statements on the part of the criminal, which show that he had conscience (e.g., Gen 4, 23-24). But it is undeniable that these consciences were dulled by continuous ~~were dulled~~ by continuous disregard of their protest, just as they are today. Besides, certain of the elemental laws of God became obscured. And so, by the time of Moses, it was necessary to state the law again and set it down in writing, in order to sharpen conscience and establish guilt. Every transgression of the law was sin, punishable with death. "Cursed be he that confirmeth not all the words of this law to do them." (Deut 27, 26). "The soul that sinneth it shall die." Ez. 18, 14.

That sin was a universal evil is proven: (1) By the historical narratives, which present nothing but sinful men. (2) Especially by direct passages: Gen.8, 21 makes a general statement about the character of man.* Ps. 51, 7, "Behold, I was born in iniquity and in sin did my mother conceive me," shows that sin was an hereditary trait, a habitus; and that total depravity of the whole human race was taught in the O.T. This is brought out more clearly by Eccl. 7, 20: "There is not a just man upon earth that doeth good

* "The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth." Cf. p. 28, end of first paragraph.

and sinneth not." Again Is. 64, 6 says of the righteousness of the children of Israel, including the prophet's own: "All our righteousnesses are as filthy rags. " *

⁹
8. Redemption from sin; But with the fact of sin, guilt, and dread of punishment clearly indicated in Gen. 3, let us see how man attempted to escape his doom. The account has nothing to say of works. We must not make the mistake of thinking Moses a contemporary of Adam. There were no sacrifices to perform. Adam could not plead any righteousness on his part. No thought of self-redemption is suggested. Adam was thrown entirely on the mercy of God. Immediately after sin comes Gospel in Gen. 3, 15. This is the Protevangel; and because it is the first promise of the Messiah, it will occupy us a little more than the other prophecies.

a) Gen. 3, 15: The situation is this: God has pronounced a curse upon the serpent itself in v. 14. Though the serpent was only the instrument of Satan, it received a curse as other animals which have become partakers in the sins of men (Lev. 20, 15-16); moreover, like all the other irrational creatures, it suffered by the fall of man (Rom.8, 20 f). But now God turns to the real force behind the serpent. It is noteworthy that He does not turn to man, for man has nothing to do with his own redemption.

וְאֵלֹהִים יִצְרָאֵל וְאֵלֹהִים יִצְרָאֵל: אֵלֹהִים is derived from אֵל and means continuous enmity, LXX ἔχθρα. God is He who instigates the conflict. וְאֵלֹהִים, between thee; i.e., the serpent. But the serpent now is simply Satan, whom God addresses in the disguise with which he beguiled man. This is evident: (1). From v. 1, where this serpent speaks. If before the fall serpent could speak and think and argue

* Also Ps 14, 3: "They are all gone aside, they are all together become filthy: there is none that doeth good, no, not one.
Ps 143, 2: "For in thy sight shall no man living be justified.

and persuade, they would have been on a level with man. (2) The serpent was one of the creatures which had been declared "good" by God in Gen. 1, 31; how could it beguile Adam and Eve to sin? How could it tell deliberate falsehoods? (3) If a natural serpent is the cause of sin, why does it not assume a more important place in the O.T.? (4) The curse is simply trivial, if it is applied only to a natural serpent. It is almost ridiculous that God should formally declare the existence of a warfare between mankind and the snakes! (5) It is false that such a warfare exists. Mankind as a whole has not hated serpents. The Persians and other heathen have even deified them. Conversely, serpents are not especially at war with mankind. With the exception of a few venomous serpents and the very few constrictors, snakes are the friends of mankind. The supposed enmity is largely superstition.

No believing exegete, Jewish or Christian, understands the snake in itself to be meant. It is only that class of expositors, who consider the whole story a myth, that fail to recognize Satan in his first disguise. Adam and Eve certainly did not belong to their camp. Of course, we admit that the name "Satan" may have originated later. * But Adam and Eve knew that there was an evil power behind the serpent. **

* "Satan" is first mentioned in Job 1, 6, or, if the Book of Job dates from the time of Solomon, in the Davidic Psalm 109, 6. Just how definite a conception Adam and Eve had, does not concern us here.

** In his commentary on Genesis at this place, Skinner brings three proofs that the serpent was meant in itself: (a) "A message of hope and encouragement in the midst of a series of curses and punishments is not to be assumed, unless it be clearly implied in the language," he says. Even if we granted that curses and punishments are not mixed with messages of hope and cheer, we could answer that this is a curse, a curse upon Satan. Of course, every curse upon that enemy of man is a blessing to man; but there is no break in the series

נָחֵשׁ וְרֵעַ: Why is the woman and not the man mentioned? This remarkable, unusual diction is explained in two ways: (1) The serpent had had dealings with the woman only. Now it was opposed to

of curses. But we do not grant it, for it is the manner of God to place Law and Gospel side by side. Cf. Is. 1, 16-20.

(b) Skinner continues: "To the mind of the narrator, the serpent is no more a symbol of the power of evil or of temptation, than he is an incarnation of the devil. He is himself an evil creature." According to his own theories this seems to be a remarkable statement. For this section was written by J, a school that lived between 930 and 750 B.C. At that time demonology had come to Israel already from Babylon. And the snake was certainly not considered a demon in itself. We say that Moses wrote this, who was rather a practical man in regard to snakes, as we see from Num. 21, 6 ff and other similar passages.

(c) Skinner concludes: "No victory is promised to either party, but only perpetual warfare between them: the order of clauses making it specially hard to suppose that the victory of man was contemplated." We shall try to deny this statement categorically, when we get that far. But right here we can see what Skinner thinks about the inspiration of this passage: If this is really inspired, God made a mistake, because the snakes seem to have gotten the worst of the battle. Besides, as we showed above, there is no warfare between man and serpents. And it seems to us, that if Skinner were really correct about it, Adam should have been sending all his descendants out in regular armies to hunt snakes and to take vengeance upon them for seducing the human race and bringing sin into the world.

König, who also wants to deny the satanic element in this passage, goes so far as to say, that even the N.T. does not consider this serpent Satan. He saves himself by saying "Ausdrücklich". (Mess. Weissagungen, p. 81). He should read Rom 16, 20 with a little less bias. He should also look a little closer at the context of 2 Cor. 11, 3: for while this passage says that "the serpent beguiled Eve," (St. Paul also thought that snakes had such seductive powers!) in v. 14 he says that "Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light." König says that this means "the real Satan." But v. 13 doesn't contrast this Satan with some imitations, but if with anything, then with false prophets. Certainly Satan is not contrasted with the serpent, but identified with it.

While we are in the N.T., we refer to Rev. 12, 9; and 20, 2 where it says: "That old serpent, which is the devil." But we don't have to go to the N.T. to show that the Jews thought of the devil in connection with the fall; for in the Book of Wisdom 2, 24 we read: "By the envy of Satan death came into the world." Jewish theology has adopted the name שָׂטָן וְרֵעַ for the devil from Gen. 3, 15.

the woman as adversary because she was her victim in the temptation. (2) From Is 7, 14 we learn that this Seed was to come from the woman only. Philippi points to the article with אִתָּהּ to prove that Isaiah had understood the reference אִתָּהּ correctly; he merely stated clearly what had been suggested before. To be sure Adam and Eve did not recognize this (4, 1).

אִתָּהּ וְגַם אִתָּהּ וְגַם: The word אִתָּהּ may denote either the collective seed or an individual seed.* The former needs no further proof because that is generally accepted. But for the individual meaning St. Paul has given us an argument, which has been stigmatized as rabbinical. But let us remember that St. Paul was fighting Judaizers when he brought the argument. It is as unscientific as it is unscriptural to assume that he simply laid down new laws of grammar and rhetoric in the midst of a conflict in which his very authority was questioned. No, his argument must have had weight with the Jews of his day, and they must have felt, too, the individualistic interpretation to be the correct one. But our unbelieving exegetes find more flaws in his arguments than his bitter enemies. Aside from St. Paul's, we have very good evidence in the interpretation of the Targums, and best of all Eve's own interpretation. (4, 1). Later Eve uses the word of Seth, making it clearly individualistic (4, 25). -- The seed of the serpent is collective, not only for the other evil spirits, but also for any power that assists Satan, even human beings. In truth most of the woman's descendants belong to the seed of the serpent! But the Seed of the woman is an individual, Christ, the Messiah. He is individualized by the pronoun אִתָּהּ. He stands in the conflict where Adam and Eve

* So Gen 4, 25 of Seth; Gen 21, 13 of Ishmael; 1 Sam 1, 11: But wilt give unto thine handmaid seed of men, then I will give him unto the Lord."

fell. He overcomes that supernatural power which was able to take possession of the serpent and use it for its ends. Hence, He must be God Himself. Note that He is to crush the serpent itself, according to the third member of v. 15.

וְיָצַח רִגְלֵךָ וְיָצַח רִגְלֵךָ וְיָצַח רִגְלֵךָ: Roman Catholic exegesis wants וְיָצַח. But this is impossible even though the letters וְיָצַח could be read וְיָצַח, for the verb is masculine and the suffix is masculine (i.e., neuter in English). The meaning of וְיָצַח has been much debated, because the rendering, "crush," in the sense of "to injure" is applied to both. Note the pronominal suffix in וְיָצַח: The serpent, the devil, would be crushed. This singular again shows the folly of thinking of the serpent itself in this connection. וְיָצַח, the head of the serpent would be mashed, killing it; but the serpent would also do some damage by biting the heel of the Seed. But this is not as serious a wound as that inflicted on the serpent: (1) because not all bites even of venomous serpents are fatal; (2) because there is an evident weight in favor of וְיָצַח in comparison with וְיָצַח. As the head is generally looked upon as the most important member, a bruising of the head is more serious than a bruising of the heel. And so the text does after all indicate where the victory will be. * In the light of later prophecy, the Israelites could see how serious would be the injury of their hero in the conflict (Is 53). And Adam and Eve also knew that Satan would inflict some kind of serious injury, though they may not have known how serious.

The interpretation that the seed of the woman is to be understood collectively of the congregation of Israel is refuted first

*Against Skinner, cf. p. 32.

of all by the fact that Israel doesn't enter in here; it would be humanity, if anything; and then secondly, humanity has succumbed to temptation, how should it overcome the serpent?

This prophecy of the conflict between Satan with all his evil forces and Christ stands at the beginning of the career of the human race, in the midst of temporal curses that are laid upon mankind. In its prediction of victory over the enemy of mankind it is a blessing upon mankind. But even if Adam and Eve understood the character of the Seed, did they realize that this conflict was for their benefit? or did they understand it merely as a curse upon him who had introduced sin into the world without any reference to an atonement for their guilt? The following points come into consideration: (1) They did not die at once. They might have realized the grace of God in this fact. (2) They knew that the cause of sin would sometime be removed by a descendant of theirs. But until that time they could see the cause of sin at work; for one new sin after the other appeared in the world. Since this Descendant would destroy the cause of sin according to the promise, it follows easily that they looked forward to His birth with hope of redemption by it. (3) Their relation to God was somewhat restored. Their sons brought sacrifices and spoke to God directly and received from God signs of favor. Surely, then, they must have known that in the victory of their Descendant over Satan lay the cause of the favor of a God, Who had threatened and cursed them for their sin.

b) Gen. 4, 1: Gen 4, 1 has been variously interpreted. But since ~~nx~~ never means "with the help of" and never stands for in or and, it must be sign of the accusative to give any sense. * And

* ~~nx~~ "with the help of" is without analogy in the O.T. This is rejected even by Skinner (ad. loc.). He adopts the meaning "with cooperation of" i.e., Eve felt she was the wife of God. But this is too mythological; and it conflicts with v. 1a.

then Eve's statement must be rendered "I have acquired a man, Jehovah." אִישׁ points to אִישׁ in 3, 15; and יְהוָה interprets the אִישׁ. Here was Jehovah, the Savior from sin, in the man whom she had born, she thought. And so this statement is the first confession of faith in the O.T. It shows how well the first promise was understood. *

The next significant remark is made when Lamech begets his first-born son. He calls him Noah, i.e., rest, peace, because he would comfort (נָחַם) them from their work and from their toil (i.e., very difficult work), which had come upon them on account of the curses of Gen. 3, 17. The deliverer or rest from this curse is only the Seed of 3, 15. נָחַם in the piel means to comfort.** The curse of sin and the sorrow resulting from it weighed upon Lamech. Hence, when he thought that Noah would comfort, he expected him to be the remover of the curse and so the promised Seed. Lamech, then, believed in this promise of God's for his redemption.

c) Messianic prophecy does not again appear until Noah blesses his sons, Shem and Japhet (9, 26 f). Since Shem is the older, he gets the better blessing: "Blessed be Jehovah, the God of Shem." Here בָּרַךְ should not be taken in the sense of praised (because that would not be a blessing for Shem), but in the sense of bringing blessing. Therefore also, the God of Shem is called אֱלֹהֵי חֵן, the unchangeable God of grace, the God of the promise. More of His blessing is brought out by the words to Japhet: "He shall dwell in the tents of Shem." Here the reference is evidently not to the conquest of Canaan

* In Gen. 4, 26 we read the statement "Then began men to call in the name of Jehovah," immediately after the birth of the son of Seth, who was named, significantly, Enos, the frail, weak one. Sad experience had taught our ancestors to know that the Messiah wasn't coming so soon. They began to call on God, therefore, to ask Him for mercy and blessing, to praise Him; in short, to worship Him. But since בָּרַךְ means to proclaim, to preach (Is. 40, 6; Joel 4, 9) they probably had a regular service with prayer and preaching. ** Thus Gen. 37, 35; Is 12, 1; Jer 31, 3: "I will turn their mourning into joy and will comfort them and make them rejoice from their sorrow"

by the Indo-European nations, because a mutual blessing is required by their mutual act of respect and love. Hence, the dwelling is a reference to the participation of Japhet in the worship of Shem. Through Shem the blessings of the God of grace shall go out to all the world. Even Canaan, because he is a servant of Shem's, shall partake of the blessing.

d) We hurry on to the next major prophecy of the O.T., the blessing of the Patriarchs. It is repeated five times in Genesis*: "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." In Gen. 12, 3, it even says "In thee," inasmuch as Abraham was the ancestor of the Seed. In the words וְנִבְרַכְתָּ בְּכָל לֵב קוֹמֵת מִן כָּל אֲרָצוֹת there is a reference to several of the preceding prophecies. "All the families of the earth" points back definitely to the prophecy of Shem, where all the nations will dwell in the tents of Shem (see above). This universality also made the prophecy definitely Messianic; for Abraham knew that there was no man in whom all the families of the earth were blessed, even before the confusion of tongues at Babel; and so Abraham knew that a more than earthly blessing was to come through him. Instead of אֶרֶץ, the usual word for earth, אֲדָמָה is used. It is the same word that is used in Gen. 3, 17. It shows the relation of this blessing to that curse. That בְּךָ is not to be understood of Abraham himself, is shown from the parallels in 22, 18, where בְּרַשְׁתָּךְ is used. That is the Seed, of whom Eve and Lamech spoke, He who was to come to redeem His people and to conquer Satan. וְנִבְרַכְתָּ the niphāl, is passive; so is the hithpael in 22, 18. The nations shall be blessed in the Seed of Abraham.

* Three times to Abraham: 12, 3; 18, 18; 22, 18. Once to Isaac 26, 4; and once to Jacob 28, 14.

** Nowhere is the niphāl of נִבְרַחְתָּ reflexive. The hithpael is usually reflexive but also passive. When we consider the meaning of the reflexive sense, it becomes self-evident that God did not intend a reflexive. Because all the nations do not bless themselves by Abraham; i.e., wish each other to be as blessed as Abraham.

meaning of לָקַח is deliver, ransom. לְקַח is one who must avenge a murdered kinsman (buy back his blood, so to speak); redeem a sold kinsman; buy back the land of a needy kinsman; deliver the widow of a dead kinsman. When used of God, it means redeem, in the sense of deliver, or buy back from sin to which the man has sold himself. Here where we find it for the first time, it must have that idea of deliverance from sin; but the sense, buy back, is too strong to be disregarded. Jacob knew that he was in the power of sin; he knew that he had to be ransomed, he realized that the Angel of the Lord was his Redeemer and Ransomer. How? From the two great Messianic prophecies of his day, Gen. 3, 15 and Gen. 12,3. The latter had been given to him directly in Gen. 28. 14, while he was sleeping at Bethel. Note how general a deliverance he expected עָרַב is the widest term that he could use. And to that he joins לָקַח. Through this Angel he expected to be restored to Paradise.*

f) The next direct prophecy of the Messiah is uttered by Jacob when he blesses Judah. Just in this fact, that an important blessing was transmitted and was kept in one family and was clearly traceable through the ages till Christ came, lies the proof that the Seed was understood in its Messianic sense. And along that line we find the description of the principle Descendant becoming always clearer. In Gen. 49, 10 the Seed receives a proper name: יְהוּדָה. -- Judah is promised the greatest power among the tribes of Israel. Its pre-eminence is described by the comparison with a lion. But the climax is reached when the rule of Shiloh is announced. "The scepter shall not depart from Judah, not the rod of

* It is a question whether Jacob has a knowledge of the Trinity, since he uses three appellations for God. Some hold that the second and the third go together. If that is actually the case, then we have a reference to the royal office of Christ; for Jacob uses the word מָנַח which includes besides feeding (A.V.) the general care of a being. This passage shows that in the O.T. as in the N.T. believers attributed all blessing to Christ.

of the lawgiver (*) from between his feet." Judah shall remain autonomous until the time of the Messiah. יְהוָה ought not to be taken as an expression of absolute limit: for Shiloh's kingdom shall emerge from the kingdom of Judah, and be a continuation of it in the spiritual realm.

The word שָׁלוֹם has been subjected to much emendation and misinterpretation. Some have seen in it a reference to the reign of Solomon. Others have considered it the name of the city Shilo. Many split it up into יְהוָה and translate: "Until he comes, whose it is." But all these are refuted by the last clause: "And to Him shall be willing obedience of the peoples." The only interpretation which fits this is the Messianic. שָׁלוֹם is derived from שָׁלַם, to be quiet, safe, peaceful. It describes the Messiah as the Prince of Peace.

This prophecy brings out the royal office of the Messiah, the favorite view of Him among the Jews. This phase of Messianic prophecy is repeated again and again: by David (Ps. 2; 72), to David (2 Sam 7, 12), by Isaiah (9, 6; 11,4), by Jeremiah (23, 5), and by Daniel (7, 13-14), and by Zechariah (9, 9). It is unfortunate that the spiritual character of His reign should have been lost by the Jews, and that this phase of His work should have been emphasized almost to the exclusion of the office of Prophet and Priest. Yet Jacob had no such mistaken notions, as we saw from Gen. 48, 16 and 49, 18.**

* A little difficulty arises from the use of the word מֵבֵינַי. Some insist that it must be a lawgiver; and they explain "from between his feet" as "from his loins" referring to the act of generation. But because of the parallelism with מֵבֵינַי it probably refers to the commander's staff, which was quite long and was rested between the feet while the ruler sat down.. Be that as it may, the expressions both refer to a ruler.

** Cf. p. 38 and p. 26 respectively.

10. The Law of Moses and Sacrifice: With Gen. 49, 10 we come to the end of Messianic prophecies in Genesis. But we pause to consider that in all this time there had been no formal law, the fulfilment of which God required. A sacrament had been introduced, when Abraham was commanded to circumcise all males to show that they belonged to the people of God; but this was not the cause of the promise but its result. God chose a particular people in the descendants of Abraham; among them He worked out His plans, built His kingdom. But in the Messiah this kingdom would embrace all the world, and all peoples would become subject to Him. Not from one race, but from all would the church be built up. During those first centuries the people had Gospel to comfort them, long before the Law came in to condemn them. It is impossible to consider this fact of O.T. theology without being forced to conclude that the faith, which was among them, which we found stated in Gen. 15, 6 and implied from Gen 4, 1 on, rested on the Messiah to come. Through Him God would be gracious to the sinful world.

But within the bounds of the chosen people God introduced a set of strict laws, not only moral but also ceremonial and political. What was the purpose of this strict law-enforcement, if the believers were saved in the O.T. as in the N.T.? Why was the Law added at all? For one thing the law which had been in man's heart was becoming more obscure, and it had to be restated and re-enforced for the sake of order in the world. But this does not account for the ceremonial and political law. These were given in order that the depravity and helplessness of man might become clearer. The conscientious man soon came to the conclusion of Isaiah, "All our righteousnesses are as filthy rags." Transgression, conscious

10. The Law of Moses and Sacrifice: With Gen. 49, 10 we come to the end of Messianic prophecies in Genesis. But we pause to consider that in all this time there had been no formal law, the fulfilment of which God required. A sacrament had been introduced, when Abraham was commanded to circumcise all males to show that they belonged to the people of God; but this was not the cause of the promise but its result. God chose a particular people in the descendants of Abraham; among them He worked out His plans, built His kingdom. But in the Messiah this kingdom would embrace all the world, and all peoples would become subject to Him. Not from one race, but from all would the church be built up. During those first centuries the people had Gospel to comfort them, long before the Law came in to condemn them. It is impossible to consider this fact of O.T. theology without being forced to conclude that the faith, which was among them, which we found stated in Gen. 15, 6 and implied from Gen 4, 1 on, rested on the Messiah to come. Through Him God would be gracious to the sinful world.

But within the bounds of the chosen people God introduced a set of strict laws, not only moral but also ceremonial and political. What was the purpose of this strict law-enforcement, if the believers were saved in the O.T. as in the N.T.? Why was the Law added at all? For one thing the law which had been in man's heart was becoming more obscure, and it had to be restated and re-enforced for the sake of order in the world. But this does not account for the ceremonial and political law. These were given in order that the depravity and helplessness of man might become clearer. The conscientious man soon came to the conclusion of Isaiah, "All our righteousnesses are as filthy rags." Transgression, conscious

1.1. Post-Mosaic Messianic Prophecy: After the Law and sacrifice had been given, the promise would have been inoperative, if the law had been intended to take the place of prophecy as the means of redemption. Not only would this conflict with the unchangeableness of God, but it would also end prophecy. How different is the fact in the matter! After the Law had been given, Messianic prophecy not only continues, but also becomes most distinct and clear. The Law is surrounded by Gospel. Not from the Law, but from the Gospel salvation came. We saw that the very word מָשִׁיחַ had a Messianic sense. This forces us to the conclusion: Not from works but from faith in the Messiah came justification in the O.T.

It is not the purpose of this paper to treat Post-Mosaic Messianic prophecies. We shall content ourselves with mentioning but a few: Moses points to the Redeemer as a prophet like unto himself, who shall be the Mediator (Deut 18, 18-19). David predicts the suffering and crucifixion of the Savior (Ps 22). He also predicts His soul agony (Ps 8) and His resurrection (Ps 16). Job knows Him as Redeemer and as Awakener at the Last day (Job 19, 25-27)*

But it is in Isaiah that we meet the most definite statements about the person and the work of the Messiah. He is properly called the Evangelist of the O.T. His first distinct prophecy of the Messiah is the sign which the Lord gave to Ahas (7, 14): "Behold, the virgin has conceived and is bearing a son and has called his name Immanuel." מָרְיָם can be nothing else but a virgin.** With the arti-

 * That the מָשִׁיחַ is the Messiah and not a vindicator, is proved by the expressions "the last once upon the earth" "I shall see God," and by the parallel to chapter 16, 21 and 33, 23. (LXX 11, 110f)
 Note the parallel to Daniel 11.

** LXX παρθένος; so also Mt. 1, 23. All passages refer to a virgin Prov 30, 19 is disputed, but since adultery is scored in v. 20, it is more natural to refer v 19 to something else, namely fornication, And then not a young married woman but a true virgin would be involved. Luther's famous offer would stand today.

cle it points to Gen. 3, 15: Seed of the woman. And since this prophecy speaks of the virgin birth, the child born cannot be a human child, but must be divine. This is emphasized by its name, God with us. The perfect is prophetic and indicates the certainty of the occurrence. V. 17 clearly shows that it cannot be a true perfect; for before this child is old enough to distinguish between good and evil, Judah will have gone through the Babylonian captivity. Hence, it is the same child that is called "Wonderful, Councillor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace," in 9, 6.

The prophecy of prophecies is chapter 53 of Isaiah, in which the suffering of the Servant of Jehovah is depicted. That the "Servant of Jehovah could be Israel is made impossible by the pronoun of the first person, by which the prophet places himself in the group of those who are benefitted by His suffering. But since the prophet belongs to the congregation of Israel, this is an individual separate from the congregation. Other points of the prophecy bring out the same thing: He is innocent (vv4-5), He is a willing sufferer ((v. 10); an unresisting sufferer (v. 7). He dies (v. 9). All of this does not fit the congregation of Israel. With the heaping of the "For us," "for our transgressions," the vicarious atonement is plainly brought out.

12. Justification and righteousness in the O.T.: אֱמִתּוּת is the correct thing to do. When it is used of God, it refers to His faithfulness in keeping His promises and His firmness in carrying out His threats. Toward His children, God's righteousness manifests itself in their salvation. This is brought out by Dan 9, 16: "According to thine righteousness, let thine anger and thy fury be

turned away from me." In Ps. 103, 17 it is therefore placed parallel to mercy. And that also explains the expression "salvation and righteousness", which occurs Ps 71, 15; 98, 2; Is 51, 6; etc. The two words belong together

אֲדִי in man is the correct attitude toward God. But that does not mean work-righteousness. Even in Deuteronomy work-righteousness is condemned. Moses tells the children of Israel: "Not for thy righteousness or for the uprightness of thine heart dost thou go to possess their land (Deut 9, 5). Ezekiel says: "The righteousness of the righteous shall not deliver in the day of transgression (33, 12). Though he was a righteous man, yet any transgression condemns him, and his former and later righteousness doesn't deliver him. Daniel says: "O Lord, righteousness belongeth unto thee, but unto us confusion of faces." Simply because they had no righteousness, they were put to shame. It is noteworthy that the prophet includes himself among the shamed ones. Again in v. 18 he shows that his righteousness counts for nothing before God: "We do not present our supplication before thee for our righteousness, but for thy great mercy."

But righteousness in man is made possible by imputation. We saw that from Gen. 15, 6. Isaiah says of God: "He hath covered me with the robe of righteousness." In Mal. 4, 2 we read of the Sun of righteousness with healing in His wings. How does healing follow from righteousness, except righteousness be vicarious righteousness? Ps. 24, 5 says that he "who has clean hands and a pure heart" shall receive blessing from the Lord and righteousness from the God of salvation. Righteousness is here considered a gift, distinct from mere uprightness (v. 4). This is certainly imputed righteousness, which alone stands before God. It is parallel to blessing because it is the highest blessing.

These passages show clearly that true righteousness is the gift of God. But does the O.T. teach that it came from the Messiah? that for His sake God counted men righteous? It does most certainly. Is He not called the "Sun of righteousness" in the prophecy of Malachi? More clearly righteousness of Christians is ascribed to Him in Jer. 33, 15: "In those days and at that time will I cause the Branch of righteousness to grow up unto David (Is 11, 1) and He shall execute judgment and righteousness in the Land. In those days shall Judah be saved and Jerusalem shall dwell safely; and this is the name whereby she shall be called, The Lord our Righteousness." This promise had already been given with slight modifications in 23, 6. But not the force of applying the name of the Messiah: The Lord our righteousness, to the believers, to Jerusalem and Judah. Clearly here imputed righteousness is taught. The name of the believers shall be "The Lord (i.e., the Messiah) is our righteousness." Here even the mystic union of the believer and Christ is taught. "Our righteousness" clearly refers to the iustitia imputata.

But if this is not yet clear enough, we refer to Is 53, 11 where righteousness is expressed in the verb, justify: "By His knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquity." יְצַדִּיק is the γυνώσκω, the wisdom of Christ, which He has given to men by the preaching of His gospel. By this He, the צַדִּיק עַבְדִּי, the righteous, my servant, shall declare righteous: יְצַדִּיק, hifil of the verb from which δικαιοσύνη is derived; here because no direct object follows, we use the full hifil force "cause to be righteous." לְרַבִּים to a multitude; but Gesenius 117 n shows that this is equal to a direct object: He causes a multitude to be righteous; better, He declares them to be righteous, for He also

also is the judge. יִסְרֵל He shall bear their iniquity. The future indicates that this action goes on indefinitely. He bears all sins of all times. And the י is then properly causal, "for." Here, then, we have the clearest possible proof that the righteousness required by God in man has been gained by the Messiah, and is imputed. How? בְּדַבְרֵי: By the preaching of His Word and by faith which accepts that preaching.

13. Summary: From O. T. Theology we glean the following points with reference to salvation: 1. That after the Fall man has become totally depraved (Gen 8, 21; Ps 51, 6). 2. That man has been unable to save himself by his own righteousness (Ps 143, 3; 49, 7; Deut 9, 5). 3. That immediately after the Fall man received from God the promise of a divine Seed, who should conquer Satan, the cause of sin (Gen. 3, 15). 4. That the need of a Savior was not taken away by the Law, but emphasized by it (Deut 9,5; Is 64, 6). 5. That sacrifices were not a substitute but a type for His atonement (Is 1, 11 with Is 53, 10). 6. That accordingly, the Messiah would die (Is 53, 9) to take away the sins (Is 53, 6) of the whole world (Is ^{2,2} 2, 2). 7. That true righteousness is the imputed righteousness of Christ (Is 53, 10; Jer 33, 16; Mal 4, 2). 8. That this righteousness comes by faith (Gen. 15, 6; Hab. 2,4).

Bibliography

Briggs, C. A., Messianic Prophecy.

Brown, Driver and Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the O. T.

Delitzsch, Franz, A New Commentary on Genesis

" " Der Prophet Habakkuk

" " Messianische Weissagungen.

Dillmann, Commentary on Genesis.

Driver, S. R., Moods and Tenses

Edersheim, Alfred, Prophecy and History in Relation to the Messiah

Fuerbringer, L., Notes on Messianic Prophecy

" " The Book of Job

" " Einleitung in das A. T.

Gerhards, Jo., Commentarius super Genesis.

Gesenius, W., Hebrew Grammar

" " and Buhl, F., Heb. u. aram. Handwörterbuch (Ed. 17).

Heerboth, L. A. in L. and W., 61, 1ff: Das Bekenntnis Hiobs.

" " " " " " 62, 389 ff: Der biblische Begriff "glauben" ^{glauben.} "glauben"

Hengstenberg, E. W., Christology of the O. T.

Hirschberger Bibel.

International Critical Commentary on the O. T.

Keil Delitzsch, Commentary on the O. T.

König, Edw., Lehrgebäude.

" " Messianische Weissagung

" " Theologie des A. T.

Lange Schaff, Commentary.

Maier, W. A., Notes on Genesis, Psalms, and Isaiah.

Moore, G. F., Judaism.

Mueller, J. T., Notes on Isaiah.

Oehler, G. F., Theology of the O. T.

Pieper, August, Jesaias.

Philippi, Römerbrief.

Sellin, Ernst, Komm. des A. T.

Stöckhardt, G., Jesaias.

" " Ausgewählte Psalmen

" " Römerbrief.

" " Biblische Geschichte, A. T.

" " in L. and W. 36.

Strack-Zoeckler, Commentary.

Weber, F., Die Lehren des Talmuds.

Young, Analytical Concordance.

Zorn, Psalmen.