

the Prince of Peace," we fail to see wherein that differs in kind from the prediction of the same prophet concerning Cyrus, calling him by name one hundred years before his reign.

Of course, there is considerable force in what Prof. Workman says concerning interpreting prophecy in the light of its supposed fulfilment; thus reading a meaning into it that we may read it out again, as analogous to the habit of looking for the answer of a problem before attempting its solution.

But if the problem has been very difficult of solution, or wholly insoluble, and if our blessed Lord points out to His doubting disciples that in Him these prophecies have found their fulfilment, why should we not avail ourselves of the key thus furnished to unlock the difficulties of the problem? Many of the predictions of the Apocalypse we think were not designed to make plain to our minds the events to which they refer while still in the future, but to be a perpetual testimony of the divine inspiration of that prophecy *after* the event shall have taken place. So the eyes of the disciples were often holden that they did not discern the true nature of Christ's kingdom and character. But when our Lord put this key of the fulfilment of the Scriptures into their hands, the mystery was unlocked, and they recognized His true Messiahship.

While many of Dr. Workman's applications of the principle of interpretation command assent, yet the general conclusion that "in the Propheticage, Messianic prophecy proper appears; but even here there is no prophetic passage that has an original reference to the New Testament Messiah,"—p 448—strikes us, as it will, we think, strike most Bible readers, with a mental shock. Not all his force of argument will be able to shake the deep-rooted conviction of Messianic prediction, nor induce us to yield assent to the above quoted statement.

Having said this, it is unnecessary to refer at length to the particular prophecies. It seems to us, however, a

"most lame and impotent conclusion" that the celebrated passage in the 3rd chapter of Genesis, the *prot evangelium*, given before the expulsion of our first parents from Eden, recognized as a distinct Messianic prediction by the great body of Christian interpreters throughout the Christian centuries, was but the bald and literal statement of the natural "enmity between mankind and serpents."—P. 441. "It has yet to be discovered," says Dr. Clark, "that the serpentine race have any peculiar enmity against mankind; nor is there any proof that men hate serpents more than they do other noxious animals."

When we read twenty-five years ago the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament with Prof. Hirschfelder, to whom the Hebrew tongue is a familiar vernacular, we were deeply impressed with his literal interpretation of these passages as referring predictively to our Lord; and recent conversations upon the subject convince us that he still retains the same interpretation as strongly as ever. It strikes one with a mental shock that even those sacred prophecies of Psalm 22 and Isaiah 53 are explained as having no original reference to Christ or Messianic prediction, although Messianic in their "application."

With the closing pages of Prof. Workman's essay we are much more in accord. There is much that is devout and that is deeply spiritual; much that would make us fain hope that many of the differences of interpretation between Dr. Workman and his critics are differences in manner of expression more than of underlying principle. "The Hebrew Scriptures," he says, "are saturated with Messianic prophecy, but in a sense deeper than Christian people commonly suppose. Because of the divine element in prophecy, the Old Testament is full of Christ, not in the sense of prediction, but in the sense of testimony. From Genesis to Malachi, the prophetic Scriptures, in their lofty ethical conceptions, breathe the spirit of Jesus Christ. 'To Him bear all the prophets witness.' He is the central or focal point, so to speak, in which