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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

another's language, to converse together in an informal manner. The boat stopped at the Rütli—a spot sacred in the history of Swiss liberty—the passengers disembarked and climbed to the top of the steep eminence; and there, with a glorious view of lake and mountain, the company stood bareheaded while Herr Philippi told the tale of the oath taken on that spot to die rather than submit to the strangers' yoke. "And so we, members of this Congress," he continued, "make a firm resolution to struggle against the religious slavery which emanates from Rome, and to constitute ourselves into free and independent Churches." It was a picturesque and characteristic, as well as suitable, termination of the Congress.

No one who has been brought into contact with the Old Catholic body can doubt of the honesty, the uprightness, the piety, the soundness of faith, and the hostility to Roman Catholic corruptions which characterize those who are conducting the movement. The apathy displayed by English Churchmen is a sad and strange phenomenon. God sets before us allies, friends, helpers, ready to work with us, pray with us, sympathize with us, and we turn away with a cold bow or a stare of indifference. Happily this is not the attitude which we all of us take up. Honour to the late Bishop Harold Browne, the late Bishop Christopher Wordsworth, his son, the present Bishop of Salisbury, and the Archbishop of Dublin, who have done, or are doing, their best to advance and co-operate with this healthy, wholesome movement for Catholic reform and Christian union!

F. MEYRICK.

ART. IV.—THE PROMISE TO DAVID.

"Moreover the LORD telleth thee that the LORD will make thee an house. When thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish his kingdom.

"He shall build an house for My name; and I will stablish the throne of his kingdom for ever. I will be his Father, and he shall be My son."—2 SAM. vii. 11 ff. (Revised Version).

THE promise thus given to David and to his seed is the acknowledged foundation of Messianic prophecy, strictly so called; that is, of prophecy in which the Redeemer of Israel is foreshadowed as a king, the representative and viceroy of Jehovah, "the LORD'S Anointed."

A new and more definite form is thus given to "the hope of Israel" based upon the ancient covenant with Abraham: "In

thee and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed."

The fulfilment of that hope is henceforward to be looked for in the house of David, and in the kingdom promised to his seed for ever.

Here, then, we find an epoch well marked both in the history of Israel and in the progress of Divine revelation; an epoch therefore at which we may best observe the nature and conditions of Messianic prophecy in its living connection with the fortunes of the people to whom it was addressed.

The actual circumstances and special demands of the age and nation, the character of the persons by whom, and to whom, the Divine message was delivered, the truthfulness and accuracy of the history—all these considerations must enter into any just estimate of the prophetic utterance. And the first place in our inquiry is claimed by modern criticism for the historical character of the written record. Is it trustworthy? Have we reason to believe that the narrative of events is true, and the prophecy genuine?

Happily we can answer these questions with confidence. The Second Book of Samuel is one of the portions of the Old Testament which most firmly resist the disintegrating and dissolving processes of the higher criticism. Here, as elsewhere, all forms of ingenious conjecture have been exhausted upon the origin and composition of the book.

It has been variously described as: "An old *short life* of David with later interpolations;"[1] and as "a *special history* of David, rising almost into a biography;"[2] as "*two* contradictory accounts elaborated by compilers;"[3] and as "the work of the Jehovist *alone*;"[4] as based upon "authentic accounts by the court historian of the events of his own time," setting out "from a simple observation of occurrences" recorded "immediately after the death of each king," *or* "from a *prophetical* view of events, mainly representing the operation of prophetic energies in Israel."[5]

The prophetic historian is followed by "the first Deuteronomic editor," more welcome perhaps as "the last editor but one," who strives "to illuminate and recast the more important features" of the history under this new light of "the Deuteronomic ideas."[6] We are not surprised to learn that the history had by this time become "very comprehensive" and "somewhat burdensome to later readers," so that yet "another editor soon became necessary, who would both shorten many parts, and add much that was important."[7]

---

[1] Eichhorn, ap. Keil, "Introduction to O. T." p. 250.
[2] Thenius, *ib.*
[3] Gramberg, ap. Keil, Introd., *ib.*
[4] Stähelin, *ib.*
[5] Ewald, "History of Israel," I., p. 136.
[6] *Ib.*, p. 156 f.
[7] *Ib.*, p. 159.

Such are some of the fantasies of criticism with which we have grown familiar, and to which familiarity has brought no increase of persuasive force. Their effect on the mind of M. Renan is expressed in a notable passage of his preface to the French translation of Kuenen's "Critical History of the Books of the Old Testament":

"To be content to be ignorant of that which cannot be known is perhaps in the present state of the studies of Biblical exegesis the first quality. . . . On such subjects a new idea has much chance of being a paradox. To invent new hypotheses is a perilous thing, when for years past science has been turning in a beaten circle, and no new datum has been introduced. What is more dangerous still is the temptation felt by false and sophistical minds, when there is nothing new to be found, to *un*do that which has been well done. Science rests on liberty, and liberty consists in being able always to call in question the results that have been gained. But hence arise very serious inconveniences, I mean those barren agitations of restless minds, those backward steps pretending to be progress, those bizarre theories, in which one sees what has been proved by the genius of great masters, brought again into doubt."

Returning to the Second Book of Samuel, we find that a critic so advanced as Reuss describes it thus: "If we no longer find here the poetic charm which formed the principal attraction of the former book, as a compensation we find ourselves in face of a greater number of material facts, which permit us to appreciate at their real value both the character of the prince who was the true founder of the Israelitish monarchy, and the policy of his government." "We feel at once that we are on the solid ground of history." "The greater part of the text may be regarded as going back to very ancient documents, very exact, and presenting all safeguards that can be desired of historical fidelity."[1]

Wellhausen, in the second edition, published in 1889, of "The Composition of the Hexateuch and of the Historical Books of the Old Testament," maintains (p. 238) that with the Book of Samuel the thread of the history becomes continuous, but is compiled from several original sources, and was finally revised after the supposed discovery of Deuteronomy. Of these original sources, those which contain the life of David were written in Judah or Jerusalem; and as they show no trace of a tendency to favour either Ephraim or Judah, "they appear," says Wellhausen, "to lie not so very far away from the events." In other words, these original narratives were written before the division of the kingdoms of Israel and

[1] Reuss, "Books of Samuel," p. 128 f.

Judah, and their date is thus fixed within the reigns of David and Solomon.

The collection of these original documents into great historical books had taken place before the supposed Deuteronomic revision, of which there are few traces, if any, in the Book of Samuel.[1]

From this favourable judgment of the critics there is an exception which cannot surprise us. The seventh chapter, with which especially we have to do, is said to have been supplied by a later hand. The reason is obvious; it contains the narrative of a supernatural incident, a communication of God's will to His prophet in a vision of the night, and a promise extending far into the unknown future. To critics such as Wellhausen and Reuss a Divine revelation is *à priori* impossible, and prophecy nothing else than history antedated.

The author who pretends to foretell the fortunes of David's posterity must of course be looking *back* upon a long duration of the dynasty; there is no need of further witness; the inventor, or, as he is rather more courteously called, "the concipient," of the prophecy "must have written while the kingdom of Judah existed, but quite late, perhaps under Josiah, when in spite of the evil past new hopes were still formed for the future."[2]

These assertions seem somewhat arbitrary, and will perhaps be satisfactory only to those who, like the critics, are already convinced that God *could not* hold communication with His creature man, and that prophecy is either at the best a lucky forecast, or more commonly the fiction of a later age.

Happily we can often appeal from the prejudices of a critic to his truthfulness and candour; his own admissions may supply a sufficient answer to his objections.

Thus Reuss himself, immediately after the words already quoted, goes on to speak of David's reign in these terms: "As this first reign left ineffaceable memories upon the mind of the nation, as almost every page of its literature bears witness, there will be no great rashness in supposing that very early the pen of the historian was already employed in fixing them."

And we may safely add that among these memories of David's glorious age there was none more ineffaceable by time, more worthy to secure immediate record, than this prophecy of a kingdom to be established henceforward for ever.

Still more important and more favourable are the admissions made by Kuenen. His principle is that "the books themselves by their character and contents give us the secret of their true date. Thus a narrative, lively, exact, archaic in its diction,

[1] Wellhausen, p. 301. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 257.

will usually be ancient. If purely *objective*" (written, that is, with a simple regard to facts), "it will be earlier than a narrative reduced to the point of view of prophets, priests, or other partisans of the theocracy."[1]

Now, in our books of Samuel the editor's work, says Kuenen (p. 399), is "*very* objective"; he finds in our seventh chapter especially "no regard to the Deuteronomic Torah,[2] no interest in the hierarchy";[3] and as the author seems, he thinks, "not much to admire the *temple*-worship, the chapter must have been edited at an epoch when the earlier and more simple organization of Divine worship was not yet forgotten."[4] He calls it, in short, "a very ancient prophetic narrative," and classes it among "fragments written a short time after the events which they record."[5]

It is satisfactory to find that these chief critics all agree in admitting the existence of contemporary, or almost contemporary, records of David's reign, and differ only as to the mode in which those records were employed in the composition of the present book. Their agreement is of course far more convincing than their differences; for when we turn to the facts as they lie before us in the Bible, we find the strongest evidence that the events of David's reign *were* recorded by contemporary writers, who had taken part in the incidents which they describe, and whose character gives the surest warrant of their faithfulness and accuracy.

The author of the First Book of Chronicles informs us that "the acts of David the king, first and last, behold, they are written in the book of Samuel the seer, and in the book of Nathan the prophet, and in the book of Gad the seer."[6]

Modern critics have tried in many ways, but with little success, to avoid the natural meaning of this verse, that three written documents, of which Samuel, Nathan, and Gad were the *authors*, are here indicated by the chronicler as the original sources of the history of David. Moreover, the chronicler's own narrative of Nathan's prophecy agrees almost exactly word for word with the chapter before us, so that the one must evidently have been taken from the other, or both from the same common source. In either case, we have before us not only the substance, but the actual words of the very Prophet Nathan who brought the Divine message to David—the testimony of a man whose uncompromising fidelity is proved by his terrible denunciation of David's later sins.

How could we have any surer warrant for the truthfulness and accuracy of the record, or for the genuineness of the

---

[1] "Hist. Crit.," p. 392. [2] P. 390. [3] P. 391.
[4] Note xiii., p. 576. [5] P. 393. [6] 1 Chron. xxix. 29.

promise, so important as the foundation of the hope of the Messiah and His kingdom?

The next point for our consideration is the character of the promise, as viewed in connection with the circumstances and needs of the time.

The government of the people of Israel had recently undergone a change of vital importance. In the disastrous period of the Judges we can hardly say that any political constitution existed; the unity of national life was sacrificed to the jealousy and violence of contending tribes. Even Samuel himself, greatest after Moses as leader, and prophet, and judge, could neither restrain the disorders of civil life, nor restore the lost purity of faith and worship.

Harassed and oppressed by warlike neighbours, corrupted and debased by contact with the foul idolatries of the heathen, the people of Israel had lost faith in the inspiring thought that "God was their King," and that His power was pledged for their protection. They must have a king to lead them forth to war like the kings of the nations, and their demand was only too fully granted.

Saul, in the pride of youth and beauty, of unmatched strength and heroic valour, was their ideal king, but, like themselves, impatient of Divine guidance and control, and too ready to trust in his own arm for deliverance. In the distractions of his turbulent reign and in its tragic end Hosea saw a close resemblance to God's judgments upon apostate Israel and its last ill-fated monarch. "Where now is thy king, that he may save thee in all thy cities? and thy judges, of whom thou saidst, Give me a king and princes? I gave thee a king in Mine anger, and have taken him away in My wrath."[1]

It was then in David, "the man after God's own heart," that the theocratic kingdom was first established according to its true ideal. As "the LORD'S anointed," the king of Israel was the vicegerent of the King of kings, chosen by the grace of God to rule over God's own people, and to lead forth the armies of Israel in the power of "the LORD of Hosts."

Of this absolute dependence upon God, David is most emphatically and appropriately reminded in the message sent to him by the mouth of Nathan: "Now, therefore, so shalt thou say unto My servant David, Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, I took thee from the sheepcote, from following the sheep, to be ruler over My people, over Israel: and I was with thee whithersoever thou wentest, and have cut off all thine enemies from before thee;" and then, turning to the future: "I will make thee a great name, like unto the name of the great ones that are in the earth."[2]

---

[1] Hos. xiii. 11.

[2] 2 Sam. viii. 8, 9.

Encouraged thus by the remembrance of God's gracious favour and protection in all the wonderful course of his past life, and by a promise of yet greater honour and success, David is next reminded that these personal blessings are intimately connected with the welfare of God's chosen people: "Moreover, I have appointed a place for My people Israel, and have planted them, that they may dwell in their own place and be disturbed no more; neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as aforetime, from the day when I appointed judges over My people Israel. And I will give thee rest from all thine enemies."[1]

We see that the troubles and disasters which the Israelites had suffered in the time of the Judges are contrasted with the freedom and safety which they now enjoyed under David's rule. For already the tribes who adhered to Saul's ill-fated house had been reunited to Judah; the assaults of the Philistines had been rolled back, and their power broken. Already David had made the stronghold of the Jebusites the centre of civil government. He had brought up the Ark to Mount Zion, and so made Jerusalem "the city of the great King," "the city of God." He had built for himself a house of cedar, and was at present enjoying an interval of rest from all his enemies.

In such circumstances the king's desire to build a house for the Ark of God seems at once so natural and so pious, so well-calculated to strengthen the royal authority by restoring the unity of religion, that Nathan's ready approval, "Go, do all that is in thine heart, for the Lord is with thee," is at first easier to understand than the restraint of David's zeal by the message communicated to the prophet in a vision of the night.

The contemporary record—written, as we believe, by Nathan himself—does not expressly state any reason why David might not build a house for God. The fact is recalled that in all the wanderings of Israel, and throughout the period of the Judges, God had chosen to dwell among them "in a tent and in a tabernacle." But such an admonition is not contradictory, to the promise that a temple shall ere long be built; rather it is a counsel of patience and consolation to David, teaching him to raise his thoughts from the earthly tabernacle to the high and holy place which God inhabiteth eternally, and a well-timed reminiscence of the fundamental principle of all spiritual religion, that the "Lord of heaven and earth dwelleth not in temples made with hands. As saith the prophet, Heaven is My throne, and earth is My footstool.

[1] Vers. 10, 11.

What house will ye build Me? saith the Lord; or what is the place of My rest?"[1]

Other reasons for delay we may gather from the known circumstances of the time and the subsequent course of events. For in the jealous strife and dangerous rebellions by which David's later reign was troubled, there is abundant proof that his power was not even then fully consolidated nor the loyalty of all the tribes secured.

The old tabernacle at Gibeon was still a recognised place of sacrifice; there were two high priests, whose rival claims might at any time become a source of danger—as, in fact, it afterwards proved, when Abiathar joined Adonijah's insurrection, while Zadok remained faithful to David and to Solomon.

For the present the removal of the ark to Mount Zion was a sufficient indication that this was the "place which God had chosen to set His name there."

But the unity of the state and the strength of the monarchy must be more firmly established before Jerusalem could with safety be made the one exclusive centre of worship and sacrifice.

The force of these reasons was, in fact, but too clearly proved in the disastrous schism, political and religious, of Rehoboam's reign.

Again, for David there was work of a very different kind to be accomplished in the consolidation and extension of his kingdom. God's covenant with Abraham that his seed should possess the land "from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates,"[2] had remained through many centuries a promise unfulfilled. But the time had now come when its fulfilment was needed to give strength and security to the new kingdom, as well as to vindicate the faithfulness of God.

It was a work for which David was pre-eminently fitted; and he of whom the daughters of Israel sang that "Saul had slain his thousands, and David his ten thousands," was soon to be called again to wage war against the enemies of Israel on every side. For in the next chapter we read that, after renewed victories over Philistines and Moabites, David advanced through Syria to the Euphrates, and there in two great battles routed the vast armies which Hadadezer had gathered from both sides of the river; and by making Damascus, and Hamath, and all the Syrian kingdoms west of the Euphrates his tributaries, gave to his dominions an extent which literally fulfilled God's ancient promise, "I will set thy bounds from the Red Sea even unto the Sea of the Philistines, and from the desert unto the river";[3] foreshadowing

[1] Acts vii. 48 f. [2] Gen. xv. 18. [3] Ex. xxiii. 31.

thus the world-wide kingdom of Messiah, as described in Psa. lxxii., "He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth."

The necessity for waging such great wars against his heathen neighbours was of itself a hindrance to David's purpose of building the house of the Lord. "Thou knowest," wrote Solomon to King Hiram, "how that David my father *could* not build a house unto the name of the Lord his God for the wars that were about him on every side, until the Lord put them under the soles of his feet."[1]

But the author of the Book of Chronicles, looking back from a much later age, has preserved for us the record of another reason, not mentioned in the earlier canonical books, why wars, marked too deeply by the fierceness and cruelty of the age, unfitted David to build the house of God. And it is David himself who with touching humility makes this confession, first to Solomon and then to his assembled people: "The word of the Lord came to me, saying, Thou hast shed blood abundantly, and hast made great wars: thou shalt not build a house unto My name, because thou hast shed much blood upon the earth in My sight."[2]

We may see even in this brief glance at the course of events in David's reign how much light is thrown upon both parts of the message conveyed to him by Nathan. It explains why David himself was never permitted to carry out the cherished desire of his heart to build a house unto the Lord, and further shows that the promise which follows—apart from its Messianic import—was precisely adapted to the most urgent necessities of the time. For if the new kingdom, though enjoying a brief interval of rest, was still beset by dangers from within and from without, what words could more surely breathe courage and confidence into the hearts of the king and his people than those which Nathan brought: "Moreover, Jehovah telleth thee that Jehovah will build a house for thee"? "And it shall come to pass, when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels; and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for My name."

The notion that these last words interfere with the just sequence of the thought and betray a later insertion has been too hastily adopted by some recent critics, who have themselves drawn attention to the double meaning of the word "house," and to the contrast which thus runs through the whole prophecy—between the house which David may not

[1] 1 Kings v. 3. [2] 1 Chron. xxii 8.; xxviii. 3.

build, of cedar and stone, and the house which God will build for David, of living stones—son and son's sons, sitting upon his throne for ever.

For though the promise was fulfilled in its limited and material sense by Solomon, we are rightly reminded that its terms are general, referring not to Solomon alone, but to the whole line of David's descendants—that "seed" of which it is said, "He shall build a house for My name, and I will stablish the throne of his kingdom for ever: And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before Me."

May we not now say that the Messianic interpretation of this great prophecy gains much in clearness and certainty from the careful determination of its exact grammatical sense, for which we are indebted to Hebrew scholars of the highest authority in our two chief universities? The "*house*" which God Himself will build for David, the "*seed*" of David who shall build the house of God, the "kingdom" which "shall be established for ever"—does not such language justify, or, rather, necessitate, that higher meaning which was ascribed to it in every age of the Jewish Church, with ever-growing clearness and confidence, from the days of David himself to those of Christ and His Apostles?

I say "with growing clearness," because it is by no means true that a prophecy can contain nothing beyond the meaning which it bears for those who first receive it. The truths of God are living truths, and growth and progress are marks of their Divine origin and continuous life. We have an example of such growth in the remaining promise of our text, "I will be his Father, and he shall be My son."

The loving relation between the Heavenly Father and His children is implied from the first in the blessing of Abraham and his seed. It finds striking expression in God's message to Pharaoh: "Israel is My son, even my first-born; and I say unto thee, Let My son go, that he may serve Me."[1] In the subsequent history, and especially in the last "Song of Moses," the Israelites are constantly reminded of their privilege and duty as God's children—sons and daughters of Jehovah.[2]

But the title becomes more definite and the promise more significant as renewed to David. Here for the first time God speaks of one particular person as His son. Of the king, who as David's "seed" shall sit on David's throne, He says: "I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to Me a son."

The privilege of the nation is thus concentrated upon its king, in his official and typical character as "the Lord's anointed," and not for any personal merit. This is evident

[1] Ex. iv. 22. [2] Deut. xxxii. 5, 6, 19.

from the words which follow: "He shall be to Me a son, whom, if he transgress, I will chasten with the rod of men, and with the stripes of the children of men." Such language sets the primary application of the prophecy beyond question; it refers to Solomon first, and then to each of his successors on the throne. So it was understood by David and by Solomon himself, when at the dedication of the temple he declared: "The Lord hath performed His word that He spake: and I am risen up in the room of David my father, and sit on the throne of Israel, as the Lord promised, and have built a house for the name of the Lord God of Israel."[1]

This literal sense of the promise was never forgotten; but even in the last dark days of the expiring dynasty the hope of Israel still clings with touching fidelity to each unhappy monarch who sits in turn on David's throne. For the figure of "the Lord's anointed" is still closely combined with that of the human king, whose sins are visited with the stripes of the children of men.

Hence the sorrowful emphasis with which the author of Psa. lxxxix. lingers over the warning so fatally neglected: "If his children forsake My law, and walk not in My judgments; if they break My statutes, and keep not My commandments, then will I visit their transgression with a rod, and their iniquity with stripes."[2]

Hence, too, the earnest plea of an immutable promise: "Nevertheless, My loving-kindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer My faithfulness to fail. My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of My lips."[3]

Hence the bold expostulation: "But Thou hast cast off and abhorred: Thou hast been wroth with Thine anointed: Thou hast made void the covenant of Thy servant."[4]

Hence, finally, the fear that the Psalmist himself may not live to see a restoration of the promised mercy, and the pathetic sadness of the prayer: "Remember how short my time is." "Remember how I do bear in my bosom the rebukes of many people, wherewith Thine enemies have blasphemed Thee and slandered the footsteps of Thine anointed."[5]

It would be easy to show how this longing hope of a restoration of the earthly kingdom lived on from age to age, growing in intensity at each stirring crisis of the national life, and inspiring every effort to shake off the yoke of subjection both before and after the coming of the true Redeemer.

But the promise given to David meant more than a kingdom of this world; and its higher meaning became clearer in

---

[1] Kings viii. 20. [2] Ver. 30. [3] Ver. 33. [4] Ver. 38. [5] Vers. 47, 50.

the light of subsequent events, proving, as they did too surely, that none of the kings of Judah could ever satisfy the hopes inspired by so lofty an ideal.

And in this connection it is worthy of notice that the compiler of the Book of Chronicles, who lived long after the return from the captivity, omits altogether the words, "If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men," as if he would remove from the promise what referred only to the human type, and not to the Divine ideal.[1]

But without thus anticipating the later interpretation, we may see that David himself was conscious from the first that the promise was full of a mysterious blessing. In the prayer and thanksgiving which he pours out "before the Lord," he can find no words to express all the joy and wonder with which his heart is filled. "Who am I, O Lord God?" he cries. "And what is my house, that Thou hast brought me hitherto? And this was yet a small thing in Thy sight, O Lord God; but Thou hast spoken also of Thy servant's house for a great while to come. And is this the law of man, O Lord God? And what can David say more unto Thee? For Thou, Lord God, knowest Thy servant."[2]

Whatever may be the meaning of the difficult words "Is this the law of man?" the whole passage is full of astonishment and delight at the greatness of the promised blessing. How far David was able to discern the spiritual glory of the house which the Lord Himself would build for him, how far he could rejoice in the conscious assurance that as "the Lord's anointed" he and his seed were to be signs and figures of One "higher than the kings of the earth," whose "seed shall endure for ever, and His throne as the days of heaven," are questions to be answered in connection with those royal Psalms which show us the form of "one like unto the Son of God, enthroned at God's right hand, a King and 'a Priest for ever.'"

E. H. GIFFORD.

ART. V.—CHOLERA.

Notes of Lectures delivered at Gresham College.

BY PROFESSOR E. SYMES THOMPSON, M.D., F.R.C.P.

I. THE HISTORY OF CHOLERA.

THE literature of cholera is vast and varied; our earliest accounts of it are to be found in Sanscrit writings some 400 B.C. From the description contained in them the symptoms seem to have been precisely the same as those met with

[1] 1 Chron. xvii. [2] 2 Sam. vii. 18-20.