

The Hebrew Christian Witness

AND

PROPHETIC INVESTIGATOR.

AN ANGLO-JUDÆO CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE.

וְאַתָּה עֵד. "Ye are My Witnesses."—Is. xliii. 10.

No. 22.]

OCTOBER, 1874.

[NEW SERIES.]

THE LORD'S PRAYER.

(Continued from p. 492.)

No. III.

THY KINGDOM COME. These few words cannot possibly be over-rated as to their import and comprehensiveness. Whatever construction some of the disciples may have palmed upon this laconic petition when it was first dictated, the Evangelists and Apostles fully comprehended the magnitude and vastness of meaning conveyed in the three words—two only in Hebrew, **THE LANGUAGE OF CHRIST**, though the Greek translators had to make them twice two—when the Comforter, who is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father sent in Christ's name, taught the disciples all things, and brought all things to their remembrance, whatsoever **HE** had said unto them. We said *some of the disciples* advisedly; for there was one at least amongst the first twelve who put the right construction upon the prayer **THY KINGDOM COME**. Even he who apostrophised the Redeemer, "**RABBI, THOU ART THE SON OF GOD; THOU ART THE KING OF ISRAEL.**"* We shall presently advert more particularly to that guileless Israelite's exclamation.

The Divine Teacher, the Holy Ghost, when He brought to the remembrance of the disciples the supplication under review, must also have recalled to their mind such inspired passages as the following:—"Thine eyes shall see the King in His beauty: they shall behold the land that is very far off. . . . Look upon Zion, the city of our solemnities: thine eyes shall see Jerusalem a quiet habitation, a tabernacle that shall not be taken down; not one of the stakes thereof shall ever be removed, neither shall any of the cords thereof be broken. . . . For the Lord is our judge, the Lord is our lawgiver, the Lord is our king; He will save us."† "I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought Him near before Him. And there was given Him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve Him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away,

* John i. 49.

† Isaiah xxxiii. 17, 20, 22.

and His kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."* "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy King cometh unto thee: He is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass. And I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim, and the horse from Jerusalem, and the battle bow shall be cut off: and He shall speak peace unto the heathen: and His dominion shall be from sea even to sea, and from the river even to the ends of the earth. As for thee also, by the blood of thy covenant I have sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit wherein is no water."† We might easily fill the whole of this our monthly issue with Old Testament predictions respecting the COMING KINGDOM, for which Christ's disciples have been taught and are taught to pray. The above, however, will suffice for the present. We would only remark just now on the divine presentiment which pervaded the souls of the sage, serious, and sober-minded thinkers, amongst heathens as well as amongst Jews, at the first advent of the Redeemer, about the COMING KINGDOM. It was this divine presentiment which led, at the birth of the Redeemer, "wise men from the East to Jerusalem, saying, Where is He that is born King of the Jews? for we have seen His star in the East, and are come to worship Him."‡ Nathanael, however, gave expression to expectations with which the thoughts of his like-minded contemporaries were exercised. Never was the whole range of God's purposes respecting Israel concentrated into two such terse declarations as when the Spirit of God inspired that Israelite indeed, in whom there was no guile,—the type of the nation at large in latter days,—to exclaim, "Rabbi, Thou art the Son of God; Thou art the King of Israel." That exclamation furnished the key to the staple expectation for which the hearts and souls of the Israelites indeed yearned. Even for the coming of the kingdom, the sceptre of which was to be swayed by the Son of God as the King of Israel.

That prevailing expectation, however, in Israel had a tendency to mislead, and has misled multitudes, into the belief that the KINGDOM OF GOD would forthwith, on the first appearance of the Messiah, be established. Notwithstanding that, our people, as a nation, remained uncleansed from their filthiness, profaning the most hallowed name—in which ONLY there is salvation, "for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved."§ To counteract, therefore, the prevailing notion that the COMING KINGDOM was then on the eve of being ushered in, and by anticipation to refute the unscriptural idea, even now espoused by many pious Christians, that the Jews will have their kingdom restored to them in an unconverted state, the Saviour dictated the petition *THY KINGDOM COME*; for it was to be then, and was to be for generations to come, a subject for prayer. Yes, it is to be a subject of prayer as long as it shall be necessary to pray, *HALLOWED BE THY NAME*. The Saviour Himself elucidates this part of His dictated Prayer by His rejoinder to Pilate, which the beloved disciple preserved in the following narrative:—"Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world. If My kingdom were of this world, then would My servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is My kingdom not from hence.

* Dan. vii. 13, 14.

§ Acts iv. 12.

† Zech. ix. 9-11.

‡ Matt. ii. 1, 2.

Pilate therefore said unto Him, Art thou a king then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness of the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth My voice.* Now is His kingdom NOT FROM HENCE, "NOT OF THIS WORLD;" but when His name shall be hallowed by Israel as a nation, when they shall look upon Him whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for Him as the mourning for an only son, and shall be in bitterness for Him, like the bitterness for a firstborn.† Then shall the prayer THY KINGDOM COME be fulfilled, and cease to be offered up. "For what a man seeth"—using an inspired mode of logic—"why doth he yet pray for? But if we pray for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it."‡

To revert for a while to the prevailing expectation about the COMING KINGDOM at our Lord's first coming. It almost passes all understanding that this prevailing expectation, which was in the days of yore so clearly understood by our people, should have become in process of time a most perplexing problem to the earnest inquirer of the house of Jacob. It seemed perfectly natural, at the first coming of the Redeemer, when the people heard that He was coming to Jerusalem, that they should take branches of palm-trees, and go forth to meet Him, and to sing, "Hosanna! Blessed is the King of Israel that cometh in the name of the Lord!" But ever since His crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension, though the "remnant according to the election of grace" from amongst the House of Israel own Him as the many-crowned Head of universal empire, the bulk of the nation of Judah and Israel is under a sort of judicial spell as to the glorious and prevailing expectation of our forefathers, who were stimulated thereto by the predictions of our prophets. We cannot help connecting this judicial spell with a misunderstanding of the first three supplications in the LORD'S PRAYER, of which the one under meditation—THY KINGDOM COME—is the sun and centre.

We would invite the most serious attention of our brethren of the House of Israel to think well, and that prayerfully—especially on the first four days of this month, being the last four days of their group of solemn festivals this year—of the COMING KINGDOM, the claims of the Redeemer to the Kingship of Israel, and of the prerogatives which belong to those regal claims. No well-instructed Israelite could be ignorant of the Almighty's displeasure against His especially chosen nation, by reason of their asking an earthly king, as well as of the national repentance of that heinous sin. We just quote a couple of verses from that humiliating chapter in our national annals:—"And when ye saw that Nahash the king of the children of Ammon came up against you, ye said unto me, Nay; but a king shall reign over us: when the Lord your God was your King. . . . And all the people said unto Samuel, Pray for thy servants unto the Lord thy God, that we die not: for we have added unto all our sins this evil, to ask us a king."§

The first king—who was chosen on account of his imposing person, stature, and strength—proved a curse to the people! What a satire on human penetration and potency! Saul—the man of enormous size and

* John xviii. 36, 37.
§ 1 Sam. xii. 12, 19.

† Zech. xii. 10.

‡ Rom. viii. 24, 25.

vigour—became demented by jealousy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness, and died a miserable death. The second king was elected, in a direct manner, by the Almighty's command; not because of the man's superior powers, but because he was a man after God's own heart. To David was communicated the revelation that the Son of God, who should, in fulness of time, be born into the world through the seed of his posterity, was to be the KING OF ISRAEL, HENCEFORTH AND FOR EVER. The same revelation was frequently repeated, in different words, by subsequent prophets. To that revelation Nathanael had respect; hence his exclamation, "Rabbi, Thou art the Son of God; Thou art the King of Israel!" To that revelation our people at large had respect at THE REDEEMER'S first coming, hence their welcome, with loud acclaim, "Hosanna! Blessed is THE KING OF ISRAEL, that cometh in the name of THE LORD!"

This Nathanael, and the mass of our people at Jerusalem—during the ever memorable preparation week—became the most lucid exponents of God's purposes respecting Israel. The Redeemer Himself endorsed the exposition. To Nathanael:—"Jesus answered and said unto him, Because I said unto thee, I saw thee under the fig tree, believest thou? thou shalt see greater things than these. And He saith unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man."* To the Pharisees who would, if they could, have stifled the promptings of God's Spirit, Jesus "answered, and said unto them, I tell you, that if these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out."†

The first intimation which we have of the real KINGSHIP of the Almighty over Israel is in the divine instruction which was vouchsafed to the aged prophet at Ramah:—"And the Lord said unto Samuel, Harken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee: for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected Me, that I should not reign over them."‡ The nation soon found, to their dismay, that a king, unless he be a man after God's own heart, was but a broken reed. The dynasty of Saul was utterly wiped out. God raised up a new dynasty. The first king of that new dynasty was made to understand that for the sake of the eventual KINGSHIP of the Son of God would the House of David sway the sceptre of Israel for ever. This astounding item of revelation is more patent in the original than it is in translations. The latter stands at present in the Authorised Version as follows:—"And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee: thy throne shall be established for ever. According to all these words, and according to all this vision, so did Nathan speak unto David. Then went king David in, and sat before the Lord, and he said, Who am I, O Lord God? 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 manner of man, O Lord God?"§ But the last clause of this quotation stands thus in the original:—

וזאת תורת האדם אדני יהוה

* John i. 50, 51.

† Luke xix. 40.

‡ 1 Sam. viii. 7.

§ 2 Sam. vii. 16-19.

This clause cannot be translated otherwise than, "But this is the prescriptive right of the Man, the LORD JEHOVAH." St. Paul has respect to the meaning of the original when he penned, as he was moved by the Spirit of God, "The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is the Lord from heaven."*

This accounts for the Messianic character of almost all David's Psalms. A few of which we quote:—"Yet have I set My king upon My holy hill of Zion. I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto Me, Thou art My Son; this day have I begotten Thee. Ask of Me, and I shall give Thee the heathen for Thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for Thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel. Be wise now therefore, O ye kings; be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him."† "All the ends of the world shall remember, and turn unto the Lord: and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before Thee. For the kingdom is the Lord's: and He is the Governor among the nations. All they that be fat upon earth shall eat and worship: all they that go down to the dust shall bow before Him: and none can keep alive his own soul. A seed shall serve Him; it shall be accounted to the Lord for a generation. They shall come, and shall declare His righteousness unto a people that shall be born, that He hath done this."‡ We know not of a more cogent proof that the whole of this Psalm refers to Jesus—in His humiliation and exaltation—than the mockery of the chief priests and scribes, in the hour of the Redeemer's agony, cross, and passion. We read:—"Likewise also the chief priests mocking Him, with the scribes and elders, said, He saved others; Himself He cannot save. If he be the King of Israel, let Him now come down from the cross, and we will believe Him. He trusted in God; let Him deliver Him now, if He will have Him: for He said, I am the Son of God. The thieves also, which were crucified with Him, cast the same in His teeth. Now from the sixth hour there was darkness over all the land unto the ninth hour. And about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani? that is to say, My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?"§—thus reminding the chief priests, scribes, and elders that their mocking Him was predicted, and where predicted, namely in the twenty-second Psalm, which begins, "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" "He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth. . . . His name shall endure for ever: His name shall be continued as long as the sun: and men shall be blessed in Him: all nations shall call Him blessed. Blessed be the Lord God, the God of Israel, who only doeth wondrous things. And blessed be His glorious name for ever: and let the whole earth be filled with His glory; Amen, and Amen."|| We need not adduce evidence from Hebrew writers that those Psalms we refer to were understood by Jewish sages, exegetes, and Biblical expositors to speak of the Messiah. Every well-educated Hebrew, Christian or anti-christian, must be aware of the fact.

* 1 Cor. xv. 47.

§ Matt. xxvii. 41-46.

† Ps. ii. 6-12.

|| Ps. lxxii. 8, 17-20.

‡ Ps. xxii. 27-31.

All Hebrew seers, subsequent to David, made the KINGDOM OF GOD over Israel and the world the principal theme of their predictions. The following are a few specimens of such prophecies :—"For unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given : and the government shall be upon His shoulder : and His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon His kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this. . . . And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people ; to it shall the Gentiles seek : and His rest shall be glorious. And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall set His hand again the second time to recover the remnant of His people, which shall be left, from Assyria, and from Egypt, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from Shinar, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea. And He shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the outcasts of Judah from the four corners of the earth. The envy also of Ephraim shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah shall be cut off : Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim."* The thirty-third chapter of the same Prophet we have already cited. His book actually teems with presages on the subject. Just a few predictions, to the same effect, proclaimed by some other prophets :—"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In His days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely ; and this is His name whereby He shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS. Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that they shall no more say, The Lord liveth, which brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt : But, The Lord liveth, which brought up, and which led the seed of the house of Israel out of the north country, and from all countries whither I had driven them ; and they shall dwell in their own land."† "As I live, saith the Lord God, surely with a mighty hand, and with a stretched out arm, and with fury poured out, will I rule over you : and I will bring you out from the people, and will gather you out of the countries wherein ye are scattered, with a mighty hand, and with a stretched-out arm, and with fury poured out. And I will bring you into the wilderness of the people, and there will I plead with you face to face. Like as I pleaded with your fathers in the wilderness of the land of Egypt, so will I plead with you, saith the Lord God. And I will cause you to pass under the rod, and I will bring you into the bond of the covenant : and I will purge out from among you the rebels, and them that transgress against me : I will bring them forth out of the country where they sojourn, and they shall not enter into the land of Israel : and ye shall know that I am the Lord."‡ Daniel has already been quoted on the subject. Thus writes Hosea, "For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice,

* Isa. ix. 6, 7 ; xi. 10-13.

† Jer. xxiii. 5-8.

‡ Ezek. xx. 33-38.

and without an image, and without an ephod, and without teraphim: afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the Lord their God, and David their king; and shall fear the Lord and His goodness in the latter days."* Compare this with a subsequent utterance of the same seer:—"O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself; but in Me is thine help. I will be thy king: where is any other that 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 took him away in My wrath."† Equally suggestive is the Prophet Amos:—"For, lo, I will command, and I will sift the house of Israel among all nations, like as corn is sifted in a sieve, yet shall not the least grain fall upon the earth. All the sinners of My people shall die by the sword, which say, The evil shall not overtake nor prevent us. In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old: that they may possess the remnant of Edom, and of all the heathen, which are called by My name, saith the Lord that doeth this."‡ The Prophet Micah was thus inspired to write:—"The breaker is come up before them: they have broken up, and have passed through the gate, and are gone out by it: and their King shall pass before them, and the Lord on the head of them. . . . But thou, Bethlehem-Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall He come forth unto Me that is to be Ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting. Therefore will He give them up, until the time that she which travaileth hath brought forth: then the remnant of his brethren shall return unto the children of Israel. And He shall stand and feed in the strength of the Lord, in the majesty of the name of the Lord His God; and they shall abide: for now shall He be great unto the ends of the earth."§ One of Zechariah's predictions on the sublime theme we have already quoted at the commencement of this our paper.

It was in the spirit of those prophecies adduced in the course of this essay that the angel Gabriel addressed the Virgin Mary:—"And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a Son, and shalt call His name JESUS. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give Him the throne of His father David: and He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of His kingdom there shall be no end."|| Pontius Pilate was constrained, by the same irresistible power, to indite the superscription on the cross, "Jesus of Nazareth, THE KING OF THE JEWS." But none have so fully, so comprehensively, so lucidly explained the whole counsel of God respecting Israel as did Nathanael, perhaps unwittingly, on his first interview with Jesus; and the mass of the Jews on welcoming, perhaps involuntarily, the Saviour to His last Passover at Jerusalem,

* Hos. iii. 4, 5.

† *Ibid.* xiii. 12-19.

‡ Amos ix. 9-12. When these papers shall be reprinted, in the form of a volume, they will be supplemented by critical observations as to the exact import of the original.

§ Micah ii. 13; v. 2-4. According to the Hebrew version, the latter reference is v. 1-3.

|| Luke i. 31-33.

which, as He Himself said, with desire He had desired to eat that Pass-over with the disciples before He suffered.* “Rabbi! Thou art the Son of God; Thou art the King of Israel!” exclaimed the former. “Hosanna! Blessed is the King of Israel, that cometh in the name of the Lord!” sang the latter.

These declarations, however, might have had—as indeed they have produced—a baneful effect upon unlearned and unstable professors, who, by wresting those divinely inspired exclamations, scoffingly asked, and ask, “Where is the coming kingdom? What has become of the rapturous outburst of Nathanael’s confession? What of the loud acclaim of the multitude on Jesus’ triumphal entry at Jerusalem?” The Redeemer, therefore, in mercy to His own chosen disciples, anticipated the bane by an effectual antidote, teaching His disciples to pray,—**THY KINGDOM COME.** And when the disciples; after the resurrection, just before the ascension, ere the Holy Spirit came upon them, began to betray a prying inquisitiveness, asking, “Lord, wilt Thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?” the ascending Redeemer at once and for ever vetoed such curiosity:—“And He said unto them, It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in His own power. But ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto Me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth.”† In other words, Remember, I taught you to pray **THY KINGDOM COME**, and not to spend your precious time in speculating and conjecturing about the time when it will be restored to Israel.

But is not the delay these many centuries, during which the prayer has been offered up by myriads of professing disciples, proof positive that the petition will never be accorded? **CERTAINLY NOT!** Let Israel be summoned to the bar of inquiry, and let their own condition testify in the matter. We cannot insist too often upon the evidence from that quarter. What has been the condition of the House of Israel since their heinous national profanation of the name of the Redeemer, the Lord of Hosts? Why, ever since “the chief priests answered, We have no king but Cæsar,”‡—and thus have our nation a second time rejected the God of Israel from being their King, and thus have they again profaned His Holy Name more than ever—the nation of Israel has remained without a king at all. They have been scattered all over the world, but everywhere—with the exception of a few fractions of the nation in favoured lands, such as England, Holland, Germany, &c.—under the rule of despots resembling the Cæsar to whom they tendered their allegiance in preference to Him who came to seek and to save them.

How fervently, therefore, should the petition **THY KINGDOM COME** be offered up by the children of the synagogue! To do the framers and compilers of the modern Jewish Liturgy justice, they have endeavoured to make extensive, if not the best, use of the respective and suggestive supplications in **THE LORD’S PRAYER**. But, as we have already observed in former numbers, how overlaid with vain repetitions! With respect to the laconic petition under treatment, how diluted it has

* Luke xxii. 15.

† Acts i. 7, 8.

‡ John xix. 15.

become by the mass of vain repetitions ! In the morning Judæo-liturgical service, in the course of the composition which begins, "Blessed is He who said, and the world came into being," we have the following passage :—"And in the songs of Thy servant David we will celebrate Thee Lord our God, with praises and hymns we will extol Thee, and we will applaud Thee, and we will adore Thee, and we will mention Thy name, and we will have Thee our King, our One God, who liveth for ever, to reign over us ; a King whose great name is ever bepraised and belauded. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who art a King applauded with dignified exaltation." Yes, our people have become mindful, by the promulgation of the LORD'S PRAYER, that the COMING KINGDOM should be a subject of earnest supplication ; but, as a nation, they are still unconscious of the Hallowed Name, through which alone prayer is accepted. In vain do they fast, in vain do they confess, "Our Father, our King, we have sinned before Thee. Our Father, our King, we have no king but Thee," &c. &c.* In vain do they repeat in various forms and divers words their orisons for the coming kingdom,†—all, all, all have remained unheeded, simply because Israel as a nation have not yet learnt to hallow the name of Him whom they have set at nought, and preferred a Gentile Cæsar to Him.

Even some Jewish writers entertained presentiments to the same effect. In *Yalkut Simeoni*, and *Medrash*, on Ps. xc., occurs the following :—"What is the reason that the Israelites pray during this dispensation and are not answered ? Because they know not the ineffable name, but in the future one, the Holy One, blessed be He, will make them know it ; for it is said, 'Therefore My people shall know My name.'‡ At that time they shall pray and shall be answered, for it is said, 'He shall call upon Me, and I will answer him.' "§ Rabbi Joseph Albo, in his book *Ikkarim*, part ii. chap. 28, has the following orthodox passage :—"And the Scripture designates the name of THE MESSIAH, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS, because He is to be our Mediator, that we may obtain righteousness from God, by His hand." We would particularly commend these two quotations to the votaries of the synagogue-ritual, who have recently prayed and fasted, in a way they have not done during the other seasons of the year. It may please God to make known unto them the ineffable name, so that they may experience that RIGHTEOUSNESS which is to the true believer in Christ an earnest of the COMING KINGDOM. In our next paper, on the LORD'S PRAYER we hope to demonstrate that the answers to the first three supplications are anticipated in the REVELATION vouchsafed to St. John.

* This is a sort of Litany, the opening sentences of which, no less than forty-two times, are "Our Father, Our King," &c.

† To quote them all would occupy too much of our monthly space at command. We may adduce some when the papers shall be published in the form of a volume.

‡ Isaiah lii. 6.

§ Ps. xci. 15.

ISAAC JAQUELOT;

AN APOLOGIST OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.*

IN no part of Christendom have apologists who have defended Christianity against the Jews worked with so enthusiastic and purely Christian a spirit as in Holland. When the Spaniards and Portuguese, from motives of fanatical hatred, and, under pretence that in a Christian state no Antichristians ought to be tolerated, had driven the Jews out of the irterritories, it was the Dutch Protestants who, in a specially hospitable manner, not only welcomed the unfortunate people out of Christian sympathy, but also gave them soon after political liberty, such as the Jews at that time enjoyed in no other Christian country. But the Dutch were well aware that there existed yet another and higher freedom to be given; they regarded it as their Christian duty to speak to them earnestly and affectionately about it, so as to awaken in them the longing to become free through the Son of God. Many Synods busied themselves with the spiritual Jewish question, looking at it from this point of view, and earnestly considering what the Church and her ministers could do, or cause to be done, in order to find means to introduce Christianity among the Jews. So they founded a professorship at the famous university of Leyden for the "Controversy between Judaism and Christianity," and the celebrated Hebraist, Constantine l'Empereur, was invited to undertake its duties. The fidelity and discrimination with which the Dutch then fulfilled their duty as Christians towards Israel is still a noble example and earnest reminder to all Christian people.

Schutz raised a loud outcry about the "really excessive freedom" enjoyed by the Jews in Holland, since they were granted a privilege there which they had in no other country, namely, that of receiving proselytes from another faith into their religious community. This is a fact; and faithful Christians needed to exercise themselves daily in patience and forbearance when they could not help seeing, to their bitter sorrow, so many wretched creatures openly breaking loose from their Redeemer; so many infidel books published; and so many foreign apostates wielding against Christianity the long-disused weapons of ridicule and satire. It was indeed a shocking abuse of the freedom accorded to them; but the Dutch, in spite of it all, maintained their Christian principles, manfully defending their sacred things, albeit only using spiritual weapons.

The praise we have given to the Dutch of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries belongs also to the French refugees, who had been driven from their own land for the sake of their faith, and were heartily welcomed in Holland. They had brought the freedom of Christ Jesus with them into Holland, and, as they now obtained also political liberty, they were bound to the natives of the land by the closest ties of Christian brotherhood, and fought side by side with them the good fight of faith. We have already (in "*Saat auf Hoffnung*," 1871) introduced our readers to Gousset, the French scholar, who lived in exile in

* Translated from the German of our talented brother the Rev. A. Fürst— which appeared in the June issue of *Saat auf Hoffnung*—by our accomplished sister, A.F.O.I.

Holland, and utterly upset all the arguments of the Antichristian Chiz-zuk-Emuna. We would now draw the reader's attention to the doughty apologist of this (the seventeenth) century—Isaac Jaquelot, who defended Christianity, not only against the Deists, but also against the Jews. He was born December 16th, 1647, at Vassy, in Champagne, where his father was a teacher of the reformed faith. On completing his theological studies, he became his colleague; but, on the promulgation of the Edict of Nantes, was obliged to leave his fatherland, and go first to Heidelberg, then to the Hague. In after years he obeyed a call to Berlin, to take the office of preacher to the French congregation there, where he died of apoplexy, October 20th, 1708.

Jaquelot had already published his work against Deism—"L'Existence de Dieu"—when he resolved to take up the cudgels against Jewish objections to the Christian faith. This appears by his "*Dissertations on the Messiah, in which it is proved to the Jews that Jesus Christ is the Messiah promised and foretold in the Old Testament*" (1699). He divided his work into two sections, the first of which deals mainly with Christian Evidence, the second with the objections which have been brought against it. The whole is written in so lively and familiar a style, that we are powerfully impressed by it. We seem to be reading a work that might have been written in our own century. The author has made it his business to become intimately acquainted with the chief Jewish objections; and he goes so far as to say that he has himself read the works of all the Jewish writers whom he quotes; above all this, his book conveys to us an impression of his beautiful Christian sympathy and pity for Israel, whom he would fain see under the protection of the Good Shepherd. "Christians," he says in the preface, "should regard the errors of these poor people with compassion and sympathy, for they were formerly so much beloved by God that their national ancestor is the Father of the Faithful, and also of the Messiah; the Law and redemption too sprang from them. The apostle Paul was willing to allow himself to be under the curse, if by that means he might save his people; and we should at least consider it our duty to contribute to their conversion; by bringing near to them instruction in Christian truths; for persecution will only harden them still further, and is besides contrary to all humanity and to the Gospel. So, as we cannot blame their Rabbis, if they defend the religion, of whose truth they are sincerely persuaded, without invectives against Christianity, it is also the duty of Christian scholars to set before them the Christian religion as the development of the Old Testament dispensation, and to do this by better arguments than brute force and popular tumults against them. We believe that God will take them once more into a new covenant with Him; and we must further the Divine purpose by every means in our power, and not suffer them to perish in spiritual destitution, nor even drive them out of the countries where the Gospel is preached. Can we expect them, if we do, to become Christians among the Mohammedans or heathens?"

We will look a little more into Jaquelot's work, and see how he discharged his duty. We know how the Jews have ever wearied themselves to prove that Christ Himself taught nothing new, and that what He really did teach, was to be found already in the Old Testament Scriptures or in the Talmud; and in this they found many credulous followers even among

Christians. In order to strip the King Messiah of His divine glory, they had degraded Him to the level of a Rabbi, though a superior one. This was already the case in Jaquelot's time. "The Jews," he says, "maintain that Jesus Christ, as one of their teachers, found all that He taught in the Law, from whence He instructed them. Good ! but what enabled this Incomparable Teacher to purge His national religion of so many childish fables, with which it had been overlaid by other teachers, as we perceive by the Talmud ? This reflection places Jesus in a favourable light. But still further, He speaks with authority, such as no other man could ; and gives Himself out as a teacher come direct from God. He raises the ancient promises, visions, and types out of their former obscurity. He foretells the fall of Jerusalem, the centre of the most elaborate ritual of the Law. He announces that the time is coming when God, who is a spirit, shall be worshipped in every place. It cannot be urged that these announcements were first ascribed to Him after the terrible events took place, for both Tacitus and Suetonius inform us that there was a persecution of the Christians at Rome as early as Nero's time. Thus Christ must have lived many years before then, and, indeed, in the reign of Tiberius, in whose time, according to the Gospels, He fulfilled His ministry and died. How wonderful, then, it must have sounded at such a time, that from the Jews, who lived in a small province of the Roman empire, salvation should spring forth, and conquer the world, which was then under the sway of the Roman sceptre ! However, the announcement was verified ; Jerusalem was destroyed, the nation scattered, and the name of Israel's God preached in every land by the disciples of Christ. The idol temples have been laid in ruins, and the cross erected over their *débris*. This is without controversy the work of God ; and Christ is a Teacher come from God, to whom also the Jew must finally submit, unless he is prepared to deny that the mission of Moses and of all the prophets was true."

The modern Jews are not tired of making the world believe, that Judaism has a great mission to perform among the nations, and above all, has to make known to them the Unity of the Godhead. But if they are asked what they have been doing for the heathen for the last two thousand years, they excuse themselves by various meaningless evasions. Two men may be here brought forward, who may be considered to represent fairly the most current and favourite ideas of the Jews on this subject : the Frenchman Cohen, in his "*Le Décides*" (Paris, 1861), and the Judæo-German historian Grätz, in his treatise, "*The Rejuvenescence of the Tribe of Judah*," which appeared in the "*Wertheimer und Kompert's chen Jahrbuch*, for the year 5624 (1863-1864)," and brought down on its editor Kompert the well known trial for heresy by the orthodox Jews of Vienna. Cohen excuses the indolence of the Jews by quoting the activity of Christians. According to his account, the Jews have no need to bestir themselves at first, since Christianity is a bridge between heathenism and Judaism, and all Christianised nations who are passing over this bridge must be coming nearer to Judaism, "the religion of the soul and of duty." In his opinion, Christianity is a "mighty mediator" between Israel and mankind, an "untiring pioneer," which is to make ready in the wilderness of heathenism the way of the Lord ; "a missionary" that carries the words and book of Truth to the uttermost ends of the earth ;

"a sower" who is scattering the mysterious seed into all the fruitful ground, but—"Judaism will one day celebrate the Harvest Home!"

So the modern prophet concludes his sententious work! He is indeed wide-awake enough to perceive what a beneficent spiritual power Christianity has become in all parts of the earth, and how vigorous and active it still is, and this gives him serious uneasiness; but he knows where to find comfort; all this labour and trouble of the Christians is to turn out finally to the advantage of Judaism! We will leave him, and turn to Grätz, who dreams with closed eyes, not open ones; he gives the latter-day glory to no Messiah, Israel personally is the Messiah, we must not expect any other. While Cohen, with a heavy heart, wonders at the great and vigorous spiritual power of Christianity, Grätz affects to know nothing about it; he ignores all the doings of Christianity up to the present time; he claims all present and future honour for Judaism. Instead of seeing Christians and Christianity all around him, he sees only heathens and heathenism, to whom his "Nation-Messiah" is sent as a Deliverer from the darkness and slavery of idolatry. "The Jewish nation," he says, "is the messenger that God sends to the idolatrous, God-forgetting, corrupt world. It is to be the Light of the nations, by whose instrumentality the salvation of God is to be carried to the ends of the earth."

"When?" we would ask. "When, indeed, will this Messiah, or Apostle, enter on his Divine Mission, that of delivering the people?" Two thousand years have already been allowed to elapse. Are two thousand years more needful for due preparation to be made, or has Israel more important affairs to settle beforehand than this, to take into consideration the soul's health of those millions of "idolatrous, God-forgetting, corrupt men?" What deeply wounding words are these for assembled Christendom to hear! Even in Jaquelot's time the Jews—though they had not got so far as the present fashion of denying a personal Messiah—lulled themselves to sleep with such dreams of vain self-exaltation. "Rabbi Isaac," says he, "maintains that the promise given to the patriarch Abraham is fulfilled already, in that the Israelites have taught other nations the Being, Unity, Providence, and Eternal Power of God; but where are those nations who have been converted by Jewish teachers? What idols have they caused to be broken in pieces by their preaching? Even the prophets have never yet taken much pains to convert the heathen! Jonah alone preached to Nineveh of the coming judgment and exhorted repentance; and this happened by the express command of God, which he only obeyed from compulsion. David and Solomon were allies and friends of the kings of Tyre, but this did not help the latter to the knowledge of the true God. On the contrary, the heathen king's daughter, whom Solomon married, turned his heart away from God's ways. In a word, history records but a very small proportion of proselytes who embraced the Jewish religion; but it tells us much more about the falling away of Israel from the worship of the true God. Christianity first took up the work of converting the heathen, and set about it from the very day on which the risen Saviour gave to His disciples the command: "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature!"

The important question—"What, then, was the personal work which

Messiah was to perform?"—is still, by the modern orthodox Jew, answered in this fashion:—"He is to gather the scattered nation and lead them back to Jerusalem, there to sit as a mighty king enthroned on Mount Zion, and to subdue all the nations of the earth." They only dwell on the mighty kingly power of their Messiah; so they agree in referring Isaiah lii. 13-15 to Him; but they apply the whole of the fifty-third chapter to the whole Jewish people. What we understand of the Messiah, and find fulfilled in Jesus, Grätz attaches to his "Messiah-nation;" he traces their path through suffering to glory; they must wear a "crown of thorns" patiently, that they may be worthy of a "royal diadem;" through "suffering and death to resurrection, through the gates of the grave will they be aroused to everlasting life." We could hardly believe our eyes, as we read this, for we always thought that any Messiah who was to suffer first was totally opposed to modern Jewish notions. We read these remarkable passages more than once, and indulged at last in the fond hope, that this might prepare the way for the mission to Israel; for if the Jews believe all this about the Messiah, as Grätz maintains, they might—we should think—find all this easily in the crucified and risen Christ, and joyfully acknowledge Him. Grätz, indeed, declares that all this, when referred to "a single individual," becomes a caricature, and savours of romantic fanaticism; but we are still of the opposite opinion, and have sound common sense and the Holy Scriptures on our side. In refusing to acknowledge any other Messiah but the nation, He sets himself in open opposition both to the Holy Scriptures and also to the traditions of his own nation.

The District Rabbi, Solomon Kutua, in his noteworthy little tract, entitled, "*Open and Honourable*," (Halberstadt, 1864,) in which he opposes the way in which Grätz does away with the fundamental belief in a Messiah, says, among other things:—"In the thing itself there is no difference, and the belief in a personal Messiah is the first distinct fact in the faith of the nation, the hope and aim of the people ever since their Galuth (Exile) wandering, and even before that, when they were drawing near their fall. It is announced by all the prophets—from Moses, the first, down to Malachi, the last—it is a necessary consequence of God's justice; it is, so to speak, the revelation of the foundation stone of Israel's religion, and may be regarded as its top stone also." So also do all the Jews believe who hold fast to the thirteen fundamental articles. They believe in a personal Messiah, who is *not* to wear any "crown of thorns," *but* to be adorned with the "royal diadem." It is with *such* Jews that Jaquelot also has to do.

"The cross of Christ," says he, "is to the Jews a stone of stumbling, because they misunderstand the counsels of God, and have imagined a Messianic Kingdom, like the kingdoms of this world. If, as the Rabbis teach, all nations are to be swayed by the sceptre of Messiah—and the natives of Japan, America, and Australia are to become and remain subjects of the King of Jerusalem, and then turn their weapons of war into implements of peace—this becomes an impossibility, unless the sin of mankind is first atoned for and taken away; for does it not require before all things that man's nature should be entirely changed? And shall we think that, if any difference exists between people in any part of Messiah's kingdom, they are to appear before

Messiah to receive sentence from Him? Does this not appear to us—looking at it from outside—as not to be thought of? And then, will this Messiah, whom they are expecting, be liable to death, or live eternally on the earth? Will he have children or not?—If he is to have children, will they be like him in power and majesty, or like the rest of mankind? If they were like him, there would be a plurality of Messiahs. If not, who would, then, in the event of the Messiah not being immortal, rule after him with justice and righteousness? Such, and many other questions, confuse the superstitious believer in a worldly Messiah (a Messiah-conqueror) with the attendant absurdities. In these and similar ways does Jaquelot attack the erroneous belief of the Jews about Messiah. He stands firm on one point, which he works out by referring to the records of Old Testament prophecy, judged of by the universal interpretation which all ages have put on the spirit of the New Testament.

In our troublous times, when Judaism, in its unbelief, is stepping so boldly forward, such faithful witnesses and champions of the truth in old times deserve more consideration than we have thought it our duty to give them. If we were only to read over their numerous works with more carefulness, we might find much in them that would do us good and profitable service in our present struggle. They fought the good fight of faith in God's strength, and exhort us to be, like them, mindful of our solemn duty as Christians.

WHAT DID THE ANCIENT HEBREWS KNOW OF ASTRONOMY? *

IS a proposition which has been often propounded, but never satisfactorily, nay, not even feasibly, demonstrated. The writers in Bible dictionaries have never sufficiently availed themselves of the only right and bright telescope for the purpose of viewing the firmament and the orbs therein, in the same manner as the ancient Hebrews have done; and they have, consequently, only beclouded themselves, and no doubt many of their believers also. That telescope is the most ancient Hebrew book extant, by whose aid I trust to be able to demonstrate, not only feasibly, but satisfactorily, the proposition which heads this paper.

No author could have penned, and no reader could have fully comprehended, the Mosaic narrative of the fourth day's creation, as given us in the first chapter of the Bible, without a general knowledge of the laws which regulate and affect the sidereal system, which we call by the technical term ASTRONOMY. Pregnant with no ordinary import are the words, "Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven, to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years: And let them be for lights in the firmament of heaven," &c., &c. Had we nothing left of the oldest Hebrew book but the first chapter of Genesis, it would have been sufficient for my purpose to prove in the present instance that the antiquity of the science

* This article appeared in the first volume, 1866, of *The Scattered Nation*. It is reproduced here with the Author's sanction.

of astronomy does not derive its value from heathen writers. Apart from inspired revelation, this chapter is the most wonderful in the annals of the world. Its antiquity makes the oldest Pagan chronicle appear but yesterday. Its wisdom renders the sagacity of man's understanding absolutely foolish. Its profoundness makes the depth of human intellect extremely shallow. Its truth, which is day by day more and more elucidated, and made better and better understood, makes the falsehood and doom of the would-be philosopher ominously clear. Every fresh assault which man's frail wisdom makes upon our chapter is overruled to render its sterling accuracy and pure orthodoxy more palpable than ever. But there are many rays irradiating from other portions of that old Hebrew book alluded to, which tell pretty plainly that the ancient Hebrews knew more of the science of astronomy than modern *savans* are disposed to credit them with.

The current belief amongst the Hebrews was, from time immemorial, that the science of astronomy was a direct emanation from "the Father of lights." Josephus, who committed to writing a variety of floating traditions amongst his people, thus speaks of the science (*Antiq. i. iii. 9*): "God afforded them [the aboriginal patriarchs] a longer time of life, on account of their virtue and the good use they made of it in astronomical and geometrical discoveries, which would not have afforded them the time of foretelling the periods of the stars unless they had lived six hundred years; for the great year is completed in that interval." Upon which Cassini annotates: "This period, whereof we find no intimation in any monument by any other nation, is the finest period that ever was invented, for it brings out the solar year more exactly than those of Hipparchus and Ptolemy, and the lunar year within one second of what is determined by modern astronomers. If the antediluvians had such a period of six hundred years, they must have known the motions of the sun and moon more exactly than their descendants knew them some ages after the flood."

It has been the fashion of late years to trace every ancient science and art to Egyptian and Chaldean sources; and Hebrew astronomy has been treated in like manner. There can be no doubt that those ancient nations retained much light of the pristine illuminations in the knowledge of the celestial bodies; but that that light became, in process of time, fearfully overlaid with clouds of thick darkness is equally certain. The modern mania of tracing the science of astronomy to the Chaldeans is only reviving the presumptuous arrogance of the Babylonians themselves. I cannot do better than refer the readers of "THE SCATTERED NATION" to Isaiah's withering satire respecting Chaldea's boast of superlative wisdom, as given in his forty-seventh chapter, the eighth and five following verses, the last of which, verse thirteenth, runs thus, according to the original: "Thou art wearied in the multitude of thy counsels. Let those who search the heavens stand up and save thee; even they who are gazing at the stars, giving intelligence respecting months; [let them save thee] from the things that shall come upon thee." Who could fail to perceive that the Hebrew seer was a far more accurate astronomer than the wisest of the wise Chaldeans were?

Again, were the Chaldeans indeed the great astronomers which they themselves pretended, and which certain modern authors make them out

to have been, how came it to pass that among the captive children of Judah "in all matters of wisdom and understanding that the king inquired of them, he found them ten times better than all the magicians and astrologers that were in all his realm?" (Dan. i. 20.) It is noteworthy here, that it was then, when Daniel, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego were at Babylon, that Pythagoras arrived there in search of the sciences of the East, whence he carried to Europe the doctrines of a heliocentric system, and the daily rotation of the globe on its axis. It was owing to Daniel's calculations and predictions respecting the appearance of a certain star, that, at the first advent of the Saviour, "the wise men from the East" were led to Jerusalem, to worship the infant Redeemer of the world.

These fragmentary considerations alone would have been sufficiently circumstantial evidence to prove that the original writers and primitive readers of the Hebrew Scriptures possessed a pretty accurate knowledge of the asterisms of the celestial sphere, which lie in the annual path of the sun—termed by Moses "signs," and which mythological writers designated "the zodiac." But we have in the oldest Hebrew book, the Hebrew Bible, positive traces of the asterisms, or "signs." Joseph's dream (Gen. xxxvii. 9) had evidently reference to the sidereal system. For a long time the signs of the zodiac numbered only eleven, according to the ken of man.* Balaam's picturesque description of Jacob's tents had a palpable allusion to the asterism Aquarius (Num. xxiv. 7). The Hebrew term for that sign of the zodiac is דָּל, *Delee*, "bucket." I shall presently point out the aptness of the figure of speech which the prophet of Pethor employed. So thus Deborah, in her triumphal ode, makes mention of the same "sign."

"They fought from heaven;
Even the stars in their path,
They fought against Sisera.
The river Kishon swept them away,
That ancient river, the river Kishon."

(*Judges* v. 20, 21.)

The ancients represented the zodiacal sign Aquarius by rivers—such as were in the immediate neighbourhood—or by a man pouring water out of a bucket or buckets. The Egyptians utilised the Nile for that purpose; the Chaldeans, the Tigris and Euphrates.

In that ancient book, the book of Job, we have mention made (xxxviii. 32) of מזָרוֹת, "Mazzaroth." I consider Sir William Drummond's version of that passage the soundest, namely, "Canst thou bring forth the zodiacal signs, each according to the season in which it ought to appear?" The "Mazzaroth" of Job is the same as the מְזָלוֹת, "Mazzaloth" (the ל and ר are mutable in the Hebrew language, as they are in other languages) of 2 Kings xxiii. 5, which the margin properly renders "twelve signs or constellations." The writer of the Book of Job records the names of several asterisms, even אֲשׁ, *Ash*, translated, in the authorised version, "Arcturus"; כֶּסֶל, *Keseel*, rendered "Orion," but

* Amongst some Hebrew ballads which the Jews are in the habit of singing on the first two nights of the Feast of Passover, there is one which contains a verse with the following beginning:—"Who knows anything about the number eleven? I know something about eleven: eleven are the planets," &c. &c.

unquestionably the proper rendering of which is "satellite"; כִּימָה, *Keemah*, which has been translated "Pleiades" (Job ix. 9; xxxviii. 31-33). One of the great Hebrew luminaries in astronomical science, Rabbi Samuel by name, said that that constellation was called *Keemah*, because it produced the appearance כְּמַיָּה *Kémayah*, i.e., as of a hundred stars.* The latter names, *Keseel* and *Keemah* are also mentioned by Amos (v. 8). The passage referred to in the Book of Job invests Ps. cxlvii. 4, with a literal prose meaning:—

"He telleth the number of the stars ;
He designates them all by certain names."

(*To be concluded in our next.*)

THE BANISHED ONES FETCHED HOME.

AN HISTORICAL SERIAL TALE, ILLUSTRATIVE OF THE CHEQUERED ANNALS OF THE JEWS IN THIS COUNTRY.

BY AN INTIMATE FRIEND OF THE FAMILY.

BOOK IV.—CHAPTER VII.

THE JEWS UNDER EARL RICHARD, KING OF THE ROMANS.—SANCHA'S FUNERAL EXPENSES.—MORE MASSACRES AND BANISHMENTS.—THE JEWS PAWNED AND BARTERED.—THE EFFECT OF THE BATTLE OF LEWES UPON THE BRITISH JEWS OF THAT PERIOD.—THE JEWS OF OXFORD.—MERTON COLLEGE.—PARTICULARS ABOUT THE FAMOUS UNIVERSITY CROSSES ERECTED IN THAT LONG AND DREARY REIGN.

(*Continued from page 511.*)

EARL RICHARD, having obtained his election as successor to the Emperor of Germany, named himself King of the Romans. This exaltation had no favourable effect upon our down-trodden people. Tyranny and cruelty seemed to have been the predominant features of royalty in those dark ages. He caused the Jews to be arrested, and would not accept of any bail. The attorneys he employed were Jews—in all probability of very indifferent characters, such as his favourite Abraham, the murderer of his own wife—who made no effort to alleviate the oppression of their suffering brethren; perhaps helped forward their affliction, by telling the Roman King the Jews could raise the money at once, if made to do so. There can be no doubt that our people had then able judges and lawyers of their own, and whom the King's court considered competent to decide all sorts of questions, spiritual as well as temporal. This circumstance annoyed the ecclesiastics not a little, which they did not fail to resent. The prelates began to complain that the Jews were protected by the King's courts. Alas for the protection! Boniface, the primate, who was honoured with the merited appellation of "this ruffian, this cruel smiter . . . no winner of souls, but an exacter of money," convened a provincial synod, in which the prelates enacted the following severe and cruel edicts:—

"That because ecclesiastical judicature is confounded, and the office

* Talmud, treatise Berachoth, fol. 58, col. ii.

of prelates obstructed, when a Jew offending against ecclesiastical persons and things is convicted of these, or other matters, which belong to the ecclesiastical court of pure right, and yet is not permitted by the King's sheriffs or bailiffs to stand to the ecclesiastical law, but is rather forced to betake himself to the King's court; therefore all such Jews shall be forced to make answer, in such cases, before a judge ecclesiastical, by being forbidden to traffic, contract, or converse with the faithful; and they who forbid and obstruct them, and distress the judges and others on this account, shall be coerced by the sentences of excommunication and interdict."

This primate, "elected by female intrigue," proved a great source of trouble and virulent persecution to the poor Jews in this island. He having been uncle to Queen Eleanor,—who, in fact, was the sole monarch of England, and even of her husband,—had, as a matter of course, great influence with the king. Henry therefore, though he opposed the decrees of the Church against the Jews during Stephen Langton's primacy, entirely concurred with the Church in persecuting our people during the administration of Boniface. Accordingly, by an edict enacted in the thirty-seventh year of this reign, Henry sanctioned Stephen Langton's decrees; and it was ordained that, "no Jew should remain in England who did not render service to the king; that there should be no schools for Jews, except in places where they were wont to be of old; that, in their synagogues, all Jews should pray in a low voice, according to the rites of their religion, so that Christians might not hear them; that every Jew should be answerable to the rector of his parish for parochial dues, chargeable on his houses; that no Christian woman should suckle or nurse the child of a Jew, nor any Christian serve any Jews, eat with them, nor abide in their house; that no Jew nor Jewess should eat meat in Lent, or detract from the Christian faith; that no Jew should associate with a Christian woman, nor any Christian man with a Jewess; that every Jew should wear a badge on his breast, and should not enter into any Church or Chapel, except in passing to and fro, and then should not stay there to the dishonour of Christ. That no Jew should hinder any other who was desirous to embrace the Christian faith. That the Jews should not abide in any town without the king's special license, save in places where they were formerly wont to reside. On offending against any of these provisions, their properties were to be immediately confiscated.

Unfortunately for our people, in the year 1261, Sancha, the Queen's sister, Countess of Cornwall, and Queen of the Romans, died. The king and queen made great lamentations for her, and gave her a magnificent funeral. As usual our people had to supply the needful, for the king ordered that new inventories should be made of all their lands, tenements, debts, ready money, plate, jewels, and household stuff. The king's commissioners were to be assisted in their strict search by all sheriffs, constables of castles, mayors, &c.

The king's opposition to the barons proved a two-fold scourge to our oppressed brethren. He took away their money, in order to be able to continue his opposition to the barons; whilst the barons took away their lives, with the remainder of their wealth, for yielding to the intolerable pressure of that covetous monarch. It was, therefore, a

cause of joy to the Hebrew congregations in this island, that a truce was established between the sovereign and his barons, and that the former was prevailed upon to sign an amicable arrangement with the latter, by which he bound himself to confirm the provisions of Oxford. Henry, however, was not a man to abide, for any length of time, by an agreement; and, as a matter of course, refused to adhere to the rules of the compact, under the pretence that his consent and signature were extorted from him. He withdrew to the Tower of London. The offended barons unexpectedly entered the city. Eager for plunder and athirst for blood, they raised a dreadful clamour against our luckless brethren, which was the prelude to a personal attack upon the queen, the most unpopular of all the queens of England. The following are some of the particular details of this tumult. The great bell in the church named after one of the greatest pillars of the Church of Christ, St. Paul, sounded. This was a signal for a multitudinous mob to sally forth. This mixed rabble was hounded on by the then marshal of London, Stephen Buckrell by name, and by a certain baron, John Fitz-John by name. They killed and plundered many of our helpless people without mercy. The ferocious leader, John Fitz-John, ran through with his sword, in cold blood, Kok-ben-Abraham, the wealthiest of our people, then resident in London. Besides plundering and killing seven hundred of our suffering race, the mob turned the rest out of their beds, undressed as they were, keeping them so the whole night. During which catastrophe, a newly erected synagogue was reduced to ashes.

The oppressions exercised towards our Jewish brethren by the king, rendered our people obnoxious to the inhabitants of the places where they resided. The continual exactions to which they were subjected, had necessarily the effect of withdrawing large sums from the towns in which they resided. It could not fail to be discovered, sooner or later, that though the tax, in the first instance, fell upon the Jews alone, yet that eventually the wealth of the neighbourhood was thereby considerably diminished. It may have been partly with a view to this consequence, that many towns obtained, during the present reign, from the king, charters, or writs, directing that no Jew should reside within their walls. Charters or writs to this effect were granted to the towns of Newcastle, Derby, Southampton, as I have already stated, Wycomb, Newberry, and to other places, from which our people were obliged to remove with their families and effects. It would have been happy for them if the necessity of changing the places of their residence had been the only hardship to which, through the popular feeling, they were exposed. In many parts of the country, the so-called Christians treated the banished ones with open violence; charges of the wildest description were raised against the persecuted ones, and made excuses for the exercise of every species of cruelty, and extortion. Tumults were excited, the Jewish houses were pillaged and burned; hundreds fell victims to the frenzy of the populace. At Norwich on the occasion of some Jews being executed upon a charge of having stolen a Christian child, to which I have already referred, the citizens broke into the houses of the Jews there and stripped them, then set fire to them, and burned them to the ground. At Canterbury, the Jews were subjected to a similar violence, the immediate cause of which is not mentioned;

but it is stated, that the clergy there, did not scruple to encourage the outrage, and to take an active part with the rabble on the occasion. At Oxford, the scholars of the University, having upon some pretext picked a quarrel with the Jews, broke into their houses and pillaged them of their property.

When Prince Edward returned from his victorious campaign in Wales, he was so poor, that he could not pay the arrears which he owed to the troops, and unwilling to disband men, whom he foresaw his father's cause would require, the king fixed on the expedient of presenting him with the Jews—the King of the Romans must have got, by this, all he wanted from our people—with a new privilege, namely, that of having all writs of judicature, which had been formerly sealed by the justices of the Jews, sealed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the profits of which were to be paid to the prince. Edward, however, could not keep them long in his grasp. Being in want, at once, of ready cash, he assigned them, with his father's consent and signature, for two years to the Catercensian merchants. No more did the latter keep them long, for Edward was soon after accused of a conspiracy against his father; whereupon the king formed the accusation into the pretext to seize upon the Jews.

The battle of Lewes is another memorable event in the history of our people in this country. This battle, as is well known, terminated in the complete discomfiture of the king's party. The common people having been disbanded and out of employment, had betaken themselves to persecute our unfortunate brethren. They pretended that our people conspired with the king's party to destroy the barons and the good citizens of London; this, they thought, gave them a right to plunder the defenceless Jews, wherever they could find them. They began with London; and the conduct of the metropolitans was soon followed by the inhabitants of the provinces. Lincoln, Northampton, Canterbury, and many other towns in the kingdom, became the scenes of plunder and persecution. The London Jews were placed in imminent danger. In all probability, those who had survived the massacre of Montfort and John Fitz-John, would have shared the fate of their seven hundred brethren who perished in that city. Most humanely, however, the constable of the tower opened the gates of that fortress to afford the persecuted ones a timely refuge.

The king, in conjunction with the barons, endeavoured to quell those riots, and issued letters-patent to the mayor and sheriffs of London, and to the persons put under authority in all those places where outrages were committed, to suppress all sorts of disorders. The letters-patent ordered that as peace had been established throughout the kingdom, the Jews should share in that peace. A proclamation was therefore published, for the Jews to return peaceably to their homes. Few indeed, must have been the number of those who had found homes to come back to. However, it was announced that any molestation offered to the Jews would subject the offender to the danger of life and limb. The generous Henry had a politic object in view.

The king being anxious to obtain for himself the services of his friends after his disastrous differences with his Gentile subjects, resolved to do so at the expense of his Jewish ones. This he did, by remitting the interest-money which was owing to our Hebrew brethren from several of his friends. So that, though the Jews were permitted to return to their

homes, they had well nigh been deprived of any means of subsistence when they had reached those homes. Parliament, however, soon met, and enacted that the Jewish houses, goods, and chattels, should be restored to their Hebrew owners in the same condition as they were in before the battle of Lewes. Our people therefore enjoyed comparative tranquillity for the period of four years, from the time of the meeting of that parliament. They agreed to pay a thousand pounds to be free from taxes during that period; under the proviso, however, that neither the king nor the prince should undertake any crusade during that time. Some few had even great favours conferred upon them, especially those, who had rendered effectual service to the king in his distresses. Yet was their tranquillity only comparative; they were by no means universally exempt from trouble and annoyance. Individuals were subject to grievous calumnies and accusations, as was the case with the Jews of Lincoln during that period. The dean and chapter of that city would not pay their debts; they contrived therefore to accuse their Jewish creditors of forging a bond. It is a faithful picture of the English of these days. "that when churchmen and laymen, prince and prior, knight and priest, come knocking at Isaac's door, they borrow not his shekels with these uncivil terms. It is then, Friend Isaac, will you pleasure us in this matter and our day shall be truly kept, so God save me? and, Kind Isaac, if ever you served a man show yourself a friend in this need.—And when the day comes, and I ask my own, then what hear I but the curse of Egypt on your tribe, and all that may stir up the rude and uncivil populace against poor strangers." *

The Jews in Oxford for a long time, seem, upon the whole, to have been more prosperous than their brethren in many other places. I have already demonstrated from these chronicles, that our people, especially some of my own ancestors, had schools and seminaries there at an early period of our history in England. Their occupation there seems to have been almost altogether in literary and scientific fields; so that we do not find any documents respecting forged bonds there. Our people have always appreciated learning very much, and encouraged it. We read of individuals selling some land at a very low rate indeed, for the erection of an institution for that purpose. The celebrated Sir Walter de Merton, the founder of a college in Oxford bearing his name, purchased a site for that building from a Jew. The college treasury possesses still the deed of sale. Yet our people were now and then subjected to some eccentric and apocryphal accusations.

We learn from a writ of release, to which I have already alluded, that several Jews in that city were imprisoned, on a charge, brought against them of having taken away a boy who belonged to a Hebrew Christian, and concealed him. However, it proved a false alarm; the child was soon found; and, the prisoners were therefore forthwith released. Had it been a Gentile child, the ecclesiastics might have prevailed on the parents not to find the child, or to find it murdered somewhere. Prynne briefly notices an investigation respecting the murder of a certain Jew there, Jacob by name.

The university, however, was at that time badly off for a nice elegant cross; the authorities had no means for erecting one. They, therefore,

* Sir Walter Scott.

ingeniously contrived to make the Jews erect one for them. A member of the Oxford synagogue was hence accused of having, on Ascension day—whilst the chancellor, masters, and scholars of the university were walking in solemn procession, to visit the sainted reliques of Frideswide, bearing the cross before them—snatched the cross, a wooden one, from its bearer, and trodden it under his feet, in contempt of Christ. A very likely story! Strict search was made for the culprit, but in vain. Of course,—there was evidently no culprit to find; if there were, he could not possibly have escaped, as no Jew was allowed to travel from place to place without especial license. All those therefore who could be found within the city were seized and imprisoned, until they had provided sufficient funds for the erection of a cross of white marble, with golden figures of the Virgin and the child Jesus. Also to provide a rich silver cross, to be carried before the masters and scholars of the university in their processions. The marble cross was placed in Merton college, and the silver one entrusted to the fellows of that Society.

The large marble cross appears to have existed till Henry VI., according to John Ross, a contemporary antiquary, who copied from it just before it was destroyed, the following inscription :—

QUI MEUS AUCTOR ERAT ? JUDEI.

QUOMODO ? SUMPTU.

QUIS JUSSIT ? REGNANS.

QUO PROCURANTE ? MAGISTRIS.

CUR ? CRUCE PRO FRACTU LIGNI.

QUO TEMPORE ? FESTO ASCENSUS DOMINI.

QUIS ERAT LOCUS ? HIC UBI SISTO.

At Brentford the Gentiles rose up against the Jews, and robbed our people of whatever goods they could lay their hands upon. On that occasion, forty-five of the principal actors in the outrage were apprehended by the authorities of the place. All of them were, however, shortly after liberated, upon the intervention of the Bishop of Lincoln; his prelateship maintained that no man could impeach the barefaced robbers of any crime, or of breach of the peace.

(To be continued.)

Notes.

A NEW SOLUTION IN PART OF JOHN'S REVELATION OR APOCALYPSE,

SHOWING THAT CHAPTERS I. TO XI. MAINLY DESCRIBE
THE APOSTASY.

BY REV. RICHARD GASCOYNE, M.A.

(Continued from page 521.)

"AND I saw in the right hand of Him that sat on the throne a book written within and on the backside, sealed with seven seals. And I saw

a strong angel proclaiming with a loud voice, Who is worthy to open the book, and to loose the seals thereof? And no man in heaven, nor in earth,

neither under the earth, was able to open the book, neither to look thereon." (Chap. v. 1-3.)

Here an occurrence takes place which suspends the divine service until it is resumed (verse 8) under new circumstances occasioning great joy to the Church. John sees a book in God's right hand. When Jehovah is represented in a bodily form it is in condescension to our infirmity; he is a pure spirit, and is then only rightly seen when we regard him as the object of our intelligence and affections; hence a literal sense is here altogether out of place. As in the Jewish Church God's presence was denoted by the Shekinah, and men approached it in token that God was there, so the Divine presence in the militant Church is here described as one sitting on a throne surrounded by the four beasts and twenty-four elders, his ministering servants. The sealed book, too, is equally a symbol denoting something which professes to be Divine or to come from God. To be in His right hand cannot claim less than a divine origin either in pretence or in reality. But then it forms part of a vision relating to things which must be hereafter, centuries after John's death, things of moment to God's servants, since they were revealed to them in particular, and things which would probably be of an evil nature and tendency, since they precede an advent of Christ which all the tribes of the land lament. The book was also written within and without, or it was partly known and partly hidden; and it was sealed or under powerful restraint; for to seal a book can only mean to forbid its perusal. Put all these things together and they will amount to high pretensions to Divine authority set up in the Church long after revelation had ceased to make further communications. Now what is all this but an unexaggerated description of the corrupt doctrines and practices which obtained in the Church before and during the fourth century? What indeed they were will be better explained hereafter. The sealing of the book, too, supposes a restraint imposed by a power extraneous to the Church, or that the Church also was

under the same restraint. And this, indeed, is denoted by the silence of the service, which was not broken till the Lamb took possession of the book. But what power opposed to the Church do the seven seals represent? My reply then is, that the Pagan Roman empire at its close under Diocletian, Galerius, and others, is here intended. That power had existed from apostolic days and was adverse to the Church, and the apostle intimates that when it should become a let or hindrance to the mystery of iniquity, preventing its development into the Man of Sin, it would be taken away.* That period had now arrived. The mystery of iniquity is here under restraint, and it will appear as the history proceeds that first the paganism of the empire, and then the empire itself, will be removed to make way for the full expansion of the apostasy under the guidance of the Man of Sin. I fix the period of this persecution under Diocletian, because that alone was succeeded by unparalleled changes in the visible Church. It was, moreover, like this, almost universal, and had for its object the total annihilation of Christianity and of its name, whilst also that persecution alone was immediately followed both by the establishment of Christianity as the state religion and by the rapid growth of corrupt doctrine and practices then already considerable for magnitude and extent in the Church. No power for a while stood up in its defence, the courage of the Christians in many woeful cases gave way, martyrdom, though it was then well nigh idolised, had feeble adherents, for that very reverence in which martyrs were held was evidence of the loss of its true spirit.

This great danger to Christianity is implied in what next arrests the attention of the prophet. A strong angel with a loud voice called for some one from heaven, earth, or under the earth to come forward and break the seals, or as here interpreted, to give toleration and free course to Christianity. The Church had gradually so identified grace with forms

* 2 Thess. ii. 3-8.

and ceremonies, and much of its worship had become so manifestly formal, superstitious, and idolatrous, whilst the better features of Christianity that yet remained were so responsive to the felt wants of humanity, that very many heathen stood ready to enter the church, and only waited for the removal of the law's heavy penalties against it. For Christianity was then ignored, the law supposed its non-existence, and favour shown it, and much more the profession of it, made one amenable to the final severities of the law. Some authorities by bribes were occasionally tempted to wink at its observance, but the laws of Diocletian did in fact wholly forbid its existence. On these, and perhaps on other accounts, it is probable that the strong angel symbolises the feeling of the times, both in the church and among the heathen, that toleration, if not something more, could no longer be denied to Christianity.

"And I wept much, because no man was found worthy to open and to read the book, neither to look thereon. And one of the Elders saith unto me, Weep not: behold, the Lion of the tribe of Juda, the Root of David, hath prevailed to open the book, and to loose the seven seals thereof. And I beheld, and lo, in the midst of the throne and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the Elders, stood a Lamb as it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the earth." (Verses 4-6.)

Nothing was more natural than John's grief that a book apparently divine (being in God's right hand) could not be broken open. But as he here describes things which must be hereafter it was not necessary that he should understand their meaning, and being moreover in an ecstasy, his emotions personated those of others, and were not his own. According to the theory here laid down, John described the feelings of the Church during the Diocletian persecution. So many then relapsed or wavered that both the feeble and resolute were equally dismayed, and the latter began to regard the safety of the church as nearly compromised. But just at that criti-

cal moment, relief was at hand, and that one of the Elders anticipated its arrival implies that the leaders of the Church were observant of the signs of the times and of the conflicting measures concerning the church that were at work, and that were gravely canvassed in the empire.

No sooner had John described the deliverer as the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David, than a Lamb as it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, comes forward and takes the book. The lion and lamb are therefore identical. John saw that no one, as it is in the original, and not as our version renders it, no man, could open the book. This altogether precludes both from being a person, and drives us to the conclusion that they represent a power or principle. Jacob in his prophecy calls the tribe of Judah a lion's whelp, and in Daniel and elsewhere the same term denotes a kingdom. On this principle the lion would designate the kingdom of Judah which was the root and source of David and of the line of kings that reigned over Judah. But that economy no longer existed when John saw the vision. Besides, as the Apocalypse is for the most part symbolical, and especially what was presented to John's senses, the kingdom, laws, and religion of the Jews would here describe the kingdom of God under the Gospel. These phrases therefore denote the Christian Church and kingdom with the king at their head. But no such visible church and kingdom were erected by the Apostles, nor did they exist till the fourth century, when Christianity was made the religion of the Roman empire by Constantine called great. We must determine therefore whether his church and kingdom are here described in the Lamb with seven horns and seven eyes, which is the next subject of inquiry, and which is identical with the lion, forasmuch as it does what it is affirmed the lion was to do.

Many regard the Lamb as Jesus Christ, which, however, cannot be, for Christ is a person, and it is expressly declared that no one could open the book. But this is not all, for a still greater objection to such an

application of it remains. The Lamb is not only a complex creature, having no likeness in the Divine works, but it is also a symbol receiving Divine worship. This altogether forbids its application to Christ. If we may worship the God-man under a symbol, why may we not also worship a symbol of the Deity? But Scripture would condemn such an action as gross idolatry. This symbol, therefore, can only be taken in a bad sense. Nothing is more guarded against in Holy Scripture than a symbol of the Deity made an object of worship. Moses reminded the children of Israel that they saw no manner of similitude at Sinai; a voice only was heard. Neither the Shechinah nor the pillar of cloud and fire; neither the Lamb, whether for atonement or for any other purpose; nor yet the cherubim, which were in the Divine presence, rather than the divine presence itself, were ever objects of worship; and when the Jews in the days of Hezekiah perverted to idolatry the brazen serpent on a pole, evidently a complex symbol of Christ crucified, he had it destroyed.* Nor is there an instance in the Old Testament of a symbol approvingly made an object of worship. And has the clearer revelation of the New Testament rendered such precaution unnecessary? Witness the idolatry which early sprang up in the Christian Church. Witness the pertinacity with which it is even now speciously defended. But all this God foresaw. Would he then even seemingly give countenance to such an error? Surely not. And though it has hitherto been taken for granted that the God-man, Jesus Christ, is here worshipped, I have no hesitation in denouncing it as the positive idolatry set up in the Christian Church in the fourth century. This I will now endeavour to prove. He saw a Lamb as it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes. As this, if literally taken, would be a monstrosity, we are driven to the conclusion that we have here a group of symbols; and occurring, as we have shown, in the fourth century, it portrays what then existed. But a lamb slain in the

Jewish temple would have denoted a sacrifice either of atonement or thanksgiving; and as the heavenly temple here symbolises the Christian Church of the fourth century, it describes the worship then and there observed. But the sacrifices under the law represented Christ's atonement for sin, made once, and only once, for the sins of the whole world. Have we, then, here a reference merely to that atoning death, or a memorial of it only? Certainly not. A present, or at least a recent death, is here implied. But though "as it had been slain," the lamb continued to live, and stood in the midst of the holy of holies, not only in the place, but also an object of worship. Now was there any dogma of the fourth century that this scene would represent? There was, and it has been handed down even to the present day. The minister then began to be held a priest, and the bread and wine of the ordinance the real and true body and blood of Christ. They were consequently regarded with a reverence that eventually degenerated into positive and undisguised worship. Christ was then firmly believed to be presented in the Lord's Supper as a sacrifice for sin, notwithstanding that he was then bodily present in a glorified state in and before the throne of God. Now what can more plainly represent these errors than the scene here before us. It being Jewish throughout, the sacrament that memorialises the atonement is here denoted by a Lamb as it had been slain, whilst its life is yet continued in it. What feature moreover in the fourth century was more fitted to characterise the Church than this dogma concerning the Lord's supper? It was a giant and master sin and error, and such it has remained to the present day. In perfect agreement with this view, the four beasts and twenty-four elders are here officiating priests. But if the Lord's supper be more than a memorial—if it be propitiatory—if it nourish the soul not by faith only, but by something additional, then Christ's atonement is not a full, perfect, and sufficient oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world, and faith alone, or without an

* 2 Kings xviii. 4.

adjunct. cannot purify the heart and work effectually by love as Paul maintains it does. As the sacrifices under the law were not efficacious in themselves, for it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats can take away sin, but were merely symbolical of the meritorious death of Christ, so the Lord's supper in like manner, the cross, and crucifix, ought to be regarded as memorials only of the transactions of Calvary, whilst the benefit of their observance or their efficacy will depend altogether on the faith and thanksgiving that attend them. Such was visible Christianity or its crying cardinal error when Constantine made it the national religion of the Roman Empire.

But whilst the Christianity of the fourth century is here described by its predominant erroneous feature—the worship of the sacramental elements—its union and incorporation with the empire as its church is here denoted by seven horns and seven eyes. If we compare together the Lamb, the fourth beast of Daniel, (chapter vii. 7, 8,) and those of the Apocalypse, (chapters xii. xiii. xvii.) we shall find sufficient resemblance to justify the theory that they all alike denote the same kingdom at different periods of its history. Now the Lamb and the fourth beast of Daniel have horns and eyes, and if Popery, the last of the seven forms of government of the Roman domination is there in Daniel denoted by a horn and an eye, why may not the seven forms of government be so represented as in the Lamb? In such case, the seven horns and seven eyes would denote the seven forms of government by which the Roman domination during the empire was to be distinguished. But I shall hereafter show that the beast (chapter xii. of the Apocalypse), had crowns on its heads, and none on its horns, in order to distinguish the Roman empire from the Republic that preceded and from the popish kingdoms that followed, and which had crowns on their horns, and none on their heads. As then the Lamb and the beast (Apoc. xii.), have nominally each seven forms of government, they describe the period of the empire

which succeeded the Republic, and preceded the Popedom. This empire was first pagan as described (Apoc. xii.), and then nominally Christian, as represented by the Lamb. Cæsar, on becoming supreme in Rome, allowed the seven republican forms of government to remain in use, in order not to wound the feelings and prejudices of the people, which practice was continued down to the destruction of the western empire. The seven eyes are here declared to be symbolical, and are interpreted to denote the seven spirits of God sent into all the earth. But can the true God be here intended? Certainly not, and for the reason already given, that they form part of an idolatrous worship, and can only be referred to the spirit of propagandism that arose out of Constantine's adoption of the cross as the standard of his army. This he himself avowed. He was perplexed on the subject of religion, and prayed to his father's god * to remove his doubts, whereupon, says Eusebius, in the afternoon of October 26, A.D. 312, the day before his battle with Maxentius, he and his whole army saw in the heavens, just above the sun, a brilliant cross, with its motto, "By this conquer;" and in the same night Jesus Christ appeared to him in a dream, with an image of the cross, and promised him success by his making it the standard of his army. Lactantius and Sozomen speak only of the dream. Now, I have no hesitation in saying, that this vision and dream, whatever their origin, were not of heavenly birth. Not only have they no resemblance to those approved in Holy Scripture, but they recommend what is there condemned as gross idolatry. When we bear in mind that the Roman soldiers worshipped their standards, together with the image of Cæsar and the fortunes of the Empire, and that the Christian Church had already from the third century revered the cross, I cannot believe this message came from Christ with-

* The historian does not mention the name of the god of Constantius Chlorus. It remains very doubtful whether, though he favoured, he ever professed Christianity.

out allowing that it sanctions what the true Church has hitherto regarded as undisguised idolatry. If Constantine were commanded by Christ to look for protection from the presence of the cross in his army, can Protestants condemn the worship of the cross by Romanists? Certainly not. There is no escape from this dilemma. But it is not so. God has never sanctioned dependence on a symbol, but always requires his worshippers to look not at it, but through it, and recognise Himself as the sole object not only of worship, but of dependence. The children of Israel in Eli's days were punished for a superstition bordering on idolatry. They took the ark into the camp, hoping that its presence would preserve them from defeat, or at least from capture. They trusted in the ark, not in God; in the symbols of worship, not in Him who appointed them merely to lead the worshipper to Himself. That is our idol which we depend upon or substitute for God, though we perhaps offer it no bodily worship. If Constantine had been directed by Christ to make the cross, which was then idolised by the Church, the standard of the army, which was equally worshipped by the soldiers, then I have no hesitation in maintaining, that the idolatry of the cross cannot be condemned. But whilst I leave every one to form his own opinion as to the origin of this remarkable story, no one can deny that from that time the cross was the standard of Constantine and of the Empire, and that he attributed to it his victories over his competitors, the promoters of Paganism; whilst it is equally true that he did not himself profess Christianity for many years after that event. Thus the worship of the cross was enlisted against the old Pagan idolatry, and obtained the sole dominion over the Empire, forming one of the most remarkable epochs of history. Thus it was not Constantine who obtained victory over Paganism, but a new form of error which sprang up in the bosom of the Church, whereby he restored Christian worship, and placed it upon a new basis. The Christian Church from that time began a new career by drawing the

sword against Paganism, and in favour not of pure ancient Christianity, but of a profession wherein error and superstition chiefly prevailed.

Now, the object fought for, the standard of the cross, or the labarum, as it was termed, was not the cross simply, it was a shaft surmounted by a crown, with the monogram, or letters "ch," intersected by the letter "r;" the image of the Emperor was underneath, and lower still the bar from which depended the flag or drapery. These were combined into one, and it must be admitted, that it was accommodated, whether by design or accident, to gratify both the Pagan and the Christian: the image of Cæsar suited the idolatry of the one, and the cross the superstition of the other. If, however, the dependence of the mind, given to something else instead of God, be condemned as idolatry—and who can deny it?—surely the worship of the labarum by the soldiers, must be of the same character. Behold, then, the spurious work of Constantine! But was there nothing good in this achievement? I do not affirm that true Christianity ceased to exist because the Church availed itself of the civil power to obtain protection from its enemies, and to diffuse abroad its influence. Why, then, do I describe as spurious the great work which Constantine accomplished? For this simple reason, that what was good of the Christianity of that day was not his work, but the Apostles' and their followers', since Constantine found the spirit and essence of the Gospel deeply rooted in the hearts of his people when he began his career, whilst the work which made him notorious was the strong infusion of superstition which he laid hold upon and promoted, and was instrumental in pouring into the Church, by which it was eventually surcharged as by a deluge.

This was an epoch or era to the Church. All the subsequent Emperors, except Julian, favoured Christianity, and discountenanced paganism, down to Theodosius the Great, when heathenism was almost extinct, and visible Christianity, by the seeds of error gradually sown, was ripe for

the iron reign of the Man of Sin. In this group of symbols the sacrificial character of the Lord's supper, and the veneration amounting to idolatry of the cross, are made the leading features of the Apostasy, which, headed by Constantine, defeated the pagan party, and became the national religion of the Roman Empire. Living, direct, and simple faith in the God-man crucified, or in His propitiatory life and death, which, when rightly viewed and deeply felt, imparts the profoundest conceptions of the heinous and inexcusable nature of sin, are here thrown out of view, whilst puzzle and mystery bewilder and darken the mind, reduce religion to form, will-worship, and superstition, and impede effort in the way of true vital and elevated godliness.

We have, here, therefore, the Constantinian church set up in the fourth century. The Lamb symbolised the leading error in the church, and the symbols of horns and eyes the Divine ordinance of civil government. What other errors, whether of doctrine or practice, already existed in the Church, will be disclosed by the rupture of the seals, which did not originate but only let loose and sanctioned what had been long held and observed. As the rupture of the seals occupied all the time that Constantine took to subdue his enemies and rivals, it is highly probable that, during such interval, these errors in the Church grew both in number and in flagrant intensity.

"And when he had taken the book, the four beasts and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of saints. And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests; and we shall reign on the earth." (Verses 8-10.)

We learn from history that Constantine laid before his friends an account of his dream and vision, where-

upon he made the cross the standard of his army. But as he was not then a professor of the Christian faith, his friends, if not entirely, were chiefly Pagans. How, then, can we explain the fact, that an army for the most part composed of Pagans consented to fight under the cross, and at a time when its followers were suffering a severe and almost exterminating persecution in those parts of the Empire not under the government of Constantine? This can only be accounted for by supposing that the general feelings of the Empire were favourable to Christianity. Constantine saw, and acted upon this, and as success crowned his choice, he was emboldened first to tolerate all religions, but afterwards, finding that Paganism and Christianity could not exist together, he determined to make the latter the only religion of the Empire. But what effect had the measures of Constantine upon the Church? It was no careless observer of his standard, much less was it ungrateful, that he was enabled by it first to protect, and then disposed to profess Christianity; and though perhaps, thus far he followed his own suggestions merely, yet when he required all his subjects to profess the new religion, and divided the Church into patriarchies, answering to the four civil divisions of the Empire, he was probably guided by the leading members of the Church.* In conformity with this view, an Elder declares beforehand that the Lamb shall open the book, or give freedom to the Church. But on renouncing the worn-out superstitions of which as Emperor he was *pontifex maximus*, and making Christianity the national religion, he probably regarded himself as its supreme and governing head. Nor would this be disavowed by the Church. As early as in the second century the bishops held provincial councils, which soon originated a difference of rank and consideration in the episcopate,—the bishops of Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria being especially regarded with deference. Then also began the mischievous appropriation of Jewish terms to the

* Gibbon, chap. xx., p. 468.

Christian Church, by designating bishops, high priests; presbyters, priests; and deacons, Levites. Hence as a matter of course, sprang up soon afterwards the far greater error of regarding the Lord's Supper as a literal and true sacrifice. These evils very much increased in the third century, and no person promoted them so much as the great and excellent Cyprian. Such a state of things was favourable to the measures of Constantine. If, however, covetousness—if supreme love of the world is idolatry, our conduct is of the same character when dependence is transferred to human power. "Cursed is the man who trusteth in man." But was the Church aware that it was guilty of idolatry by its incorporation with the Empire? No, certainly not. God's most devoted servants probably regarded Constantine's interposition as a gracious providence for the benefit and enlargement of the Church. They hailed his measures with joyful acclamations, and entertained the most sanguine hopes of an approaching millennium of universal Christianity. This is intimated in the verses under consideration. No sooner did the Lamb (the Empire Christian) take possession of the sealed book (sealed by the Pagan part of the Empire) than the Church broke out into a song of joy, confidence, and exultation and said, "we shall reign upon the earth." But though God's servants then sanguinely looked for the rapid conversion of the world, such were the corruptions then in general favour, that the union was prejudicial rather than helpful to the interests of true religion, and hastened on the coming and foretold apostasy. It was not the cause of the downward tendency of the Church, it only gave an impetus to what already existed. This great departure is here brought before us. The worship of the four beasts and twenty-four elders, in chap. iv. 8-11, was addressed alone to God, but here, on resuming the suspended worship, the Lamb engrosses, if it does not entirely absorb, the attention of the Church. Here is dependence on the civil power combined with the worship of God and of the sacramental elements.

On resuming the Divine service, the four beasts and twenty-four elders here *acknowledge* that the Lamb made them official kings and priests unto God, but in chap. iv. it is *implied only* that the elders are priests, but here they declare that they are both kings and priests; and this is still more strongly confirmed in that they are *not* provided each with his own harp and vial, but each has *harps* and *vials*. Why? Evidently because they officiate not for themselves alone but for others also, and as no such office under the Gospel has existed, either in heaven or upon earth, except the royal and priestly office of Christ, it is just of that objectionable character which was established in the Constantinian Church. That the service also takes place on earth and not in heaven is undeniable. Had there been vials only, we might justly infer that the definition given of them is used in its loosest sense for prayer generally, which includes praise, but harps and song forbid such a general notion, and oblige us to restrict the former to deprecation, and the latter to praise and thanksgiving. But the union of the two is an earthly, not a heavenly service. This is still further confirmed by the character of the song, that it is new, which cannot describe the novelty alleged to Christianity when first announced, for at the time of the scene it was at least centuries old, but must denote something new, when compared with the Gospel set up by Christ and by His apostles. The vision evidently points to novelties which hitherto had no existence. Now, the Church of Constantine exactly answers to this description. Never was a greater change than what he brought about—never did a superstition more truly deserve prophetic reprobation and exposure. It was, indeed, new when compared with that at the opening of the vision; for if chapter iv. was Jewish in its character, it was neither superstitious nor idolatrous; but Constantine's was both, and was composed of evils which could not be too highly reprobated, and were not likely to be passed over by prophecy.

It is remarkable that the four beasts, which I have supposed to be

the civil power under Christianity, are here official priests, confirming my theory, that the priesthood very soon appropriated all power, both civil and ecclesiastical, to itself.

No writer of the New Testament uses the word "redeemed," whatever Greek word it stands for, in reference to heaven, but always to describe something on earth. No violence, therefore, will be done by such an application of it here. Nay, what authority have we to give it any other meaning? Even John himself elsewhere uses it in this sense. In chapter xiv. we have two contemporaneous events—the downfall of Popery and the propagation of the Gospel. The chapter opens with the worship of the Reformed Church: the song is new, new to the world long accustomed to Popery, and understood only by the redeemed. And who may these be? They are with the Lamb on Mount Zion, listening to God's worship there established. They are virgins, or uncorrupted by the spiritual idolatry surrounding them. They follow the Lamb whithersoever He leads them. They are the first-fruits of that era, just as the apostles were of the Christian dispensation. What are these but descriptions of an earthly service, and how can they with any propriety apply to heaven proper? If, indeed, they do, then must the angels (chap. xiv. vers. 6-8) preach the Gospel in heaven proper, and not in the metaphorical heaven, the visible Church. But this cannot be. We have here, therefore, the redeemed in the militant Church; for if St. John uses the term in this sense in one part of the prophecy, he may likewise do so in the verse under consideration.

"And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne and the beasts and the elders: and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands; saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing." (Verses 11, 12.)

Following the principle I have adopted, as the only consistent rule of interpretation, viz., that whatever

was present to John's senses was a symbol, and cannot be taken literally, these angels are not inhabitants of heaven, but members of the visible Church. Nor am I deviating from the New Testament generally or from the principles of the vision itself. In the first part of the prophecy we are expressly told that the angels of the seven Churches are human agents. But even the Gospels and Epistles use this term figuratively, when it is entirely surrounded by the literalities of prosaic and earthly life. Take the following instances:—The two men sent by the Baptist to Christ are in the original termed angels;* so is the Baptist himself, "Behold I send my messenger"† (angel); the disciples sent by Christ to a village of the Samaritans, "And he sent by messengers"‡ (angels); and finally, so are the two men sent to Jericho and sheltered by Rahab.§ But if this word is often used figuratively, in letters and history, what other sense is it likely to bear in a vision, the greater part of which is evidently symbolical, and where the prophet who witnessed it, representing events which took place after his death, was himself, in those instances at least, if not in others, a symbol? Who, then, are intended by the multitude before us? I reply, the laity of the Church. And the term angel was highly significant when so applied. In what light were laymen regarded by the spirit of innovation and apostasy then prevalent and growing? As its servants. It was not, indeed, denied that they were brethren and members of the Church; they were not, however, so much regarded as brethren as property; for the term Church was generally restricted to the priesthood, whilst the laity held a position much more ambiguously defined.

(To be continued.)

THE MUCH-NEGLECTED BOOK; OR A PLEA FOR THE BIBLE.

BY J. G. SPARKES.

Two questions will naturally suggest themselves to every inquiring mind.

* Luke vii. 24. † Matt. xi. 10; Mark i. 2.
‡ Luke ix. 52. § James ii. 25.

1. *What book is referred to?* 2. *Against whom is the charge brought of neglecting it?* The answer given to the first question is this: viz.—the book of which we complain being neglected, we will not say, altogether despised, is no ordinary book; but a very extraordinary one. It is of very ancient date. In fact, the oldest extant. It is not only very old; but it is the best, yea, the very best book in the world. Its author was not any human person; but a Divine person—not man—but God. Written by the finger of Deity and with the pen of inspiration. A volume, therefore, of such an high and holy character—stamped with such an authority, demands the most solemn respect, and the greatest reverence. In a word, the book alluded to, is none other than the Bible. It is the *book of books*; for there is not another to be met with equal to it, for beauty of diction, or sublimity of style, or simplicity of language. It deals with subjects of the highest moment. It should not be taken up lightly and laid down at will. It has reference to eternity; and the deep things of an eternal world are its theme; therefore, the person reading or studying it, should read it as for eternity. Of its excellency, too much can never be said.

The exclamation of the Queen of Sheba to Solomon, when she had seen the manifestation of His wisdom, power, and greatness—"Behold," said she, "the half was not told me," may, with equal propriety be applied to the *Holy Book*. In praise of it, none can speak too highly; nay, none can ever eulogise it enough. It has that of which no other book can exult. Not only does its greatness of matter, and dignity of title, exceed all other books; for it is rich, high, and holy, and yet so simple, that it is not beyond the weakest mind to comprehend. Yes, a child of ordinary capacity may understand the blessed truths it contains. Beyond this, it possesses that within itself, which no other book does; viz. an *inherent power*, yea, an energy which none can gainsay or resist (Heb. iv. 12); under whose force giants of mighty intellect have been prostrated;

for its power is irresistible, whilst the humblest mind has been marvellously upheld and supported, the afflicted quickened; an influence, we affirm, which it makes the devoutest student know, feel, and own; for it can convince the unbeliever, convict the gainsayer, and, at the same time, console the backslider, and comfort the oppressed and persecuted child of God. Where, then, we ask, is there another book to be found of equal magnitude and power? Search every library throughout the universe, and we venture to say its like can nowhere be discovered. It is the ordinary means of conversion. (Ps. xix. 7.) It is the vast instrument for the evangelisation of the world. By the Word of God souls are born again. It is the medium of light to the spiritually blind. (Ps. cxix. 130.) It is Jehovah's proclamation of love and mercy to guilty man,—the record of His revealed will. Learn it well, that thou mayest know how to do it.

It is the potent lever which raises the moral as well as the spiritual tone of society. It is in fine, the most complete and precious thesaurus of all true piety. For what has made men wise, holy, and good, and powerful? What, but the Bible? Yea, what has made England the first in civilisation? what, but the Bible? Yes, she owes her greatness, grandeur, and glory, to the adoption of Bible principles, and that alone. It were indeed an insult to God, and derogatory to the Bible, to say that the altar, and not the Bible were the safeguard of the nation. Such an utterance is the effect of a disordered mind,—the ebullition of a feverish brain. What the material sun is to the natural world, so is the Bible to the moral and spiritual world. It gives light, warmth, life to the soul. Yes, not like the moon, which only shines with a borrowed light, but rather like the sun, illuminating the dark parts of the earth with its own bright beams. How could the preacher, the Scripture reader, or the missionary do the Lord's work without it? Impossible. What, again, we ask, would the Christian do without this chart? How could he traverse the road to glory, or reach the land of

immortal bliss? Surely, then, we may say, that, next to the great gift of God's eternal Son, it were the best, richest, the most glorious boon, yea, the highest behest ever bestowed on man by his beneficent Creator. Such, and much more, is that blessed of all books, the Bible. It is the pastor's text-book of theology, his flock's richest treasury of knowledge—the Church's safe guide-book to heavenly wisdom—the believer's passport to glory. Ye who possess this treasure, prize it; sell it not; but keep it as your heritage for ever and ever.

Let us hasten, in the next place, to show that this blessed book is much neglected by many. This charge it is feared, may be brought against those who possess the *precious life-giving word*, as well as against those who do not. Now, however startling the statement may appear, yet, it is nevertheless true, as we shall presently prove. That it should be disregarded by the irreligious and profane, is no wonder; that it should be so frequently made light of by the professing Christian, is a thing to be wondered at. That it should be so is surpassing strange. One can well imagine why the infidel, for instance, the scoffer, the sceptic, and the free-thinker should despise it. The reason is obvious. If it were a book written for him, rather than what it is,—*against* him,—then would he love it, and write in its defence and not against it. Be this as it may, yet even he is sometimes compelled to own that it differs from all other books, both in point of doctrine and authority; though he is at a loss to know the cause. It is a fact, much to be deplored, that, in all ages there should have been found persons who have written against it, both in the Church and out of her. To their shame be it spoken; yet all their attempts to lower its dignity, power, and influence have, as well might be expected, proved fruitless. Miracles and fulfilled prophecy are the arguments generally brought forward to prove its divine authority; but we are apt to think that a much weightier reason might be given; viz.: that of *experience*. Other evidences may fail to convince the doubter, but this will

prevail; for it is impossible to disprove that of which a person is conscious of to himself.

In proof, a champion of this stamp once boasted to a Scripture reader, that he had been often visited by clergymen and others, but no one had been able to convince him that the Bible was true. "You know," was the earnest appeal of this man of God to him; "*you know what I once was; you see what I am now—a Christian.*" This was too much for this Goliath of infidelity. "*You have done me,*" were his emphatic words. To return; our purpose is not so much with men of that class, but rather with others of a more hopeful character. Our desire is, if possible, to speak to the conscience. Oh, may the arrow of conviction, by the power of the Holy Ghost, enter into that chamber of the soul! Be it remembered, that this is how God works with man now. To inform the mind and yet never reach the conscience, were worse than useless. This, surely, should be the aim of every Christian teacher; and yet, at the same time, he should endeavour to speak the truth in love, and from his own heart to that of another, for—as saith the "wise man"—"*As in water face answereth to face, so the heart of man to man.*" (Prov. xxvii. 19.) Having said this much, turn we now to establish the charge which is brought not only against the non-Christian, but also against the professing Christian.

It is an axiom in law that every man is innocent until proved guilty. Now what is the real nature of the case? Let us first state this,—that we do not say, O Christian, that thou altogether despisest *the Book*, but that thou dost not esteem it so highly as thou oughtest to do. Permit a few questions to be asked of thee. Hast thou learnt to look upon it as the ultimate court of appeal in all matters touching thy eternal interest? Hast not thou rather gone to other books for wisdom and counsel? Like King Asa, who, in his sickness, "sought not to the Lord, but to the physicians." (2 Chron. xvi. 12.) To the traditions of men hast thou gone for advice, and with what result? Has thy mind been relieved under

the pressure of some heart-felt disease? Is not thy case like that recorded of the woman who had the issue of blood, and of whom it was said, that she "had suffered many things of many physicians, and had spent all she had, and was nothing bettered, but rather grew worse?" (Mark v. 26.) Thy God has spoken to thee, it may be, by the "still small voice" within, telling thee thy heart is not right with His? Under such circumstances, how hast thou acted? Instead of going in thy distressed state of mind to thy Father and God in secret prayer, thou hast repaired to a fellow-sinner like thyself! It may be thou hast told him the whole state of thy soul; yea, even confessed to him the very "sins of thy youth;" thus putting him in the place of God, and listened to his words, rather than to the words of thy best and only *tried* friend. Some earthly trouble or social trial hath come upon thee, and, in order to get thyself out of the one, and to deliver thyself from the other, hast not thou gone to some worldly companion, instead of consulting thy sure and safe guide-book—the Bible? thus ignoring, in a measure, its divine authority; yea, more, proving thy lack of love for that best of all books, the *Book of books*. Now we would ask of thee this other question: Supposing thou hadst received a letter from a distant friend, one whom thou lovest, wouldst thou treat his letter thus? Wouldst thou take that epistle and just scan over its contents, and then throw it away as thou wouldst a piece of waste paper? Wouldst not thou rather take that letter, and read it over and over again, until thou hadst made thyself fully acquainted with all its contents? Dost thou deal thus with that letter sent to thee from thy best, yea, the very best of friends—thy Father in Heaven? Is not the charge brought against thee, O Christian, fully made out, not of altogether despising the Book, but in not regarding it with that veneration and esteem that thou shouldst do? To this indictment must thou not plead guilty? Yet, pray that the Lord may forgive thy neglect, and ask Him to shed abroad His love in

thine heart, so that thou mayest learn to value His Word, and, like David, to say, "How sweet are thy words unto my taste! Yea, sweeter than honey to my mouth." (Ps. cxix. 103.) "It was the speech of a holy man—after God had made this precious text (Matt. xi. 28) the messenger to open his dungeon of spiritual distress, and bring him into the light of inward joy, that he had better be without meat, drink, light, air, earth, life, and all, than without this one comfortable Scripture." "If one simple promise," as Gurnal sweetly remarks, in giving this story, "like an ear of corn rubbed in the hand of faith, and applied by the Spirit of Christ, can afford such a full, satisfying meal of joy to the hunger-bitten, pining soul, oh! what price can we set upon the whole field of Scripture, which stands so thick with promises every way as cordial as this!" (Gurnal on Ephes. vi. 17.) Well might the immortal star of the Reformation, Martin Luther, say, "I have covenanted with my Lord, that he should not send me visions, or dreams, or even angels. I am content with this one gift of the Scriptures, which abundantly teaches, and supplies all that is necessary, both for this life and that which is to come." It is the highest mark of a true Christian to love God's word; "*For his delight is in the law of the Lord; and in his law doth he meditate day and night.*"

The extent of our love for a person can only be measured by the amount of interest we take in anything which belongs to him. This remark is not inapplicable to God and His Word. For just in proportion as we value that Word, so, in like manner, shall we regard its Divine Author. If, then, we love His Word, we shall love Him also; yea, more; He will delight in us. And not only so, but we shall thus show that we honour Him by honouring His Word. And what saith He in His Word?—"Them that honour Me I will honour, and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed" (1 Sam. ii. 30.) Now, no one likes to be little thought of by his fellow-men, but all desire, in some respect, the esteem of others. Apply, O Chris-

tian, this rule to thyself, and only just consider what it must be to be *lightly esteemed* by God. To be treated thus by other men is nothing to be compared to being regarded so by God. If then, thou wouldst avoid His displeasure, and obtain His favour, learn to value *His Word*. It is related of Dr. Johnson and his godson, that the latter called to see him a short time before his death. The Doctor asked him what books he read. He replied, "The books, sir, which you have given me." Dr. Johnson, summoning up all his strength, fixed his eyes upon the youth, and exclaimed, "Sam, Sam, read *the Bible*. All books that are worth reading are founded upon it, and are only valuable for what they derive from it." The same good advice would we give to all who possess this blessed book. Dig deep into this mine of precious store which contains truths of priceless value, to be known, understood, and believed, in order to their saving. Search diligently, prayerfully, and daily, *for impression and information* respecting Him of whom they testify, even Jesus the Messiah, who was and is Israel's glory, and the Gentiles' Light. "A nation," observes a pious writer, "would indeed be truly blessed, if it were governed by no other laws than those of this blessed Book. It is so complete a system, that nothing can be added to it, or taken from it; it contains everything needful to be known or done." How beautifully, and yet how truthfully, does a Christian poet express, in glowing language, its estimable worth! His words we give, altho' ignorant of his name:—

"Within this volume you will find,
The best of food to feast the mind;
'Twill be a light to guide your feet
Amidst the dangers you may meet.
And should it be your lot to know
The bitter cup of human woe,
When friends shall fail, and clearly prove
How fickle is a mortal's love;
Here you will find a friend sincere,
Your sighs to hush, your heart to cheer;
When sin, that foe to all mankind,
That monster to the human mind,
Shall strive to draw your heart astray—
Or lead you in some devious way;
The mighty prevalence of this word—
The Holy Spirit's glittering sword,
Will cause the foe abashed to yield,
And leave you conqueror in the field."

SCRIPTURE EMENDATIONS.

Acts xiii. 32-34. "And we declare unto you glad tidings concerning the promise which was made to the fathers—that God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, having raised up Jesus; as it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee: and—That He raised Him up from the dead, no more to return to corruption, even as He said, I will give you the sure mercies of David."

There are two parts to "the promise which was made to the fathers;" 1st. The Incarnation. 2nd. The Resurrection. The A.V. includes the fulfilment of the promise in the resurrection alone. It is difficult to discern how such easy Greek could have been so misunderstood.

"How that" has no representative term in the Greek whatever: the same may be said of "in that he hath," and also of "again." In this last addition we can, perhaps, detect the source. The translators considered that the birth of Jesus was well known to the audience which Paul was addressing, and also His death; but His resurrection was not, and so they thought that his announcement was concerning the resurrection alone. The emendation we give for ἀναστήσας, *having raised up*, is sustained by Acts iii. 22: "For Moses truly said unto the fathers, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up (ἀναστήσει) unto you;" and verse 26, "Unto you first, God, having raised up (ἀναστήσας) His Son Jesus." An objector might point to Acts ii. 30. On good authority the Greek is rejected for "according to the flesh, He would raise up Christ." We should then read, "God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, one should sit on his throne." This is in strict accordance with God's gracious declaration to David in 2 Sam. vii. 12: he at that time saw nothing further than that his natural issue should reign after him, which was fulfilled as long as Judah was a kingdom—"for ever." Then in the next verse, "he, seeing this before," is more than the simple

translation of *προῖδων*, which would be as in Gal. iii. 3, "foreseeing." He is not said to predicate of the resurrection of Christ, what he knew only concerning heirship to his throne. The latter he knew as a man beloved of Jehovah—a special communication to Him; the former he knew only in the dimness of prophetic vision: he was one of those "to whom it was revealed that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things . . . which the angels desire to look into." (1 Pet. i. 12.)

For *εὐαγγελιζόμεθα*—"we declare glad tidings concerning," consult Parkhurst. It is almost uniformly followed by an accusative, and requires "concerning" or "of" as a part of its own meaning.

Thus is destroyed the outrage on propriety of applying to the resurrection of Christ, the words, "this day have I begotten (*γενέννηκα*) Thee." This is the word applied to the *birth* of Christ, "that which is begotten (marg.) in her is of the Holy Ghost." (Matt. i. 20.) Such is its uniform meaning for the natural and spiritual generation and consequent bringing forth.

Advantage has been taken of this passage, now emended, to support the illogical doctrine of the "eternal Sonship." It matters not how illogical a doctrine may be if it is scriptural; but on both grounds it is untenable. "Does not even nature itself teach you," that if a man have a son, that is, one begotten of his body, the father had an existence before the son? "But this is not orthodox." Well then, we say, the worse for orthodoxy. One must be prepared to sustain such an outcry as this. In reply, we say: Give a single text that plainly states such a doctrine, and then we have nothing to do but bend, and take our place as an uncompromising advocate. We will do no more now than give a few hints. First. What is meant by the term "Son of God?" "The angel said, The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that Holy Thing which shall be born of thee (or, begotten), shall be called

the Son of God." (Luke i. 36.) Secondly. Did this Holy Thing exist from all eternity, or did it then begin to be—viz., at the mother's conception? If one will say, "from all eternity," then is matter eternal; for the body of Jesus was material. The Son of God is the same as "the Word made flesh." Here perhaps has arisen the confusion of ideas. That wonderful complex being which is called Jesus, a Saviour; and Christ, the Anointed; was "very God and very man;" eternal as to His Godhead, but not as to His manhood. Now it is this union of existences that we hail as "the Son of God." But some one may say, "Is not the Son equal with the Father?" Yes, and No. "I and My Father are one." (John x. 30.) "That all men should honour the Son even as they honour the Father." (John v. 23.) Those who would deduce equality of the Son and the Father from the first of these Scriptures would also, or should, assert the equality of the saints and their Lord from such Scriptures as "I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one." (John xvii. 23.) Then as to the second Scripture, we do not honour the Son as we do the Father, unless we honour Him as He gives us commandment. We honour Him as our all-sufficient Redeemer in all the grand conditions of redemption. We honour Him as giving all our prayers efficacy when we pray unto the Father in His name. Time would fail us to state all the various ways in which we honour Him, but always as the Son of God, who came not to do His own will, but the will of Him that sent Him. Christ Himself declares, "My Father is greater than I" (John xiv. 28); and this He sustains by prayer to the Father, and referring all things to Him, even His commission of atonement." (John x. 18.) Consider also Heb. ii. 9; 1 Cor. xv. 28, and xi. 3. "The everlasting Father," in Isa. ix. 6, is really "the Father of the everlasting ages," a Hebraism, and illustrated by Heb. i. 2, "on whose account also He (God) appointed the ages." (See the Greek.)

The Son of God must be every

thing to us, as He is every thing to the Father. We do not think there is any real difference in the above statements from what is so commonly, but we are persuaded, loosely held respecting the Son. He uniformly represents Himself as the servant carrying out the purposes of Him who sent Him; now on His Father's throne, ere long to be seated on His own throne for a stated period; then, having accomplished all, He will yield all to Him who "gave Him to be the Head over all things to His Church." (Eph. i. 22.) What this giving up involves; how He will Himself become subject to the Father; which conditions, we are told, could not be reversed (1 Cor. xv. 27); what the church will be, &c. &c., we are not informed. Eternal life we are sure of, and with it, eternal blessedness; whether our regal condition and priesthood continue or not, is not for us to know. We may be sure that the cost of redemption would never have been incurred for only a thousand years' reign: rather should we look upon that as a prelude to a still greater exhibition of that love which so filled the Father's heart that He spared not His own Son—the Son of His love, that He might bring us home again.

The question was put above, "Is not the Son equal with the Father?" The answer, "No," has been considered. With equal confidence we answer, *Yes*. This, however, is not as regards the Sonship. The positive is sustained by such Scriptures as "Before Abraham was, I am" (John viii. 58), and "Christ Jesus; who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God." (Philip. ii. 6.) This word of our Lord Himself declares His pre-existence, and we know from John i. 1, 14, that this was the eternal Godhead. But the expression, "I am," takes us back to Ex. iii. 14, "I AM hath sent me unto you;" thus do we identify Jesus Christ, "the Word made flesh," with the "I AM THAT I AM"—with JEHOVAH, the self-existent, ever-blessed Almighty One. "My Lord and my God" was no surprised exclamation of Thomas, but an inspiration of the Spirit of

truth, testifying to the Godhead incarnate. Again, "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day: and he saw and was glad." (John viii. 56.) Thus is Jesus identified with Him who made Himself known to Abraham as God Almighty. (Ex. vi. 3.) We doubt not also that Melchizedek, that mysterious being, who met Abraham when he returned from the slaughter of the kings, was the same who, as "priest of the most high God," set forth, by "bread and wine," his future sacrifice of Himself.

The other Scripture from Philip. ii. 6, has had various interpretations. We cordially agree with one excellent Greek scholar, who writes, "Our translators, rightly, I think, render the expression." The Spirit is inculcating humility, and He places before us Jesus, our great Exemplar. "Being in the form of God:" as such, humility would be out of place, because there is none greater; yet being this, "he thought it not robbery to be equal with God," notwithstanding "He made Himself of no reputation," &c. This is one of the happiest efforts of our translators. The rendering, "emptied Himself," is as bad as can be, for it is not true. How could Christ empty Himself when "all fulness was pleased to dwell in Him" (so the Greek); when He was "the image of the invisible God" (Col. i. 15); "the express image of His person" (Heb. i. 3); when "in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." (Col. ii. 9.) But some one may rejoin, "He emptied Himself of His glory:" nay, He made water into wine, "and manifested forth His glory." (John i. 11.) "But His visible glory." That would be divesting, not emptying. "To make of no reputation" is of a kindred meaning with "to empty," and it has the recommendation of being most literally true.

Archbishop Tillotson translates this passage: "He did not arrogate to Himself to be equal with God, i.e., He made no ostentation of His divinity." Calcott says, "He did not eagerly covet to be (as He was of old) equal in all His appearances with the Deity," quoted by Parkhurst. Dean Alford says, "Ἐπαρῶν—(subsisting

originally) οὐχ ἀπαγγμὸν, deemed not His (existing pre-incarnate) equality with God a matter for grasping and retaining, but emptied Himself (of the μορφή Θεοῦ—the glory which He had with the Father.—John xvii. 5.) The ὑπάρχων is, no doubt, compositely “from the beginning,” illustrated by John i. 1, 2; but the “pre-incarnate” condition is not sustained by the word except as Melchizedek, or as when Jehovah appeared to Abraham as “he sat in the tent door;” but surely these were not strictly incarnate manifestations, but pro-human spiritual bodies (see 1 Cor. xv. 44); such was not “the Word made flesh.” (Luke xxiv. 39.) One can easily see here that the notion of emptying Himself would suggest the Dean’s view of ἀπαγγμὸν. The teaching of this passage is, it seems—Consider Jesus; who, though in the form of God, and without robbery, equal with God, sought not the honour such a condition would bring, but made Himself the servant of all; so “let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus.” Dean Alford, to whom we are under such great obligations, says: “‘thought it not robbery to be equal with God.’ is altogether wrong, both in rendering and in the sense conveyed.” We have considered the sense. As to the rendering, we venture on an opposite *dictum*. Many passages might be adduced, let two suffice. James i. 2: “Πᾶσαν χαρὰν ἡγήσασθε, count (think) it all joy.” 2 Pet. i. 13: “Δίκαιον δὲ ἡγοῦμαι, I think it meet.” Correlates too are found in each passage to complete the grammatical similarity. In Phil. ii. 6, there is the correlate Τὸ εἶναι ἰσα θεῷ; in James, “when ye fall into divers trials:” in Peter, “to stir up.” Clifton. W. HOWELL.

Since writing the above, being in a friend’s house, Dr. Macbride’s Lectures were put in my hands; from only a cursory glance the following note presented itself.

“If ἀλλά had been rendered here *nevertheless*, the meaning would have been more clear. The improved ver-

sion, as it is called, translates, without any authority, Οὐκ ἀπαγγμὸν ἡγήσατο, *he caught not at the robbery of being equal with God*. Nor is Whitby’s interpretation, *he did not covet to appear as God*, satisfactory. In a case where all depends on the meaning of a Greek phrase, the judgment of Theophylact, as representing Chrysostom, ought, I conceive, to be decisive. “The Son of God was not afraid to descend from His own dignity, since he had not this *by robbery* (ἐξ ἀπαγγμης), being equal with God the Father, but knew it to be His by natural dignity, therefore He chose to humble Himself, as even in His humiliation, retaining His *ύψος*, *eminence*.” W. H.

THE EVE OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT.

ON Sunday, September 10th, the eve of the Day of Atonement, the most solemn fast in the Jewish year, whilst thousands of Israelites thronged the synagogues to mourn and lament over their misdoings of the past year; a little congregation of Hebrew Christians assembled within the precincts of Palestine Place Chapel to pray for their unbelieving brethren still in ignorance of the only true atonement for the sins of the world.

Service was held as usual in the chapel, and a sermon on the subject of the atonement was preached by the Rev. H. A. Stern, who took for his text Hebrews x. 12-13: “But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till His enemies be made His footstool.” The preacher after briefly alluding to the various perverted forms of worship amongst the different nations of the earth, went on to speak of the Day of Atonement as it is now observed in contrast with the manner in which God had commanded it to be kept; he would not advert to the particular rites and ceremonies practised, as he had done so before on a similar occasion, but he would at once proceed to the chief topic of his discourse, the Messiah, the only atonement for sin. In olden

times, when the Mosaic dispensation was in force, one day in each year was set apart for an atonement. It was in compassion to the high priest that this institution was limited to one day, for had he constantly entered the Holy of holies, he would have continually exposed himself to the Divine wrath, and consequently he would have been in perpetual terror for his life, owing to the danger connected with his office. After having offered the sacrifices and sprinkled their blood, as God had specified, he took a censer of burning incense and placed it on the ark of the covenant. The smoke ascending on high, concealed from the gaze of the priest, the shekhinah, or visible presence of God descending from heaven; a sure token that the sacrifice had been accepted and atonement made. The crowning ceremony of the day, and one of peculiar significance, was the laying on of the high priest's hands on the head of the scape-goat, and confessing the sins of the people over it, after which it was sent away into the wilderness. This remarkable act was intended to prove to the arch-enemy of mankind that, as he had been the means of introducing sin into the world, so his work of ruin and destruction would be mercifully defeated by Divine interposition.*

The preacher then went on to say that these and many other rites and institutions would have been unmeaning acts, had they not all pointed to the great Antitype, Jesus Christ a High Priest after the order of Melchizedek. But there was this difference between Messiah's atonement and that made by the high priest. He made an atonement *once for all*, and after that ascended to heaven, "expecting till His enemies be made His footstool." His enemies are to be found everywhere; not only in the dark places of idolatry and heathenism, or in the haunts of superstition and vice, but also in Christian Congregations, amongst professing Christians, and even in the heart of each individual. These, however, are all to be

subdued, and they will gradually yield to His power till all, even the last enemy death, is crushed, and then He will reign triumphant over His redeemed people throughout the endless ages of eternity.

It was gratifying to notice how large a number of Hebrew Christians had assembled on this occasion, and, as they afterwards came down from the galleries and took their seats in the body of the church, many faces were to be recognised of old pupils from the Hebrew schools, as well as of former inmates of the Wanderer's Home and Operative Jewish Converts' Institution. The proceedings commenced with the hymn

"The living fountain, once revealed,
To cleanse from guilty stain,
To Israel's eyes has long been sealed,
Its stream has flowed in vain.

"For ages they have wandered o'er
The desert waste and wide;
Nor ancient Horeb, as of yore,
Welled forth its silver tide.

"In each, unbroken gloom has sped
Their long and cheerless night;
Nor fiery pillar on them shed
Its guiding, cheering light.

"Pleading Thy promise, Lord, we pray,
The long-closed fount unseal;
And now at length in this our day
Thy saving health reveal.

"Oh, let Thy Spirit's cheering beam
Bring light, and joy, and peace;
Thine ancient people, Lord, redeem,
Let Israel's troubles cease."

It was followed by a prayer offered up by Mr. Ehrlich, himself a converted Israelite, on behalf of his Jewish brethren still in darkness and ignorant of the saving power of the Gospel. The Rev. H. A. Stern then read a portion of the sixteenth chapter of Leviticus; and Mr. Simon, an old pupil of the Hebrew schools, since then grown gray in his Master's service, earnestly pleaded for those, who, at that very moment, were gathered together, but from very different motives, in the various Jewish synagogues throughout the world. When he had concluded, Mr. Rosenzweig, another Christian Israelite, read from the first to the fifteenth verse of the ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and once more the congregation bent their knees as the Rev. H. A. Stern offered up the closing prayer. Another hymn was

* See our view of the typical character of this "crowning ceremony" as propounded in our October No. of last year.—*Edit. II. C. W. & P. I.*

sung and the meeting was concluded by the Rev. W. Warren pronouncing the benediction.

A BELIEVING DAUGHTER
OF ABRAHAM.

A GLIMPSE OF JEWISH
TOLERANCE.

HEBREW Christians—no matter what their status as scholars or gentlemen may have been—have hitherto been treated with such virulent and relentless intolerance by the Anglo-Jewish press, that a glimpse of commendation, the earnest of toleration, makes us fasten on the phenomenon with the same absorbing wonder which a slender silver lining on a thick cloud attracts our wondering gaze. We therefore mark the first Friday in last month, the fourth of September, as a red letter day, in the history of Jewish Tolerance in this country.

On that day the *Jewish Chronicle*, the oldest and most respectable Anglo-Hebrew weekly periodical, makes honourable mention of the literary productions of two Hebrew Christian *Literati*. On page 362, of that weekly, we have the following paragraph:—"MR. J. E. SALKINSON, an English subject residing in Hungary, has just published at Vienna his translation of Shakespeare's 'Othello' into Hebrew, with a critical introduction by Mr. Peter Smolensky, the Editor of the Hebrew periodical *Haschachar* (Aurora), at Vienna, and author of various Hebrew works. Mr. Salkinson is already favourably known by his translation of Milton's 'Paradise Lost' into Hebrew, and his present version of 'Othello' is very highly praised by Mr. Smolensky, who contends that it is the best translation of the play into any foreign language."

On page 368, we have a notice of a lecture by M. N. Adler, M.A., [son of the Chief Rabbi of England], entitled *The Light thrown on the Bible by recent discoveries*; in the course of which we are informed, "Dr. Ginsburg's translation, or rather interpretation, of the celebrated Moabite Stone is also given at length." We need not inform our readers that both Mr. Salkinson and

Dr. Ginsburg are Hebrew Christians. The former a missionary of the "British Society for the propagation of the Gospel among the Jews," to our Jewish brethren at Pressburg Hungary; and the latter an acting member of the Committee of the same society. Both those gentlemen, are fair Hebrew scholars. They are not ashamed to own that they had been inmates of the Jewish Converts' Operative Institution, Palestine Place, when that establishment was in its palmy days.

We are glad of this symptom of toleration on the part of English Jews, for their own sake. Hitherto, when we pleaded for toleration in behalf of our unbelieving brethren, we were met by English Christians with the stubborn rejoinder, "Tolerance to the most intolerant people on earth is any thing but fair play. Look how the Jewish press in this country vilifies you Hebrew Christians, simply because conviction and conscience constrained you to return to the Faith taught you by Moses and the Prophets!" We shall now be able to back our plea by an appeal to the above glimpse of Jewish tolerance as an omen of brighter feelings, just as the silver lining on a thick dark cloud inspires hope that the sun is not far off.

THE GORSEDD (WELSH) PRAYER.

At the Corwen Eisteddfod, some weeks ago, the Rev. T. R. Lloyd (Estyn), who officiated as arch druid or high priest of the Gorsedd, read the following Gorsedd prayer in Welsh:—

"Grant, O God, Thy protection,
And in Thy protection strength,
And in strength learning,
And in learning knowledge,
And in knowledge to know the truth,
And in knowing the truth to love it,
And in loving it to love all truth,
And in loving all truth to love God."

This prayer is held in much veneration by Welshmen, in consequence of its great antiquity—having been composed, it is asserted long before the advent of Christ by a famous Welsh patriot—and the beauty and simplicity of its language.

The well-read Hebrew in Jewish liturgical lore, will have no difficulty to recognise the Jewish prayer, of which the above is an adaptation,

Poetry.

Correspondence.

RETROSPECTION AND ANTICIPATION;

OR, THE FIRST HEBREW-CHRISTIAN FESTIVAL, AND THE CHRISTIAN FEAST
"TILL HE COME."

"As He sat at meat with them, He took bread, and blessed it, and gave to them. And their eyes were opened, and they knew Him. . . . He was known to them in breaking of bread."—ACTS xxiv. 30, 31, 35.

"KNOWN in the breaking of bread ;"—
The "bread," and the "cup" filled
with wine ;

To be "till He come" for the glad
"marriage feast"

The simple memorial "sign." (a)

"Known in the breaking of bread :"
Can any who love turn away ?

"That I may know HIM !" the one wish
of the heart

That believes HIM to Heaven "the
Way." (b)

"Known in the breaking of bread :"
Then oft would we meet to "break
bread,"

That we, now but babes, may grow up
unto HIM

Who is our adorable "Head." (c)

"Known in the breaking of bread :"
And thus to be known in the hour
Of His ultimate triumph and "glad-
ness of heart,"

The day of His kingdom and power.

"Known in the breaking of bread :"

For, has He not said, in His grace,
"Twill be His delight still to minister
where

We shall "see HIM" with unveiled
face ? (d)

"Known in the breaking of bread :"

How simple ! yet oh ! how sublime !
The "peace" breathed of old in a small
"upper room"

Sheds a holy calm over all Time. (e)

"Known in the breaking of bread :"

Then gratefully let us unite
Thus to seek fuller manifestations of
CHRIST,

Till faith is supplanted by sight.

J. E. J.

(a) Matt. xxvi. 26-31; Mark xiv. 25;
1 Cor. xi. 25, 26.

(b) Phil. iv. 10; Jno. xiv. 6.

(c) Eph. iv. 13, 14, 15.

(d) Luke xii. 37, with Exod. xxi. 5, 6.

(e) Jno. xx. 19-23 and 26-30; Acts ii. 42,
46.

IN RE CALVINISM.

To the Editor of the Hebrew Christian
Witness and Prophetic Investigator.

MY DEAR MR. EDITOR,—On the first page of my article in your number for this month, "*Idolatry among the Ancient Israelites*," I have the following words in this order :—"And to Calvinistic texts we can oppose enough of anti-Calvinistic ones; but note, in particular, Amos iii. 2." Upon this there is the following editorial note :—"But what are we to do with the Pauline hypothesis, Rom. ix. ?" &c. Now it is quite true that the juxta-position of the reference to Amos with *Calvinistic* and *anti-Calvinistic* might tempt some readers to fancy that I saw in Amos iii. 2 some bearing upon the Calvinistic controversy. You happen to know from my private letters that I must have written my paper in a very great hurry, and I wrote only to show you good will. I have long felt the want of a good religious periodical in England, with original articles upon Bible questions, and I should be glad to contribute my share towards such a periodical; and so I made an extra effort against time, which, indeed, I am doing again this very minute, or that juxta-position would have been cleared away. This mere juxta-position, however, is surely not decisive, and I certainly had not the remotest idea that Amos iii. 2 could be forced either into *Calvinism* or *anti-Calvinism*; I referred to it only as showing that God did not pass over the sins of His people merely because they were His people. (Luke xii 47, 48.) But Calvinism must be excluded from every question, as a disturbing element. Some years ago a little volume of sermons appeared by a strong Calvinist, under the title of "*Mount of Olives*," and in every sermon the preacher tried to prove that Calvinism is not opposed to prayer, but evidently felt to the end that he had not succeeded, as he certainly had not. The doctrine of election must be true, or God would not be the moral Governor of the world. If an Alexander the Great, a Napoleon, or a Pope of Rome could do all they please, then the moral government of the world by a supreme Sovereign will would be at an end. But this election is a mystery, because it must be consistent with man's free will, as that of a

justly responsible being,—and we see that man does his own will,—while the boundary between the Divine Sovereign will and the free-will of the mortal it is impossible for man to fix or to form any conception of. It stands with this as with a certain argument showing man's limited capacity, which unbelievers constantly try to deprive believers of, but never will,—that is, the argument derived from *time* and *space*: we can neither affirm that they are bounded,—for then, what is, or what was, or will be on the other side of that boundary?—nor can we say that they are without bounds, for that is for man language to which he can attach no meaning; it is like speaking of a *chamber that has neither walls nor ceiling*. Man must be content to remain ignorant in this world of everything in which infinity is concerned. And this applies just as much to the sovereign will of God in dealing with man as it does in reference to time and space. And as in reference to these we are quite safe in all speculation to assume the infinity of time and space, though we do not know what this means, so we are equally safe in assuming the absolute justice of God, without being able to show how this accords with an eternal purpose and counsel. It is something like an element in the air: it affects the air chemically, but does not make it at all the less passible. If this is not Calvinism, neither is it Arminianism.

I am, my dear Editor, yours truly,
G. WILDON PIERITZ.

Oxford, Sept. 5, 1874.

WHAT GENTILE DIVINES THINK OF THE COMPOSITION OF THE LORD'S PRAYER.

REV. SIR,—The adoption by our Lord of some of the aphoristic sayings from older Jewish schools, affords a presumption that a similar course might be followed in the form of prayer which He taught His disciples. It is found accordingly that the petitions therein are for the most part assimilated to more ancient devotional formulæ. It is observable that this divine condition of forgiveness, "Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors" (Matt. vi. 12), is solely and exclusively the dictate of the great Author of our redemption. I like your remarks on this prayer—a breviary of

the Gospel, and compendium of saving doctrine; it is framed somewhat like the Decalogue: the three former petitions respecting GOD, the three latter, ourselves and others. Every word is weighty. OUR, there is *charity*; FATHER, in that word is *faith*; IN HEAVEN, there is our *hope*.

1st petition: "Hallowed be thy name." Deus S. B. vult ut nomen suum glorificetur in terra quemadmodum gloriosum est in cælo."—*Schar. Exodus*, fol. 28, col. 110, 111.—*Schoettgen*.

2nd petition; "Thy kingdom come." "R. Jehuda et R. Seira ambo dixerunt: Quæcunque preces nihil habent de regno, nomen precum non merentur." *Sanhedrin*, fol. 28.—*Schoettgen*.

3rd petition: "Thy will," &c. "What is the short prayer? R. Eliezer saith—'Do thy will in Heaven, and give quietness of spirit to them that fear Thee beneath,' i.e. in earth."—*Lightfoot*.

4th petition: "Give us," &c. "Quicunque creavit Diem, creavit etiam cibum ejus. Propterea dixit R. Eliezer: Quicunque habet quod hodie comedat, et dicat quidnam crastino die comedam? ille est *ὀλιγοπιστος*."—*Schoettgen*.

5th petition: "And forgive us," &c. "Eodem modo res procedit circa peccata quæ homo committit contra Deum, et circa ea quæ committit contra proximum suum."—*Schoettgen*.

6th petition: "And lead us not," &c. "Phrasis occurrit in *Jalkut Rubeni*, fol. 139, 2. Venit tempus ad inducendum illum in manus tentationis."—*Schoettgen*.

"But deliver us," &c. "Rabbi Judah was wont thus to pray: Let it be Thy good pleasure to deliver us from impudent men and impudence; and from an evil man, and from an evil chance, from an evil affection, from an evil companion, from an evil neighbour; from Satan, the destroyer, from a hard judgment, and from a hard adversary."—*Lightfoot*.

N.B. "Hæc oratio ex formulis Hebræorum concinnata est."—*Wetstein*.

I am, Rev. Sir,

Yours respectfully,

A LOVER OF SACRED LITERATURE.

P.S.—Whether shall we think less excusable, those who omit this petition (v. 12). "Forgive us," &c. (as conceiving themselves to be pure, and to have no more need of remission of sins—having received forgiveness in justification), or those atheists who, being

not willing to forgive their enemies, will not say their *Pater Noster* at all?

[We know our learned correspondent well; we esteem him cordially. No one is more legitimately entitled to the name—"A Lover of Sacred Literature"—than is this our correspondent. But we would venture to qualify the name by prefixing the word *indiscriminate*. He sometimes falls in love too readily with the *ipse dixit* of a certain class of ancient writers. We had occasion to express, elsewhere, our surprise "at the trifling originality, in modern works, on Holy Scriptures. . . . And when one is curious enough to look up the respective referees, in order to find out on what authority the latter founded their conclusions, then the curiosity is gratified by strings of references to former authors, and so on and on."

We have often smiled at the "short cut" conclusions at which Schoettgen, Wetstein, Lightfoot, and some other learned writers have arrived. As regards their assertion respecting the composition of the LORD'S PRAYER, we think that we shall make it perfectly clear to "A Lover of Sacred Literature" that it was made in defiance of defined chronology. The author of the *Sohar*, R. Jehuda et R. Seira, R. Eliezer, the author of *Jalkut Rubeni*, have all taught and written long after the LORD'S PRAYER had been promulgated. As we proceed with our articles we shall dispose of our correspondent's referees, though we do not think it necessary to mention their names. In the meantime, as we weigh very carefully every statement which we make on the subject, we would respectfully request the same treatment for our expositions from our readers and correspondents. The supposed analogy—though trite and hackneyed—between the LORD'S PRAYER and the Decalogue is untenable, as we shall demonstrate in a subsequent paper on the subject.—*Editor H. C. W. and P. I.*]

THE NATURE AND EFFICACY OF THE GOSPEL PARDON.

DEAR SIR,—To grant a pardon without some indication of a change of mind on the part of the offender is contrary, it will readily be admitted, to every principle of natural justice—for by so doing, the offended party does in effect declare that what he once condemned, he now authorises and approves; the pardon ceases, therefore, in reality to be one,

but is rather a justification of the delinquent, and is consequently no removal of the offence incurred, but the very increase and confirmation of it. Nor is this insult to the requirements of truth greatly removed, by causing the pardon to proceed through another's mediation, or from a regard to natural and social obligations, for in all these cases some injury is done to that moral sense which renders every tie sacred and effectual. But even where forgiveness springs from a change of mind on the part of the offender, it is still in many respects unfriendly to the interests of truth, being something of a compromise between mercy and justice—a substitution of penitence for righteousness—of promise for performance. "Who indeed can rightly forgive sins but God alone?" Who remove the burden of guilt from the transgressor's shoulder without violating what gives security to a promise and stability to the gracious movements of the heart?

The pardon offered to lost sinners in the Gospel of the grace of God, unique in its character, will be found like its sovereign Bestower, replete with unfathomable wisdom, as with unutterable love. Not only a remission of past sins, but containing within itself the fruitful germ of all true obedience in the recipients of this mercy, it may well be deemed the brightest manifestation of unwavering justice, and perfect holiness. The Law was indeed "honoured and magnified" when the great Lawgiver Himself stooped to its fulfilment. The heavy penalties thereby entailed; the obedience learned in depths of suffering by God's righteous servant, though His beloved Son, when He wore the likeness of sinful flesh, and appeared as the representative of the fallen, may well convince the astonished universe that rebellion against its holy Governor can only be cancelled by such a display of omnipotent wisdom as finite beings can never adequately fathom. The angels we are told by St. Peter desire to penetrate the wondrous depths of a love that entailed such blessed contradictions—that made the sovereign a serf, the Creator a creature—that numbered with transgressors the Holy and Just One, making Him in fact the only sinner. It became the Saviour's *duty*, be it reverently spoken, as born under the law, to love His neighbour as Himself with a love therefore commensurate with the workings of His mighty

heart; thus made every man's brother, spending Himself in unwearied labours for their instruction and benefit, and finally bearing away their guilt, by His self-devoting sacrifice. Yet was this love of the great Mediator so wholly unintelligible to the favoured nation among whom it was displayed, that nothing but omniscient wisdom, and omnipotent patience could have sustained Him through the terrible conflict with the powers of darkness,

But did not Israel know? When they led Him as a sheep to the slaughter, when they taunted Him with "saving others," and defied Him to "save Himself," did no sacred words of Psalmist or of seer occur to their darkened memories and alienated hearts? Yes, their long promised Messiah had given them, by Isaiah's sublime pencil, and David's hallowed strains, a faithful portrait of Himself; but pride and unbelief had so obscured their mental vision, that, notwithstanding all His mighty works, we know that the leaders of the nation, (for there was a blessed minority) would not and could not believe in Jesus as the Redeemer of Israel.

Their subsequent dispersion, during centuries of suffering and humiliation explains the mode of Jehovah's dealings with nations apart from individuals; that its rulers are held responsible for the general weal or woe. Would that England might now lay to heart the solemn lesson! But hath God forgotten Zion? The question to every student of the revealed Word needs no reply. "If heaven above can be measured, or the foundations of the earth searched out beneath, I will also cast off all the seed of Israel for all that they have done, saith the Lord." (Jer. xxxi. 35, 36, 37.)

The progress of events in these last perilous times, enables us to forestall with the certainty of Christian hope the speedy accomplishment of those splendid promises indited by the Holy Ghost concerning their future restoration and blessedness, written with an overflowing fulness of love that passeth knowledge in its breadth, and depth, and height." We learn from Zech. xii. that Jerusalem's bitter grief, and repentance for her great national transgression, will occur at the precise period of her full deliverance and the manifestation of the Saviour's arm in its accomplishment. The torrent of regretful feeling thereby awakened is affectingly described by the sacred Prophet: "They shall look on

Me whom they have pierced, and mourn as one mourneth for his first-born." So truly does the goodness of God lead to repentance, and faith in the great atoning sacrifice of the Son of God and Son of David awaken sentiments of the liveliest gratitude, and self-devotedness in Jewish and Gentile heart, the sacred bond of consanguinity in Israel's case adding increasing depth and tenderness to the general lamentation.

As a true son of Abraham, accept dear sir, these faithful but imperfect remarks, and believe me always respectfully and truly yours,

JANE BURNETT.

WHAT IS MEANT BY "THE MORROW AFTER THE SABBATH?" WHAT IS SIGNIFIED BY THE "TWO WAVE-LOAVES?"

DEAR MR EDITOR,—When you can command time and space, would you kindly give your opinion on the two following knotty questions, which were asked at our "Teachers' Bible Class" last week? Our lesson was on "The Three Jewish Feasts," and we got into the following difficulty. The wave-sheaf of first ripe corn is directed, in Leviticus xxiii. 11? to be offered on "the morrow after the Sabbath" in the Passover Feast; and the Feast of Weeks is to be reckoned from this "MORROW AFTER THE SABBATH." Now does this mean—asks our beloved Pastor—the morrow after the "holy convocation," or first day of the Feast, or the morrow after the Sabbath which falls during the Passover week? I inclined to the former opinion, but our revered Pastor observed, "Would not the Editor of the HEBREW CHRISTIAN WITNESS AND PROPHECIC INVESTIGATOR tell you?"

The other point was about the "two wave-loaves" offered at the Feast of Weeks. (Lev. xxiii. 17.) Mr. T. says that some Christian writers regard them as typical of the two Churches,—Gentile and Jewish,—but he said that the Jews could hardly have looked upon them in that light, and he wanted to know whether there was any particular signification attached to them? I hope you will not mind being troubled with this.—Yours very truly, A. L. O. I.

[We may truly say, in this case, "the trouble is a pleasure." Our readers will recognise in the signature the accomplished translator of Professor

Delitzsch's charming novelette *EIN TAG IN CAPERNAUM*, as well as of the second paper in this issue. It is a pleasure, therefore, to comply with the wishes of such a fellow-worker. On the subject of the meaning "on the morrow after the Sabbath," the ancient and modern Jewish exegetes are as much divided as Christian expositors are. The latter have respectively adopted the opinions and arguments of the former. We feel convinced that had the typical import of "the wave-sheaf of the first ripe corn" been understood, in the inspired sense which St. Paul supplied, there would have been no difference of opinion in the matter. All would perceive at once that "on the morrow after the Sabbath" must mean the day after the Sabbath which falls during the Passover week, that is, according to our modern nomenclature, Sunday. St. Paul was very explicit on the typical meaning of the first fruit-offering, both in his preaching and writing. He told the aristocratic congregation which Festus got up for him:—"Having therefore obtained help of God, I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the Prophets and Moses did say should come: that Christ should suffer, and that He should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should show light unto the people, and to the Gentiles."* He wrote to the Corinthian sceptics:—"For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: Christ the firstfruits; afterward they that are Christ's at His coming."† Agrippa, Festus, and the rest of the audience, as well as the Corinthian self-styled philosophers, must have perceived—whether they were convinced or not—what the preacher's and writer's allusion pointed to. The report of the resurrection of the Redeemer was then the staple topic throughout the known world. That resurrection, rumour—"with its ten thousand tongues," for once at least truly—reported to have taken place on the day after the Sabbath which fell during that eventful Passover week. We steadfastly believe, therefore, that the wave-sheaf of first ripe corn was to be offered on the morrow after the ordinary Sabbath in the Passover week, that is, on the

Sunday in that week, thus typifying the resurrection of Him whom St. Paul designated "CHRIST THE FIRST-FRUIT." The Feast of Weeks was computed from that Sunday, or that "the morrow after the Sabbath." It is a very interesting feature in the typical festivals, that the Feast of Weeks, or Pentecost, is the only festival for which the day of the month is not prescribed.

The two "wave-loaves" offered on the Feast of Weeks we believe to have typified Christ, as the Bread of Life, and His Word, which He declared to be meat. We may just observe that the following prescription respecting the celebration of the Feast of Weeks furnishes a further illustration as to the meaning of the expression "on the morrow after the Sabbath:—"And ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the Sabbath, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave-offering, seven Sabbaths shall ye complete: even unto the morrow after the seventh Sabbath shall ye number fifty days; and ye shall offer a new meat offering unto the Lord. Ye shall bring out of your habitations two wave loaves of two tenth deals: they shall be of fine flour; they shall be baked with leaven; they are the first-fruits unto the Lord."‡ The two loaves may also signify the two covenants. The Jews, we believe rightly, commemorate the Feast of Weeks as the anniversary of the giving of the Law from Mount Sinai. We, as Hebrew Christians, commemorate this festival as the consummation of the New Covenant, which was sealed with the blood of Christ on Mount Calvary.—*Editor H. C. W. and P. I.*

RECORDS OF CAPTIVE ISRAEL FROM A MARBLE SLAB FOUND IN THE RUINS OF NINEVEH.

DEAR SIR,—A friend has favoured me with the following interesting statement, which you will, I think, find worthy of a place in your columns.

"A French gentleman, present at a meeting of 'the International Palestine and Syrian Committee,' sent to his friend, Professor T., the following communication, which has a very important bearing upon the researches of all interested in the question of the Israelitish origin of a nominally Gentile

* Acts xxvi. 22, 23. † 1 Cor. xv. 23, 22,

‡ Lev. xxiii. 15-17,

People, such as the inhabitants of Great Britain and kindred nations.

"In the ruins of Nineveh, a marble slab has been discovered of much interest to the archæologist. It bears the following inscription:—

"Sargon marched against the city of Samaria and against the tribe of the Beth Khumri, of which he took away 27,280 families into Assyria."

Now the Israelites of Samaria were often called Khumri, because of their idolatrous priests, "Chemarim."

The Cimbri, Cumry, or Cimri, are mentioned by Tacitus (s. xxxvii.) with the Teutons, as making part of the great German race.

As Scythians, they have occupied Denmark, a small portion of the north of Germany and Great Britain, where the Cambrian, Scythians, and Cumry, are also called Welsh.

Herodotus says (b. iv. s. ii.) that the Cimmerians came from the region called Kimmerion (or the Crimea), the land of the Khumri Israelites.

Pliny states that the Saccassunī gave to their country the name of Sacasesna (Saxonia). Query, Saxons, "Sons of Isaac" (Amos vii. 16). Sunna signifies son. Now the Sacæ were the most celebrated of the Scythians, or "wandering tribes."

Parkhurst's Hebrew Lexicon, Rawlinson's Herodotus, and Layard's Nineveh, may be consulted on the foregoing.

Judah, as well as Israel, were concerned in the idolatrous worship of which the "Chemarim"* were the leading teachers. The word is only found three times in the Old Testament. In Zeph. i. 4, in relation to Judah, and of which 2 Kings xxiii. 5 (see marginal reading) is the historical fulfilment. The passage relating to Israel is in Hosea x. 5, of which we, "upon whom the ends of the age have come," find the historical fulfilment attested by the disinterred monuments of Nineveh, concerning that long buried people, whose graves the Lord has promised to open and to bring them out of them, to place them in their own land, to be made *there* and *then*, and not before, one, with Judah,† the well-known, and, therefore, not *buried* portion of Israel;

whilst concerning the house of Joseph or Ephraim, the promise of their *national* recovery and manifestation yet remains to be fulfilled, with the forgiveness of their iniquity also as a people. "The iniquity of Ephraim is bound up; his sin is hid . . . I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death," &c.‡

Now to return to the inscription on the Nineveh tablet, and the natural deduction suggested by it as to the increase of the people, whose multiplicity is so often and distinctly foretold in the Scriptures, even to the hour of their final triumph and restoration, "and they shall increase *even as they have increased*,"§ but so contrary to the solemn predictions concerning the disobedient and unbelieving portion of Israel, as actually fulfilled in the Christ-rejecting house of Judah, "and *ye shall be left few in number*, because thou wouldst not obey the voice of the Lord thy God."|| If "Sargon then carried away 27,280 families" of Israel, and we allow the usual average of five to a family, the actual number of persons taken captive would be 136,400.

The date of this captivity in Samaria, as given in our Bibles, is B.C. 721; and a remarkable passage in Ezekiel xxix. affords interesting data respecting the time of their regaining their independence, coinciding with the account given by Herodotus of the various disturbances in the cities of the Medes, whither Israel had been deported by the Assyrian monarchs. The prophecy to which we refer (Ezek. xxix.) begins at verse 17, and the marginal date there given, B.C. 572, is that of the invasion of Egypt and its spoliation by Nebuchadnezzar; and then it is written, "In that day will I cause the *horn of the house of Israel to bud forth*, and I will give thee the opening of the mouth in the midst of them," &c.

Now between the date of Sargon's raid on Israel and that of Ezekiel's prophecy, there is an interval of one hundred and forty-nine years; and, allowing one for its actual accomplishment, one hundred and fifty years would have run their course, during which period (at a rate of increase far below that recorded during their sojourn in Egypt) these 136,000 captives, doubling their numbers every twenty-

* The final letter *m* being merely part of the masc. plural termination, the word actually stands in English letters, K M R Y.

† Ezek. xxxvii. 11-16.

‡ Hosea xiii. 12-14. § Zech. x. 7, 8.

|| Deut. xxviii. 62.

five years, would have increased to above 8,000,000 !

What wonder then that their "horn" or power should have begun to bud forth, at the very time when that of their brethren of the house of Judah, captives in Babylon, or refugees in Egypt, and doomed to destruction there, was at its lowest ebb ! IOTA.

Sept. 12.

Literary Notices.

ספר תורת אלהים עם עשרה פירושים :

The Book of the Law of God, with Ten Commentaries. A New Edition of The Hebrew Pentateuch, with Ten Rabbinical Commentaries. The Widow Rom and Brothers, Wilna.

PRELIMINARY.

THE principal feature of this edition is that the commentaries of Rabbi Solomon Isaac (Rashi), Ibn Ezra, Ramban, Rashbam, Baal Hatoorim, Toledoth Aaron, Sephorno, Pathshegen, Abhi Ezree, are supplemented by a very elaborated Commentary, on the Chaldee paraphrase of Onkelos, commonly known as TARGUM, by Dr. Nathan M. Adler, Chief Rabbi of England. Judging from the introduction to the work, Dr. Adler is not only one of the Commentators of the present edition, but is the responsible Editor of it. We have only space in this our issue for a couple of prefatory observations on the Editor's performance.

The chief Rabbi of England has demonstrated that he is a better Hebrew scholar than his continental confreres were disposed to credit him with. Dr. Adler can write—as was to be expected from such a Jewish dignitary—good Hebrew. The first evidence, however, of this ability has been furnished in the work before us. This is all we have to say in praise of it. The *tout ensemble* of the performance proves Dr. Adler to be a Jewish Rabbi of the old old type. All the conceits and prejudices—and the immolations of grammatical rules and sound criticism to those idols—which mar the writings of the Jewish Rabbis of the

middle dark ages, disfigure this his performance. We shall abundantly demonstrate this hereafter. The Chief Rabbi of England must have been conscious of the fact ; or else why, as Chief Rabbi of England, did he not publish his principal contribution to the work—which he quaintly entitled נתינה לנר, NETHINAH LAGGER—in the English language, for the benefit of the mass of the people committed to his spiritual charge ???

This edition of the Pentateuch disproves, however, most effectually, the silly assertions made by ill-informed persons, who ought to know better, that Rabbism, or Talmudism is relaxing its hold upon the Jewish mind. Here we have the Chief Rabbi of England, in 1874, as Commentator of the Chaldee paraphrase of Onkelos, and therefore of the Pentateuch itself, whose great *forte* is Talmudical impregnation !

We must say one word more at present. We regret that we cannot congratulate the venerable head of the English synagogues for good taste in the choice of a title for his contribution to the edition under review. Of course, Dr. Adler meant the designation NETHINAH LAGGER—"A GIFT TO THE PROSELYTE"—as a compliment to his favourite author. But the term must have been floating in the Rabbi's memory apart from its context. The term is employed in Talmud Treatise PESACHEEM (chap. ii. fol. 21 col. 2), where it is maintained that a NEBHAYLAH, i.e., the carcase of a beast which died of itself, is to be offered as NETHINAH LAGGER. We are rather curious to know how the continental Jewish Rabbis will receive this problematic compliment to Onkelos. We think that they will agree with us that Luzzato's title, נתינה לנר, displayed better taste, on the part of the learned professor of Padua, than that exhibited by the far-fetched name, and of somewhat unsavoury association, chosen by the chief of English Judaism.

We purpose to give the work a close and conscientious sifting ; the result of which we shall submit to our readers, in five separate articles, according to the number of volumes of which the work consists.

NOTICES TO OUR READERS AND CORRESPONDENTS.

All Letters, intended for the REV. DR. MARGOLIOUTH, to be addressed—
till further notice—to **Pelham Library, 151, Fulham Road,
Brompton, S.W.**

THE Editor does not hold himself responsible for the expressed opinions of his correspondents.

The Editor has but very little time for private correspondence, and this he applies to old and cherished friends.

Several important articles, Literary Notices, Replies to Queries, &c.—some already in type—are unavoidably postponed.

J. WHATKIN.—The late lamented Dr. Ewald, whose decease we mentioned in our last issue, was a Jew by birth; he was in no way related to the German Orientalist Heinrich Georg August Ewald, of Göttingen.

J. D. B.—The reason, we believe, why a becoming "Obituary Notice" of the demise of the late Dr. Ewald, did not appear in the *Jewish Intelligence*, is because of a wish said to have been expressed by the deceased, that nothing should be published about his life and work.

INQUIRER.—We are told that the writer of the "Obituary Notice" of the late Dr. Ewald, which appeared in *The Record*, of the 10th of August last, was Alexander Crickmer Ewald, son of the deceased.

We have ready an article on *The International Congress of Orientalists*, but want of space compels us to postpone it, along with other important matter, to some future issue.

P. I. HERSHON.—Your work came too late for any notice of it in this our issue. We may call attention to it at some future time.

AN AGGRIEVED SUBSCRIBER, G. W., A FRIEND OF MISSIONS, A MATTER OF FACT CHRISTIAN, NO ROMANCER IN HOLY THINGS, NO ADVOCATE OF PIOUS FRAUDS, and many other correspondents after their kind, must address

their complaints and remonstrances to the Committees of the respective societies, whose workings, appointments, &c. &c. &c., they, our correspondents, so severely criticise and censure. We state, once for all—and we shall continue the statement as a standing notice for some months to come—we do not consider that it is part of our calling to reform abuses in the *modus operandi* of certain societies.

HISTORICUS.—THE BANISHED ONES FETCHED HOME is intended to unfold a double tale. The principal one is a true, *bonâ fide*, complete History of the Jewish people in this country, their expulsion by Edward I., and their re-admission by Oliver Cromwell; the secondary tale is an illustration of certain facts which have proved stranger than fiction. "Historicus," as "a hard-working student," should possess a little more Christian patience and sympathy, and learn to make allowances for authors, whose peculiar circumstances all the historical lore in the world will not help him to understand.

SAMUEL SAMPSON. — Your letter reached us when the last sheet was going to be worked off. It shall appear, D.V., in our November issue.

All Communications and Books for Review to be addressed *To the Editor of the Hebrew Christian Witness and Prophetic Investigator, Pelham Library, 151, Fulham Road, Brompton, S.W.*

The Editor will not, in any case, return rejected communications.

No communication unauthenticated by real name and address—not necessarily for publication—will be noticed. We regret to find that this notification is still unheeded by some.

LETTERS AND PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED in our next.