

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

variety. Even the most elaborate and the most successful description of them, like a graphic account of Athens or of Memphis, could accomplish little more than to incite a desire in the reader to view them for himself. And this, in the case of Homer at least, would be precisely what we could wish. It is a book which deserves to be read, and to be studied, far beyond the attention which it receives; and we are glad that the facilities for understanding it are now so greatly multiplied.¹

ARTICLE VI.

THE SPIRIT OF PROPHECY IN RELATION TO THE FUTURE CONDITION OF THE JEWS.

By Rev. Luther F. Dimmick, Newburyport, Mass.

THE future condition of the Jews, is a subject which has received, from various sources, no small attention. The subject is worthy of attention. It is worthy of attention, for its own sake. Every branch of truth, and every department of the divine operations, has in it something to repay investigation. The connection of this subject with other themes, imparts to it a still higher interest. The right understanding of it will lead to some views of essential importance, in regard to the general character of the religion of the Bible; besides which, some lessons of practical duty will grow out of it. The Jews have been a people greatly distinguished.² Their origin was remarkable,—Abraham, the fa-

¹ We should not omit to mention, in this place, Mr. Owen's excellent edition of the *Odyssey*. With the flattering notices of it which have already appeared, we fully concur. The editor understands the wants of the student, and possesses much skill in meeting them. His work deserves and will receive the thanks of many who read the story of the much-wandering *Odysseus*.

² The early designation of the people was, "Israel," "children of Israel," derived from Jacob their father, who obtained the surname of *Israel*, at the remarkable scene of Peniel, when he obtained a signal answer to prayer, (*Gen.* 32: 24—30). Subsequently, after the division of the tribes, the two branches of the nation were Judah and Israel, Judah being the principal tribe of the division to which it belonged. At length, Israel being removed, and Judah, or the branch passing under that name, being the part that remained, and with which the Christian world has had the most connection, we use this term, *Jews*, sometimes, though rather improperly, as including the whole people.

ther of the faithful, and the friend of God. For two thousand years, they constituted God's visible church, while all the other nations of the world were left without the impressive merciful visitations with which they were favored. Through this dark period, they were the depositaries of the oracles and the ordinances of the true religion, for the world's benefit in subsequent time. And through them came, at length, the world's Deliverer, "the Light and Life of men." To these things the apostle alludes: "What advantage, then, hath the Jew? or what profit is there in circumcision? Much every way; chiefly because that unto them were committed the oracles of God," (Rom. 3: 1, 2). "To whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises. Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all God blessed for ever. Amen," (Rom. 9: 4, 5). The *past*, in respect to them, is full of wonders.

The present state of the Jews, as every one knows, is a state of dispersion. Reckoned at about six millions, they are scattered through almost every part of the civilized world.¹

In respect to the future condition of the Jews, two leading views are entertained. One is, that of their literal restoration to Palestine, the land of their fathers; the reëstablishment of their national polity and worship; their conversion to Christ, and his reign among them, marked with peculiar manifestations of the divine favor, making them the head of all the nations of the earth,—a peculiar people in time to come, as they have been in time past. Some suppose Christ will descend personally, and reign personally, in his bodily presence, at their head, in Palestine, making all nations subject to them, and using them as his instruments, or prime ministers, in carrying forward his purposes in the other parts of the world. The other view entertained respecting them, is, that they will be converted to Christ, and, *in common with all other nations*, partake in the blessings of his reign on earth and in heaven, leaving their outward earthly condition to be determined by circumstances, and by general providences, in the same manner as that of all other nations is determined. In the investigation of this subject, it is not a mere superficial view of

¹ "Of the two and a half tribes which removed east of the trans-Jordanic cities, Judah and Benjamin, and half Manasseh, I compute the number in every part of the world as exceeding six millions. Of the missing nine and a half tribes, part of which are in Turkey, China, Hindostan, Persia, and on this continent, it is impossible to ascertain their numerical force."—*M. M. Noah's Discourse*, pp. 36, 37.

it, with which we should be satisfied. It is a subject which enters deeply into the economy of the gospel, and involves principles of the very highest moment in the interpretation of the Bible. The gospel itself, in some important respects, borrows its character from the manner in which this question is settled.

I would not conceal it now at the beginning, that I have less confidence in the *literal* in this matter, than some others have. But I will not forestall the arguments. They shall speak for themselves.

The arguments urged in favor of their *literal* restoration, and the reëstablishment of their polity and worship, with the peculiar marks of the divine favor referred to, are several: I. The covenant, by which God conveyed the land of Palestine to Abraham and his posterity, it is said, is declared to be an everlasting covenant, and the land is conveyed as an everlasting possession. The leading passages are the following: Gen. 17: 7, 8; 26: 3; 48: 3, 4; Ps. 105: 8—11, which the reader may consult in their respective places. Now, it is said, since the covenant giving to Israel the land of Canaan, is an "everlasting covenant," and the land is given to them for an "everlasting possession," the people must return and dwell there; else the promise of God fails,—his gracious covenant is not fulfilled.¹ II. It is said that the land, described in various promises to the patriarchs, has never yet, the whole of it, been possessed by their descendants; and, as the promise cannot fail, the people must, on this account also, return, that *the whole* of what is promised them may be put in their possession. The borders of the land are frequently described in the Scriptures. As, to Abraham: "Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt, unto the great river, the river Euphrates," (Gen. 15: 18). By Moses its borders are more particularly noticed. The substance of the statement is, that the land was bounded on the south by the wilderness of Zin, along the coast of Edom, to the outer coast of the Salt Sea eastward; and, westward, by a line passing through Kadesh-barnea to Azmon, and the river of Egypt, going out at the sea,—the great sea, or Mediterranean. On the west, "ye shall even have the great sea for a border; this shall be your west border." On the north, "from the great sea, ye shall point out for you Mount Hor; and from Mount Hor, to the entrance of Hamath, and to Zedad, and Ziphron, and Hazar-enan." And on the east, "the border shall descend, and shall reach unto the side of the sea of Chinnereth, and go down to Jordan, and the goings out of it shall be at the Salt Sea," (Num. 34:

¹ See Keith's *Land of Israel*, p. 20, etc.

3—12). Within these boundaries, it will be seen, the country east of the Jordan is not included. The two tribes and a half had already taken possession of that country; and it was not necessary to speak of it, in assigning the boundaries to the inheritance of the other nine tribes and a half. The country east of the Jordan is immediately afterwards mentioned, with the tribes that had received it for their inheritance, as a separate item, (vs. 14, 15). The general representation of the Scriptures includes expressly this eastern country also. "From the river of Egypt, unto the great river, the river Euphrates." "From the wilderness, and Lebanon, from the river, the river Euphrates, even unto the uttermost sea, shall your coast be," (Deut. 11: 24). From the wilderness of Zin and Edom on the south, to Lebanon and the entrance of Hamath on the north, and from the Euphrates on the east, to the Mediterranean on the west.¹ Now it is insisted, that this land has never, the whole of it, been possessed by the descendants of Abraham; and that, therefore, they must return, and be reinstated there in their national capacity, in order that the promise may be fulfilled to them. There is a necessity for their literal restoration, and a reorganization of their polity, that *the whole* of the land described, may be subjected to them, and enjoyed by them. Without such restoration, in this respect also the covenant of God fails.² III. It is argued, that there are

¹ See also Joshua 13: 5, and Judges 3: 3, where mention is made of the "entering into Hamath" as the north border.

² It has been contended by some, that "the river of Egypt," mentioned in the covenant with Abraham, and in describing the boundaries of the land, in Numbers, is the Nile; and that, therefore, a half of Egypt itself is included in the promised land. See Keith's *Land of Israel*, p. 81, etc. But of this there does not seem to be sufficient proof. Joshua speaks of the river "Sihor, which is before Egypt," (13: 3); i. e. which runs, on the borders between Egypt and Palestine. Jeremiah speaks of this river, and says: "What hast thou to do in the way of Egypt, to drink the waters of Sihor?" (Jer. 2: 18). What more natural, in the inhabitants of Palestine, than to call this the river of Egypt, dividing, as it does, Egypt from their own territory?

Moreover, where is the evidence that any of the patriarchs, or any sacred writer, ever considered Egypt, or any part of it, as belonging to the promised land? When Abraham went down into Egypt to sojourn there, because "there was a famine in the land," he does not appear to have done it as one going to another part of his own promised inheritance, but to the inheritance of another people; and when the famine had subsided he returned again to his former place, (Gen. xii. xiii). When Jacob was about to die, he said to Joseph: "Bury me not, I pray thee, in Egypt. But I will lie with my fathers, and thou shalt carry me out of Egypt, and bury me in their burying place," (Gen. 47: 29, 30). He considered Palestine as his home, and the place where he ought to

many express declarations of Scripture, giving explicit and unquestionable assurance, that the seed of Abraham, once possessors of Palestine, shall be restored, and possess the land again, and enjoy there again their former national polity. This branch of the subject is one of much importance, and shall receive due attention. IV. There are several important circumstances connected with the Jewish people, it is contended, which favor their literal restoration, and their exalted and long continued national glory in their ancient land. It is congruous, it is thought, with the distinctions they have already enjoyed, that they should be also greatly distinguished in future. "Their past exaltation, their present degradation, and their future glory," presuming the future from the past, "are events unparalleled in the history of nations," (*Frey's Judah and Israel*, p. 249). "The wonderful preservation of [the Jews] as a distinct nation, is another argument in favor of their [literal] return to their own land. No people have continued unmixed so long as they have done." *Ib.* pp. 291, 292. "Another argument, is the general expectation of the people to return to the land of their fathers. This desire is interwoven in all their prayers from day to day, and more particularly so in the prayers for the festivals, especially on the feast of the passover, where it is said repeatedly: 'This year we are here, at the next year we shall be in the land of Israel.'" *Ib.* p. 293. Again: "A most remarkable circumstance and strong argument in favor of the people's returning again to the land of their fathers," is, "that they are so situated that at the shortest notice they are ready and able to depart as easily as when they came out of Egypt." "They have no landed property, or civil or other connections, to detain them. Their possessions, consisting in movables, may easily be conveyed with them." *Ib.* 294, 295. Moreover, it is said, the land seems, in the providence of God, to be specially preserved for them, not being inhabited, except very sparsely, by any other people; and the way seems, even now, preparing, by the break-

rest. And so Joseph when he was about to die, "took an oath of the children of Israel, saying, God will surely visit you, and ye shall carry up my bones from hence," (*Ib.* 50: 25). He, too, felt that, not Egypt, but Palestine, was the appropriate burying place for him. And the reason he expressly assigns in the preceding verse: "God will surely visit you, and bring you out of this land, unto the land which he sware to Abraham, to Isaac and to Jacob," (*v.* 24). Egypt, then, was not the land which God sware to these patriarchs. Palestine was the land; and Egypt, not any part of it, was included within its borders. "The river of Egypt," therefore, was not the Nile, but the river that is before Egypt,—"*in the way of Egypt*,"—the river that divided the two countries.

ing up of the Ottoman power, for their return. *Ib.* pp. 296, 297. With these things, additional to the others mentioned, in favor of the doctrine of a literal restoration, who can doubt, it is demanded, that a literal restoration will take place? "The denial of it may well seem to be an impeachment of the truth of God, in regard to the very thing on which he hath staked his faithfulness." Keith, p. 56.

Such is the substance of the argument, so far as we have seen it stated, in favor of the literal restoration, and the future earthly glory, of the Jewish people.

We come now to the examination of the different branches of this argument. And here we do not hesitate to express our conviction, at the outset, that they are not valid, for so much as their friends would make of them. We confess we incline to the belief, that prophecy assures us only of the conversion of the Jews to Christ, in common with other nations, and of their participation in the blessings of his reign, on earth and in heaven, leaving their outward earthly condition to be determined by circumstances, and by general providences, in the same manner as that of all other nations is determined.

It is proper to be observed here, that those who take this latter view of the case, do not pretend to determine that the Jews will not, in the progress of events, return, in some numbers, to Palestine. They may do so; and possibly, under mistaken notions, endeavor to reestablish their polity and worship. What they will do, it may not be for us to say, any more than it is, what any other nation will do. The question is, Whether the Scriptures, rightly interpreted, do in fact teach any such thing as this literal restoration and reestablishment of their institutions; whether this doctrine of *literalism*, as to them, is to be taken as a true and veritable part of Christianity, and Christianity is to be made responsible for the carrying out of the scheme it contemplates? Is this, in fact, the development into which Christianity is to unfold? Is this the great form it is to assume? Or is the work which Christianity is to perform in the earth, of a different character?

I. The argument supposed to be found in the covenant with Abraham, called "an everlasting covenant," and giving to him and his posterity the land of Canaan "for an everlasting possession," which covenant was renewed to Isaac and to Jacob, and is recognized in subsequent Scriptures.

The argument here presented contains two points to be considered. Its validity turns, *first*, on the import of the word "*ever-*

lasting," as used in this connection ; whether it means, here, a full and absolute eternity ; or whether it is modified by the subject to which it relates, and is to be interpreted of a protracted yet lesser duration ; and, *secondly*, on the question, whether, if there be in the covenant a deeper element, rendering it strictly eternal, that element has reference to the literal Canaan, or to something of which the literal Canaan was a shadow and a figure ; whether, as, in the progress of things, the covenant is fulfilled, it will not gradually throw off its earthly appendages, and rise and disclose a spiritual good, of which all figures and shadows in this world are but the faint illustration.

The expressions, "everlasting covenant," "everlasting possession," are, in themselves, capable of either of these two interpretations. They may mean a covenant, a possession, absolutely without limits, strictly eternal ; or they may mean a covenant, a possession, of an enduring character, for a long, yet limited period, circumstances requiring such limitation.

Of this latter use of the word "everlasting," or its equivalent, in the Scriptures, we have numerous instances.¹ God says of the rainbow, that it is a token of "the everlasting covenant between him and every living creature of all flesh that is upon the earth" (Gen. 9: 16), a covenant of very long duration, the meaning is ; though, according to the common doctrine, the time will come when the arrangement will cease, as the world itself will be destroyed, though not by flood. Again, he said to Abraham respecting circumcision : "And my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant," (Gen. 17: 13). Yet circumcision is abolished, no one, probably, supposes ever to be revived as an ordinance in the church of God. Of the passover it was said : "Ye shall keep it a feast by an ordinance forever," (Ex. 12: 14). Yet the passover has ceased. "Christ our passover," the SUBSTANCE, "being sacrificed for us" (1 Cor. 5: 7), the *shadow* has fled away. Of the servant who wished to remain with his master, it is said : "His master shall bore his ear through with an awl, and he shall serve him forever" (Ex. 21: 6.), perpetually, that is, as long as he lives, though not literally without end. The priesthood of Aaron was called "an everlasting priesthood" (Ex. 40: 16) ; yet the priesthood of Aaron has ceased. Of the great annual atonement among the Jews, it was said : "This shall be an everlasting statute unto

¹ The original word most usually employed is עֲלָמִית, either alone, or in some of its combinations ; though occasionally some other expression is used.

you," (Lev. 16: 34); yet that annual atonement has ceased. The house, sold in a walled city, not redeemed in a year, it was decreed, "shall be established forever to him that bought it" (Lev. 25: 30); not for a literal eternity, but while the house endures. Of servants bought of the heathen, it is said: "They shall be your bond-men forever" (Ib. v. 46); shall not go out, that is, at the year of jubilee, but remain during life. The blowing of trumpets, it was said to the Jews, "shall be to you for an ordinance forever" (Num. 10: 8); not eternally, but while the Jewish economy should endure. The heap of stones at Jordan, Joshua said: "shall be a memorial unto the children of Israel forever" (Josh. 4: 7); a memorial of long continuance, onward through the ages before them, was the meaning. It has ceased. Of Samuel, about to be left at the tabernacle, it was said: "that he may appear before the Lord, and there abide forever" (1 Sam. 1: 22); not absolutely, and in the highest sense, forever, but perpetually, during his natural life. Achish said to David: "I will make thee keeper of mine head for ever" (1 Sam. 26: 2); not any longer, certainly, than they both should live. Abner said to Joab: "Shall the sword devour forever?" (2 Sam. 2: 26); shall our wars and strifes be protracted still? Solomon said of the temple: "I have built thee an house to dwell in, a settled place for thee to abide in forever" (1 Kings 8: 13); and God said in reply: "I have hallowed this house, which thou hast built, to put my name there forever" (Ib. 9: 3); yet Solomon's temple long since ceased. The elders who counselled Rehoboam to listen to the requests of the people, added: "then they will be thy servants forever" (1 Kings 12: 7); not longer, certainly, than they all should live.

And these are but specimens of a use which is frequent in the Bible. If it be inquired, how we shall determine, in different cases, whether the expressions, "everlasting," "forever," and others of equivalent import, are to be understood of a very long time, or of absolutely unlimited duration, the answer is, the subject matter of the discourse, and the connections of the passage, must furnish the rule of judgment. Nor is this a far-fetched rule, to serve a purpose. The whole genius of language rests upon this principle. Words have different meanings. And the particular meaning, in a given case, must be determined by the subject of the discourse, and by the connections in which the word stands. The expressions, "everlasting," "forever," in the passages above mentioned, must be thus limited by their connections, and the subjects of the discourse in which they are used. An absolute necessity

exists for such limitation. They can mean only, during the present economy of things, or while the world shall continue, or during the Jewish dispensation, where the rites peculiar to that dispensation were spoken of, or during natural life, where such was the subject of discourse. Another fact may be added here; which, with a believer in the literal restoration, will have weight. In the prophecy of Jeremiah, the people of Judea are spoken of as having slidden back with a "perpetual backsliding" (8: 5); which is about equivalent to the word everlasting; yet this backsliding is not supposed to be strictly eternal. Again, of the judgments to come upon them, it is said: "to make their land desolate, and a perpetual hissing," strictly, according to the original, "a hissing forever," עָלָם, (18: 16). And again, "to make them an astonishment, and a hissing, and perpetual desolations," or literally, according to the original, "desolations for ever," עָלָם, (25: 9). The desolations, after all, must be repaired—in fact, were repaired, after the seventy years. And if the words in question must be understood in a modified sense here, why not in the other cases? Now take the "everlasting covenant" with Abraham, giving him and his posterity the land of Canaan, "for an everlasting possession." May it not be, that this language is to be understood, after all, in a limited sense? Indeed, it must mean something less than absolute eternal duration, if the world is ever to have an end. Canaan can be enjoyed only while the world shall endure. And, if the language must be restricted, may it not be restricted to the measure of the ancient economy, meaning *perpetual*, a perpetual possession and home, in distinction from the wandering life which the father of the faithful was then living—a possession and home to continue through many ages, even for thousands of years, till the economy about to be there established should be needed no more in the world. This is the kind of duration which the word designates in the other cases. Why may it not designate the same here?

There is, indeed, a sense, and that a very important sense, in which the covenant with Abraham was strictly an eternal covenant, and the blessing promised,—not the earthly Canaan, but that which the earthly Canaan prefigured,—an eternal inheritance. The blessing included, and was designed more and more to unfold into, a spiritual good, that should continue, not only through the duration of earth, but through the duration of heaven itself. It was a blessing in Christ, and including Christ and his

grace, and the fruits of his grace, while eternity shall endure. So the apostle interprets it. "To Abraham and his seed were promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ," (Gal. 3: 16). Christ was the leading blessing, even in the covenant with Abraham,—Christ, and the eternal heaven which he has prepared for his people. Hence it is written: "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise" (Gal. 3: 29); heirs of heaven according to that very promise which God made to Abraham. So Abraham himself understood it. Through those transactions, and the ordinances of his time, he "saw Christ's day, and was glad" (John 8: 56); and not only Christ's day on earth, but something of the glory of Christ's heavenly kingdom. "He looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God;" and, with his fellow-sojourners in Canaan, through faith, "desired a better country, that is, an heavenly," (Heb. 11: 10, 16). This was the vision that filled the believing eye of the father of the faithful, and the other patriarchs who embraced the promises. The earthly Canaan,—a blessing, indeed, in itself,—was yet but a shadow of richer blessings seen through it, the kingdom of Christ, and the glory of heaven.

Now to interpret the promise to Abraham, as a mere promise of the earthly Canaan to him and his posterity, is, it appears to us, to rob it of its chief grandeur and glory. To assert that the Jews must return to Palestine, and be reorganized into an earthly kingdom, at this late day of the world, in order that God's promise to Abraham may be fulfilled, is taking the matter,—we cannot resist the conviction,—altogether from the position in which the apostle has placed it. It is apparently going back to things exploded. It is coming down from heaven to earth. The promise may have had an immediate reference to the earthly Canaan, the shadow, while that shadow was needful in carrying forward the great economy of grace, and may be spoken of, in a modified sense, as "everlasting," or perpetual, in common with other things, which were ordained to continue while the dispensation then existing should endure. But when the substance shines out, and rises more and more into view, with each revolving age, till, under the present dispensation, the shadow has almost entirely sunk and lost itself in the superior glory; may not the shadow be left in its obscurity, and the substance, glorious beyond description, take its place? It is according to the economy of grace,

that it should. The shadow, the type, when it has served its purpose, disappears, as the morning star ceases to be seen after the rising of the glorious full-orbed sun.

The argument, then, from the covenant with Abraham, in favor of a yet future earthly kingdom of the Jews, of the character and splendor for which some are looking, we cannot make seem to us otherwise than exceedingly slender. Adopted, as it has been, by excellent and learned men, we must still think it is the result of mistake in interpreting the promise, and of some failure, in this one point, to apprehend the true character of the Messiah's dispensation.

II. The argument arising from the alleged fact, that the people have never yet possessed the *whole* of the land promised, next claims our notice. If they have never yet possessed the whole of the land promised, the reasoning is, they must yet be literally restored, and spread themselves over the whole of it, and enjoy it through a period of long duration; for the promise cannot be broken.

The land promised, as we have seen, was the territory extending "from the river of Egypt, unto the great river, the river Euphrates," and from "the wilderness of Zin, to the entrance of Hamath." These were its borders.

Now, is it a fact, that this territory never was wholly possessed by the children of Israel? This is a question of no small interest. Even, indeed, if the people never did possess the whole land promised, God might still excuse himself, from the fact, that they had broken the covenant with him, and this released him from his obligation to them. As it was expressly said, at an early date, respecting driving out the corrupt nations from before them: "The anger of the Lord was hot against Israel; and he said, Because that this people have transgressed my covenant which I commanded their fathers, and have not hearkened unto my voice; I also will not henceforth drive out any from before them, of the nations which Joshua left when he died.—Therefore the Lord left those nations, without driving them out hastily, neither delivered he them into the hand of Joshua," (Judges 2: 20—23). Such might have been the proceeding of God wholly and finally, without any breach of integrity or veracity on his part. The covenant broken by the people, he was not helden; he was free. But not to rest the matter on this ground, as God is always better to us than our deserts, let us see, whether, in

fact, there was any such failure, in the sequel, to possess *the whole* of the promised land.

In the book of Joshua it is said, toward the close of the book, and after the conquests by Joshua had been narrated: "And the Lord gave unto Israel all the land which he swore to give unto their fathers; and they possessed it, and dwelt therein. And the Lord gave them rest round about, according to all that he swore unto their fathers; and there stood not a man of all their enemies before them; the Lord delivered all their enemies into their hand. There failed not aught of any good thing which the Lord had spoken unto the house of Israel," (21: 43—45). Now here is an assertion, that the people had been put in possession of "all the land which God swore to give unto their fathers." It may be, indeed, that this was spoken only in a looser sense, as denoting merely a general triumph of the arms of Israel, various tribes remaining still within their borders not wholly subdued. The book of Judges shows such to have been, in fact, the case. But the triumph was signal, insomuch that the sacred writer declared that God had fulfilled his promise: "There failed not aught of any good thing which he had spoken; all came to pass." Is not this rather a stumbling-block to those who would lead Israel back to Palestine, lest the promise fail? So again, Joshua in his farewell address said: "Ye know in all your hearts, and in all your souls, that not one thing hath failed of all the good things which the Lord your God spake concerning you; all are come to pass unto you, and not one thing hath failed thereof," (23: 14). This would seem as though, in a general sense at least, the land God had spoken of to them, had become their possession. We may admit, as before, that the possession was not entirely complete and unmolested. Remnants of the nations within their borders were still unsubdued. But there was a general triumph, a general and glorious fulfilment of the promise, or it could not have been spoken of in terms like those here employed.

At a later period it is said of David, that he "smote Hadadezer, the son of Rehob, king of Zobah, as he went to recover his border at the river Euphrates," (2 Sam. 8: 3). Or, as expressed in another place: "David smote Hadadezer king of Zobah, unto Hamath, as he went to establish his dominion by the river Euphrates," (1 Chron. 18: 3). These passages show that the dominion of David did extend to the Euphrates and to Hamath. Whatever dispute there may have been in those quarters, he

marched his armies thither, and "recovered" to himself what belonged to him, and "stablished his dominion" there. The Euphrates, we have seen, was the eastern border of the promised land,—and Hamath was the northern border of the promised land; the most distant borders in these directions ever mentioned. The dominion of David, therefore, did extend over the whole territory in these directions, as it is known to have done in others.

In the time of Solomon, the extent of Israel's dominion is still more particularly mentioned. "Solomon," we are told, "reigned over all kingdoms, from the river," [Euphrates, the meaning is,] "unto the land of the Philistines, and unto the border of Egypt; they brought presents, and served Solomon all the days of his life," (1 Kings 4: 21). See also 2 Chron. 9: 26. At the dedication of the Temple, it is said: "Solomon held a feast, and all Israel with him, a great congregation, from the entering in of Hamath unto the river of Egypt, before the Lord God," (1 Kings 8: 65). See also 2 Chron. 7: 8. At a little later period, it is said: "Solomon went to Hamath-Zobah, and prevailed against it. And he built Tadmor in the wilderness"—Palmyra, far eastward towards the Euphrates,—and all the store-cities, which he built in Hamath," (2 Chron. 8: 3, 4). Signifying that, however occasional disturbances might occur, his dominion extended over these realms.

Of Jeroboam, the son of Joash, more than two centuries after Solomon, it is said: "he restored the coast of Israel from the entering of Hamath unto the sea of the plain," or Dead Sea, (2 Kings, 14: 25). Invaders were expelled, or the remnants of former tribes who had occasioned trouble, were overpowered. The border was maintained; and three hundred years afterwards, when the captivity came up from Babylon, under Nehemiah, they gave thanks to God for his covenant with Abraham, granting him the land of Canaan, and add: "And hast performed thy words; for thou art righteous," (Neh. 9: 8). They considered the covenant as having been fulfilled. God had given them what he promised them.

Now, what is the amount of the argument for the literal restoration of the Jews, that they must go back in order to possess the *whole* land included in the covenant with Abraham, and that unless they do thus the covenant of God fails? Is it not a slender argument, on which to hang so important a conclusion? Even allowing that, sometimes, Israel did not enjoy, in the land, the

full amount of peace and blessing, which the promise, as repeated on particular occasions, seemed to contemplate, there was reason enough for such failure, in their sins. They broke their covenant with God, and that released him, in such points as he chose, from his obligation to them. And admit that the people were curtailed in the possession of their territory still more in the latter periods of their history, till, at length, they were wholly deprived of it. They had had the blessing, and it was continued to them through the duration of the economy for which it was given; and they had abused it, and the economy ceased, and it was taken from them. All the connections of the subject show, that the possessions of Israel, for periods of no small duration, were as extensive as the grant in the covenant to Abraham; and that the argument, that they must be restored in order to enjoy the whole land, or the covenant of God fails, is without solid foundation. They have enjoyed what God stipulated. They considered themselves, while the ages were passing, as enjoying it. It remains for them now, to enjoy the richer blessing, of which that earthly Canaan was but the shadow. In this, we rob them not. We wrong them not. We point them to a higher good;—a good which is substantial, and literally eternal; a land, whose skies are brighter than those that hang over Palestine; a land, whose fruits and streams are richer and clearer than Palestine ever knew; a land, over which no desolating scourge shall ever sweep; a land, an abode, which God has blessed with the blessings of life for evermore.

III. But we are pointed to express declarations of Scripture, in which, it is said, explicit and unquestionable assurance is given, of a literal restoration of the Jews, and a reestablishment of their polity in their ancient land.

To these passages of Scripture it becomes us to give very serious and careful attention,—not for the purpose of establishing a theory preconceived and adopted, but that we may understand what the import of the Bible on the subject really is. In the application of these passages, two errors, we think, have been committed. One is, that passages relating to a *former* restoration of the Jews,—passages which received their accomplishment in ages long since past,—are held to be still in force, and are relied upon as proof of a now future restoration. The other error is, that of giving passages, in which the blessings of the Christian dispensation are promised under a Jewish dress, or in Jewish types and figures, a literal interpretation, rather than a spiritual,

corresponding to the character of the dispensation to which they relate.

Captivity and restoration,—being given into the hands of enemies as a punishment for sin, and being delivered and reinstated in the enjoyment of liberty again,—were themes very familiar to the ancient mind. These were channels in which judgments and mercies often flowed. The state of early society favored things of this sort. In accordance with this, Moses addressed the children of Israel, at the very commencement of their national existence. Having announced a remarkable catalogue of blessings that should attend obedience, and of curses that should follow disobedience, he added: "And it shall come to pass, when all these things shall come upon thee, the blessing and the curse which I have set before thee, and thou shalt call them to mind among all the nations whither the Lord thy God hath driven thee; and shalt return unto the Lord thy God, and shalt obey his voice, according to all that I command thee this day, thou and thy children, with all thine heart, and with all thy soul; that then the Lord thy God will turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee, and will return and gather thee from all the nations whither the Lord thy God hath scattered thee. If any of thine be driven out unto the utmost parts of heaven, from thence will the Lord thy God gather thee, and from thence will he fetch thee; and the Lord thy God will bring thee into the land which thy fathers possessed, and thou shalt possess it; and he will do thee good, and multiply thee above thy fathers," (Deut. 30: 1—5).

Such was the tenor of God's arrangement with his ancient people. And, on a larger or smaller scale, it was carried into effect, while the dispensation involved in their organization was continued. See their early history, as given in the book of Judges. When they were obedient, they prospered. When they were disobedient, "the anger of the Lord was hot against Israel, and he delivered them into the hands of spoilers that spoiled them, and he sold them into the hands of their enemies round about," (Judges 2: 14). He sold them into the hand of Chushan-rishathaim eight years (3: 8); and into the hand of Eglon, king of Moab, eighteen years (v. 14); and afterwards into the hand of Jabin, king of Canaan, who had 900 chariots of iron, and mightily oppressed the children of Israel (4: 1—3); and then, after a respite, into the hand of Midian seven years (6: 1); then into the hands of the Philistines, and the children of Ammon, eighteen years (10:

7, 8); then, again, into the hands of the Philistines forty years, (13: 1).

Thus Israel lived, amidst alternations of captivity and restoration, of oppressions and deliverances, for near three hundred years. For one third part of the time and more, they were in the hands of their enemies. They seem not to have been conveyed to a distance from their land, as in subsequent instances. Still they were sold "into the hands of their enemies round about."

In subsequent time, there were greater calamities of this description. About three hundred and eighty years from the time of the Judges, or 761 B. C. while Pekah reigned in Samaria, we are told: "came Tiglath-pileser king of Assyria, and took Ijon, and Abel-beth-maachah, and Janoah, and Kadesh, and Hazor, and Gilead, and Galilee, all the land of Naphtali, and carried them captive to Assyria," (2 Kings 15: 29). This deportation seems to have included the two tribes and a half, "the Reubenites, and the Gadites, and the half tribe of Manasseh," on the east of the Jordan, (1 Chron. 5: 26).

About thirty-eight years after this, or B. C. 723, "in the fourth year of Hezekiah, and seventh of Hoshea son of Elah king of Israel, Shalmaneser king of Assyria came up against Samaria, and besieged it. And at the end of three years they took it.—And the king of Assyria did carry away Israel unto Assyria," (2 Kings 18: 10, 11). These were the captivities of the Ten Tribes, or ten and a half tribes, from which, especially from the last, they never extensively returned.

The captivities of Judah were at a little later period. They were several distinct visitations; but were so near together, that they have generally been reckoned as but parts of one grand catastrophe. About 600 B. C. "in the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim king of Judah, came Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon unto Jerusalem, and besieged it. And the Lord gave Jehoiakim king of Judah into his hand, with part of the vessels of the house of God; which he carried into the land of Shinar, to the house of his god; and he brought the vessels into the house of his god," (Dan. 1: 1, 2). Daniel and his companions were a part of this captivity, with, doubtless, many others of the nobles and chief men of the nation. Nebuchadnezzar "bound" Jehoiakim "in fetters, to carry him to Babylon" (2 Chron. 36: 6); but afterwards permitted him to remain as his vassal. "Jehoiakim became his servant three years," (2 Kings 24: 1). At the end of three years, "he turned and rebelled against" his master. And this brought on him

a second visitation. "The Lord sent against him bands of the Chaldees, and bands of the Syrians, and bands of the Moabites, and bands of the children of Ammon, and sent them against Judah to destroy it, according to the word of the Lord, which he spake by his servants the prophets," (2 Kings 24: 1, 2). These nations were subject to Nebuchadnezzar, and moved at his bidding. Jehoiakim seems to have perished in this struggle, with his chief officers of State; and, as the prophet Jeremiah informs us, upwards of three thousand more of the Jews were conveyed to Babylon, (Jer. 52: 28).¹ About five years from the rebellion of Jehoiakim, under the reign of his son Jehoiachin, came Nebuchadnezzar again, with his armies, and besieged Jerusalem, and took it; and carried thence to Babylon the king, and the royal family, all the treasures of the house of the Lord, and of the king's house, all the mighty men of valor, even ten thousand captives, and all the craftsmen and smiths; none remained save the poorest sort of the people of the land," (2 Kings 24: 10—16). This was the third calamity, and greater than either of the former.

About eleven years after this, in consequence of the rebellion of Zedekiah, whom Nebuchadnezzar had set up in Judea, the armies of Chaldea again laid waste Jerusalem and the surrounding country, committing great devastations, and carrying still more of the people into captivity, leaving only "of the poor of the land to be vine-dressers and husbandmen." "So," concludes the narrative, "Judah was carried away out of their land," (2 Kings 25: 1—21).

Here is the Babylonish captivity, which constitutes so great an era in Jewish history. In the space of about eighteen years, the city of Jerusalem, and the land extensively, were made a desolation. And it lasted SEVENTY YEARS.

Now it is important to be observed here, that it was in connection with this captivity, a little previous to it, or in the midst of it, that the more distinguished of the Jewish prophets lived, those from whom are quoted chiefly the passages composing the main part of the argument for a yet literal restoration.

ISAIAH.

Isaiah is computed to have flourished about one hundred years previous to this great judgment. He predicted it, however, as approaching, in consequence of the abounding wickedness, into which the nation, even in his time, had fallen.

¹ "Three thousand Jews and three and twenty."

The book of Isaiah has been considered as consisting of two parts. The first includes chapters i—xxxix. This portion of the book is made up extensively of reproofs of the nation for their sins; threatenings of the calamities that, in consequence, were to come upon them; similar reproofs and threatenings in regard to several surrounding nations; interspersed with predictions of the Messiah and his kingdom, with several other matters.

The reproofs are like the following: "Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth; for the Lord hath spoken; I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me."—"Ah, sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evil doers, children that are corrupters."—"How is the faithful city become an harlot! It was full of judgment; righteousness lodged in it; but now murderers," (1: 2, 4, 21). Such is the style in which Isaiah addressed the people in his time.

Then as to the judgments impending. Sometimes he spoke of them as already present; sometimes as near at hand: "Your country is desolate, your cities are burned with fire; your land, strangers devour it in your presence, and it is desolate, as overthrown by strangers."—"Jerusalem is ruined, and Judah is fallen."—"And he will lift up an ensign to the nations from far, and will hiss unto them from the end of the earth; and behold they shall come with speed swiftly; none shall be weary, nor stumble among them; none shall slumber nor sleep; neither shall the girdle of their loins be loosed, nor the latchet of their shoes be broken. Whose arrows are sharp, and all their bows bent; their horses' hoofs shall be counted like flint, and their wheels like a whirlwind; their roaring shall be like a lion, they shall roar like young lions; yea, they shall roar, and lay hold of the prey, and shall carry it away safe, and none shall deliver it. And in that day they shall roar against them, like the roaring of the sea; and if one look unto the land, behold darkness and sorrow, and the light is darkness in the heavens thereof."—"Until the cities be wasted without inhabitant, and the houses without man, and the land be utterly desolate; and the Lord have removed men far away, and there be a great forsaking in the midst of the land."—"The land shall be utterly emptied, and utterly spoiled," (1: 7. 3: 8. 4: 26—30. 6: 11, 12. 24: 3). Thus full was the prophet's mind of the desolating judgments that were to come upon his nation, and particularly of the captivity that was but a little before them.

The remaining part of the book of Isaiah, chap. xl—lxvi, inclusive, contains some most glowing descriptions of the deliverance

of the people from the calamities they were to suffer, and particularly from the predicted captivity; in connection with which are frequent notices, and even extended representations, of the greater and spiritual deliverance, which Christ was, in due time, to effect for the world; a deliverance, of which all former deliverances were a shadow. The kingdom and glory of the Messiah caught the prophet's vision; and sublimer strains the world does not contain, than this prophetic and seraphic writer presents.

Survey, now, some of the passages from *Isaiah*, usually adduced in the argument before us, and see what construction it is most reasonable to put upon them. "The Lord will have mercy on Jacob, and will yet choose Israel, and set them in their own land." He adds, that "strangers shall be joined with them, and they shall cleave to the house of Jacob; and the people shall rule over their oppressors," (14: 1—3). Is it most natural to look, for the fulfilment of this promise, to some event now, in these latter ages of the world? or to deliverance from the captivity then about to take place, of which the prophet so frequently spake, and of which his mind was so full? The earlier event, unquestionably, is the one to be preferred, unless there be some special reasons for understanding it of the remoter. This is a grand rule in the interpretation of prophecy: *Let it apply to the earlier event, when the earlier event constitutes a proper fulfilment.* And subsequent expressions show that that earlier event was, indeed, the one intended. "It shall come to pass, in the day that the Lord shall give thee rest from thy sorrow, and from thy fear, and from the hard bondage wherein thou wast made to serve, that thou shalt take up this proverb against the king of Babylon, and say, How hath the oppressor ceased! the golden city ceased! The Lord hath broken the staff of the wicked, and the sceptre of the rulers," (va. 3—5). A large part of the chapter is occupied with a triumphal song over *Babylon's fallen king*; by whose fall the captive people obtained deliverance. This, then—deliverance from the Babylonish captivity, was what the prophet promised. If there was any further blessing couched in his language, it was a spiritual blessing relating to the Messiah's times; of which all former deliverances may be considered, in a sense, as figures.

Another passage is the following: "It shall come to pass in that day, that ye shall be gathered one by one, O ye children of Israel. And it shall come to pass in that day, that a great trumpet shall be blown, and they shall come, which were ready to perish in the land of Assyria, and the outcasts in the land of Egypt,

and shall worship the Lord in the holy mount at Jerusalem," (27: 12, 13). "These verses," says one, "predict the restoration of the Jews after the captivity; and under that event, their recovery from their present dispersion," (Scott, in loc.). But why the latter? Why make the passage refer thus to two events? The former restoration was manifestly the thing in the prophet's mind. And there is no evidence that he looked any farther than that particular event. If any one pleases to make that event illustrative of a great principle, running through all God's dealings with his people, *that he will deliver them from their afflictions when they cry unto him*, and also a shadow of the spiritual deliverances that were to come in the Messiah's time; there is probably no objection to such a view of the case. It is probably the true view. But why should two *literal* restorations be attributed to the same promise, when the promise itself gives no notice of but one? The general law is, that, where one event is a shadow of another or type of another, the latter is spiritual, owes its superiority to the former, its richness, its glory, to the spirituality of its character. But let the passage, in its literal import, stand to its original event.

So in other places, glowing descriptions of this event are given, mingled sometimes with expressions that will bear a future application, and sometimes giving no indication of looking beyond the former event. "The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them; and the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose. A high way shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called, The way of holiness. And the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs, and everlasting joy upon their heads; they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away," (35: 1, 8, 10). Beautiful language this, to be accommodated to any turning to the Lord, or deliverance which he may effect for his people! Yet, in its original design, intended simply to describe restoration from the Babylonish captivity. The whole chapter, of which this forms a part, is a most vivid description of that restoration.

The latter part of the book of Isaiah, particularly, abounds with passages of this sort: "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned; for she hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins," (40: 1, 2). Why look beyond the restoration, which, when the language was uttered, was just about to take place? True, the language is capable of being accommodated to any case, and to all

cases, where calamities have been suffered, and there is about to be a return of the Divine favor. And it contains a most sweet promise to all of this description. The Jews of the present time may appropriate it, spiritually, when the veil is taken from their hearts, and they believe in Him, whom their fathers crucified. They shall be comforted, and pardoned, and blessed. But the strict application of the passage is, to the restoration from Babylon, and nothing more, in its literal acceptation. In accordance with which, it immediately follows: "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a high-way for our God. Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low; and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain; and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it," (vs. 3—5). The mandate is given, to prepare the way for the return of God's chosen to their own land. He himself would appear, and lead them on; and the world should adore the power and grace that effected for them the signal deliverance. This is the thing which filled the prophet's vision. Again: "Sing, O ye heavens; for the Lord hath done it; shout, ye lower parts of the earth; break forth into singing, ye mountains, O forest, and every tree therein; for the Lord hath redeemed Jacob, and glorified himself in Israel."—"That saith to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be inhabited; and to the cities of Judah, ye shall be built, and I will raise up the decayed places thereof; that saith to the deep, Be dry, and I will dry up thy rivers; that saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure; even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built; and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid," (44: 23, 26—28). This is manifestly the restoration near the prophet's time, Cyrus, the chief instrument of that restoration, being expressly named. That, then, is the event to which the prophet's language belongs. So again: "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace; that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation; that saith unto Zion, Thy God reigneth!—Break forth into joy, sing together, ye waste places of Jerusalem; for the Lord hath comforted his people, he hath redeemed Jerusalem," (52: 7, 9). The literal restoration from the Chaldean captivity, is the thing intended. To make it apply to a restoration of the Jews now in our time, or subsequently,—a literal restoration to the literal Jerusalem,—is altogether losing sight of what

filled the prophet's mind,—of an event then just before him,—or it is *doubling* his vision, of which the narrative itself gives no evidence.

It were not possible in the space allotted us, to adduce all the passages from this one prophet Isaiah, relating to this subject. He gives assurance to the people, that “a remnant shall return” (10: 21); that “the Lord shall set his hand again the second time to remove the remnant of his people” (11: 11); referring to the first time, or the deliverance from Egypt; as it is expressly said, “like as it was to Israel in the day that he came up out of the land of Egypt” (v. 16); that God has “chosen them, and not cast them away” (41: 9); that they shall “go forth of Babylon, and flee from the Chaldeans, with the voice of singing, saying, The Lord hath redeemed his servant Jacob” (48: 20); that they shall “build the old waste places, and raise up the foundations of many generations” (59: 12); that “they shall build the old wastes, and raise up the former desolations, and repair the waste cities, the desolations of many generations,” (61: 4). Which is it most natural to suppose,—that this relates to the restoration just about to take place when the prophet wrote,—that it was uttered for the encouragement of the people then, at his own time? or that it was spoken of some far future restoration, under another economy of things, overlooking what was then immediately to occur? Can it admit of reasonable doubt, that the prophet had in view the restoration from Babylon, and the reestablishment of the nation *there*, in the promised land? And these are specimens of passages with which the book of this prophet abounds, and which are to be interpreted in the same manner.

There are passages in this prophet, of another description, which are to be noticed in connection with the subject before us. The prophet, as has been already said, frequently looks forward to the Messiah's times. He sings: “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 forever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this,” (9: 6, 7). He sings: “There shall come forth a Rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots.—With righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with

equity for the meek of the earth.—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," (11: 1, 4, 10). In these times, "the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid.—They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain" (saith God); "for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea," (va. 6, 9). He sings: "Behold, a King shall reign in righteousness, and princes shall rule in judgment," (32: 1).

Besides passages of this character, relating somewhat particularly to the *person* of the Messiah, there are others which describe more especially the glory of his reign; a subject to which even those now repeated also have reference. These passages, as was natural, sometimes borrow their form of expression, their figures, their illustrations, from the former dispensation—the dispensation existing when they were uttered. This was altogether to be expected. The error committed in relation to these passages is, that they have been interpreted as predicting *the restoration of the ancient economy*; whereas they only predict, as we trust it will be made to appear, *under language borrowed from that economy*, the universal prevalence of the true religion in the earth. The arrangements of the ancient economy,—the services then rendered, were the dress in which religion then appeared,—the form in which it presented itself to the world. What more natural than that, in describing its future glory, even though external changes were to take place, yet the language should have been derived from the economy, with its services, then existing?

Survey now a moment some of the passages in question. "It shall come to pass in the last days," says this prophet, "that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations, and rebuke many people; and they shall beat their swords into plough-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. O house of Jacob, come ye, and let us walk in the light of the Lord," (2: 2—5).

What does this mean? that Judaism is to be reëstablished at

Jerusalem, and that all nations are to go up to Jerusalem to worship, according to the ancient law, "three times a year" (Ex. 23: 17; and that Jerusalem is to be the grand central point, all luminous and glorious, the top of the nations, sending out its light and influence to the rest of the world, through all coming time? Or, is it intended *under imagery drawn from the then existing dispensation*, to represent the glory of the Messiah's reign? Whatever distinction the literal Jerusalem was to have, when the prophet wrote, has she not already had it, in the rebuilding of her temple, and the reestablishment of her state after the Chaldean captivity, and in the appearance of the Messiah among her children, and the foundation of the Christian church in the midst of her—an institution literally to bless all nations? Is not this the thing which the prophet designed to set before us, only employing Jewish phrase, because Jewish phrase was the garb in which, then, the true religion appeared in the earth? It is impossible for us to doubt, that it is the spiritual reign of Jesus, which is designed to be set forth in the prophet's language.

Again the prophet says: "In this mountain shall the Lord of hosts make unto all people a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined. And he will destroy in this mountain the face of the covering cast over all people, and the veil that is spread over all nations. He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the rebuke of his people shall he take away from off all the earth; for the Lord hath spoken it. And it shall be said in that day, Lo, this is our God; we have waited for him, and he will save us; this is the Lord; we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation," (25: 6—9). Must Judaism be reestablished at Jerusalem, in order to realize the great results here promised? Why is it not more rational to suppose, that Judaism accomplished its work, when it gave the Messiah to the world? And that now the Messiah's *spiritual reign* is to produce the blessed state of things here figuratively described?

And so of other passages. "Behold, I will lift up mine hand to the Gentiles, and set up my standard to the people; and they shall bring thy sons in their arms, and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders. And kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers; they shall bow down to thee with their face towards the earth, and lick up the dust of thy feet," (49: 22, 23). Shall this be literal? Is this the true

appointed relation between Jews and Gentiles in the fulness of the Messiah's reign? Or is this a figurative and impressive representation of the universal triumph of the true religion, the religion of Christ, with the reverence and homage which shall everywhere be rendered to it, and the unhappiness of its rejectors? Does not the latter seem altogether the more rational interpretation?

Again it was said to Zion: "Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee.—And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising.—The abundance of the sea shall be converted unto thee, the forces of the Gentiles shall come unto thee. The multitude of camels shall cover thee, the dromedaries of Midian and Ephah; all they from Sheba shall come; they shall bring gold and incense, and they shall show forth the praises of the Lord. All the flocks of Kedar shall be gathered together into thee, the rams of Nebaioth shall minister unto thee [for sacrifice]; they shall come up with acceptance on mine altar, and I will glorify the house of my glory, (60: 1, 3, 5—7). Shall the Jewish sacrifices, then, be restored? Shall the blood of bulls and calves, and rams and goats, again flow in the worship of God? Shall the world go back again to the rites of that old dispensation, "a yoke," says the apostle, "which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?" (Acts 15: 10). To what purpose, then, is Christianity? Why did the blood of Calvary flow? And why all the declarations respecting this surpassing glory of the Messiah's reign? Let the passage be, then, a figurative description of a spiritual religion, such as the Messiah has actually introduced into the world, and all is right; it is inimitably beautiful, and portrays a blessing in which the world shall rejoice through unnumbered ages. And one more passage: "Behold, I create new heavens and a new earth; and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind. But be ye glad and rejoice forever in that which I create; for, behold, I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy," (65: 17, 18). And "as the new heavens, and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain. And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord," (56: 22, 23). This must be a figurative promise of spiritual good, the blessings of the Messiah's reign. All flesh, on all sides of the world, cannot *literally* go to Jerusalem

every new moon, and every Sabbath, to worship. It is a glowing description of the fact, that all will be true worshippers. The literal *must* be thrown aside; the spiritual *must* be adopted. Jerusalem, dropping her childish garments which she has outgrown, rises and unfolds into a spiritual being, of which her early existence was a shadow; and, in the person of the Messiah and his dispensation, which have sprung from her, pours her blessings over all the earth.

Such is a specimen of the teachings of Isaiah on the subject before us. And is there anything here, which requires us to believe in a literal restoration of the Jews, yet future, to Palestine, and the reestablishment of their ancient polity there? May not the passages which relate manifestly to the former restoration, be considered as fulfilled by that restoration, and their import, in the *literal* acceptation, exhausted? And may not the passages which relate to the Messiah's reign,—and *must* they not, for consistency's sake,—be interpreted as figurative representations, highly beautiful and glowing, of the triumph of a spiritual religion?

JEREMIAH.

Jeremiah flourished somewhat more than 100 years after Isaiah (B. C. 629—588, according to the common reckoning), and the latter part of his course, was at the very time when the captivity took place.

This prophet, in the early part of his office, employed the strongest terms of reprehension towards the Jews, for their manifold wickedness. The picture drawn presents a state of things truly appalling: "I had planted thee a noble vine, wholly a right seed; how then art thou turned into the degenerate plant of a strange vine unto me? For though thou wash thee with nitre, and take thee much soap, yet thine iniquity is marked before me, saith the Lord God," (2: 21, 22). "Behold, thou hast spoken and done evil things as thou couldest," (3: 5). And the threatenings followed: "Out of the north an evil shall break forth upon all the inhabitants of the land," (1: 14). "Destruction upon destruction is cried; for the whole land is spoiled," (4: 20). "I will make Jerusalem heaps, and a den of dragons; and I will make the cities of Judah desolate, without an inhabitant," (9: 11). "I will give all Judah into the hand of the king of Babylon, and he shall carry them captive into Babylon, and shall slay them with the sword," (20: 4). "This whole land shall be a desolation,

and an astonishment; and these nations [some others with Judah] shall serve the king of Babylon seventy years," (25: 11). The latter part of the Book of this prophet relates particularly to the execution of these threatenings, the actual captivity that occurred—interspersed frequently, as the former part is occasionally, with promises of restoration, and glances at the coming glory of the Messiah's reign, towards which the Jewish mind was ever directed. These things, with some denunciations on the surrounding nations, employed the mind and pen of Jeremiah, during his active life of some forty years; a part of the time dwelling with the people in the land (40: 6), and a part of the time with a small company who had removed to Egypt, carrying the prophet with them, (xliii). He died, leaving the people in their dispersion and bondage.

See now, particularly, what this prophet says with reference to restoration, and whether it is to be understood of the restoration then to take place, or of a restoration of the Jews from their present dispersion: "I will take you, one of a city, and two of a family, and I will bring you to Zion," (3: 14). This is most naturally understood, certainly, of the restoration then about to take place.

Again, it shortly follows: "At that time they shall call Jerusalem the throne of the Lord; and all the nations shall be gathered unto it, to the name of the Lord, to Jerusalem; neither shall they walk any more after the imagination of their evil heart. In those days the house of Judah shall walk with the house of Israel, and they shall come together out of the land of the north, to the land that I have given for an inheritance unto your fathers," (vs. 17, 18). What is the import of this prediction? It foretold the restoration then about to occur, "out of the land of the north. It spoke of Judah and Israel as "returning together;" which, to some extent, was then actually the case. It spoke of "the gathering of all nations to the name of the Lord," which is rather, perhaps, a glance at the better times of the Messiah's reign. Their being gathered "to Jerusalem," is but the dress of the truth, in accommodation to the institutions of worship then existing.

But "The house of Judah," it is said, "shall walk with the house of Israel, and they shall come together out of the north country, to the land that I have given for an inheritance to their fathers." And Isaiah had predicted the same: "The Lord shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed 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," (Is. 11: 11—13. They shall be together, that is, as one nation; as they were before the revolt of the Ten Tribes, and shall live together in peace.

This, many are disposed to think, is yet to take place. And it is deemed a grand argument in favor of a literal restoration. But what are the facts of the case? Did not some, from the Ten Tribes, as well as from the Two Tribes, actually return to Palestine at the end of the Babylonish captivity? Israel had been in captivity towards a century and a half longer than Judah. Josephus says, indeed, that "the entire body of the people of Israel remained in that country," (Antiq. 11. 5). That is, there was, no public organized movement for their return, as with Judah. And a large portion, of both branches of the nation, seem to have remained in the countries whither they had been carried. They had acquired property, and made friends, and were happy in their new location, and were unwilling to be at the trouble of a return to their land. As Josephus says also of Judah: "Yet did many of them stay at Babylon, not willing to leave their possessions," (Antiq. 11. 1).

Yet a part returned. And that part, there is reason to believe, contained a portion of Israel, as well as of Judah. When Cyrus, on obtaining the supremacy of the East, made his proclamation for the restoration of the captive people, the country of Israel's captivity, as well as that of Judah's, constituted a part of his dominion. And the proclamation was made "throughout all his kingdom," (Ezra 1: 1). Who can doubt that Israel, to some extent at least, as individuals, availed themselves of the advantage of it? Moreover, the proclamation speaks of "the Lord God of heaven," whose house was to be built at Jerusalem, and of "ALL HIS PEOPLE," which can hardly be understood of less than all who had any interest at Jerusalem, Israel as well as Judah, who had all built the former temple, and claimed Jerusalem as their own; and commands respecting every such one: "Whosoever remaineth in any place where he sojourneth, let the men of his place help him," (Ib. vs. 2—4). This covered the sojournings of Israel as well as of Judah.

In the decree of Artaxerxes in favor of Ezra, a few years later, it is said: "I make a decree, that all they of the people of Israel, and of his priests and Levites, IN MY REALM, which are minded of their own free will to go up to Jerusalem, go with thee," (Ezra 7: 13). Josephus says that Ezra "read the Epistle at Babylon, to those Jews that were there; but he kept the Epistle itself, and

sent a copy of it to all those of his own nation, that were in Media," (Antiq. 11. 5). Media was the place of the Ten Tribes. Hence the remark of Henry on this subject: "Both Assyria [with Media] and Chaldea—the land of the captivity of Israel, as well as that of Judah—fell into the hands of Cyrus; and his proclamation extended to all the Jews in all his dominions. And therefore, we have reason to think, that many of the *houses of Israel* came with those of Judah *out of the north*," (Henry, in loc.). They came, indeed, under the banner of Judah; as many, in early times, after the division of the kingdom, and the defection of the Ten Tribes, under Jeroboam and other wicked kings, forsook their own tribes, and their own branch of the nation, and joined themselves to Judah and Benjamin, for the purer worship of God which was maintained there, (Vid. 2 Chr. 11: 16; 15: 9; 31: 6).

The returned captives from Israel may have been fewer in number, (doubtless were much fewer,) than those from Judah, as they had been longer in captivity, had less vivid apprehensions of their own land, and had found more to interest them in the countries where they dwelt. Yet the more pious and devout, of both branches of the nation, it seems reasonable to believe, came up to rebuild the temple, and restore the Jewish State.

In the book of Ezra, giving an account of the restoration, we have the two phrases, *Judah and Benjamin* and *the children of Israel*; the first, designating the Two Tribes and a Half, which were the more prominent actors in all the latter scenes of Jewish history; and the last, seeming to have a wider reference, looking more towards *the whole nation* collectively. "Then rose up," says Ezra, on the proclamation of Cyrus, "the chief of the fathers of Judah and Benjamin," (1: 5). And, afterwards, at the dedication of the temple, it is said: "And the children of Israel, which were come again out of captivity," [with others mentioned,] "did eat" (6: 21); seeming to have a reference to a company collected from the nation at large. Josephus, referring to the encouragements which Cyrus gave the people to return, says: "When Cyrus had said this to the Israelites, the rulers of the two tribes of Judah and Benjamin, with the Levites and priests, went in haste to Jerusalem," (Antiq. 11: 1). And of the company going up he says: "They chose themselves rulers, who should go up to Jerusalem, out of the tribes of their forefathers (Ib. 11. 3); not from the tribes of Judah and Benjamin exclusively, but from *the tribes of their forefathers*. This looks as though the whole twelve tribes had something to do in the matter of the restoration. "The Sa-

maritan Chronicle asserts, that in the thirty-fifth year of the pontificate of Abdelus, three thousand Israelites, by permission of king Sanridius, returned from captivity, under the conduct of Adres, son of Simon," (Rel. En., Art. CAPTIVITY). And at the dedication of the temple, when it was completed, it is said, that, among other sacrifices, they offered "for a sin-offering for all Israel, twelve he-goats, according to the number of the tribes of Israel," (Ezra 6: 17); and, on another occasion, "twelve bullocks for all Israel and twelve he-goats, for a sin-offering," (Ib. 8: 35). It seems most natural to conclude, that Israel and Judah were mingled together in these services, that all the tribes which had been carried captive had their representatives at this feast, so that it was strictly a *national* celebration. It may be true, therefore, as expressed by another: "We see Palestine [from this time to the end of that dispensation] peopled by Israelites of all the tribes indifferently" (Rel. Encyclop. art. Captivity of Israel), Judah and Israel forgetting their former antipathies, according to the prediction of the prophets, and living together again as one nation, and in peace. And what has been said by another writer may not be wholly unworthy of regard: "All questions, therefore, and investigations, for the purpose of ascertaining what has become of the TEN TRIBES, and whether it is likely they will ever be discovered, are superfluous and idle," (Jahn, Heb. Com. chap. 7, § 53). The idea is, that the tribes were extensively broken up and commingled together in their dispersions, and such portions of them as returned were commingled together in their restoration. And this may be an indication, in the providence of God, that that economy has accomplished its work in the world, and has permanently given place to something that is better. It may be in keeping with Judaism, to believe that the Messiah, when he shall come, will disentangle these intricacies, hunt up the lost tribes, show each its genealogy, and give them the earthly glory for which they are looking. But does Christianity, the question is, make itself responsible for these results?

Let some other passages receive attention. In chap. xxiii. of this prophet, Jeremiah, it is said: "I will gather the remnant of my flock out of all countries, whither I have driven them, and will bring them again to their folds; and they shall be fruitful, and increase.—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," (23: 3, 5-8). Here, also, is a sort of generic vision, having reference, primarily, to the literal restoration, and glancing at the still greater deliverance of the Messiah's dispensation, of which that was a figure, and which that ever suggested. Nothing is more natural than this kind of proceeding. Nor is it any objection to this view, that the allusion to the Messiah's reign is thrown into the middle of the sentence, the beginning and the end relating to the other subject. Such sudden transitions are a part of the manner of the Jewish prophets.

In chap. xxix, it is said: "For thus saith the Lord, That after seventy years be accomplished at Babylon, I will visit you, and perform my good word toward you, in causing you to return to this place.—I will turn away your captivity, and I will gather you from all the nations, and from all the places whither I have driven you, saith the Lord; and I will bring you again into the place whence I caused you to be carried away captive," (vs. 10, 14). This is, manifestly, the literal restoration, and nothing more. The attempt to make it mean more than this, is altogether uncalled for and gratuitous.

In chap. xxx, we have the two connected again: "The days come, saith the Lord, that I will bring again the captivity of my people Israel and Judah"—both branches of the nation—"saith the Lord; and I will cause them to return to the land that I gave to their fathers, and they shall possess it.—Strangers shall no more serve themselves of him. But they shall serve the Lord their God, and David their king, whom I will raise up unto them. Therefore fear thou not, O my servant Jacob; neither be dismayed, O Israel (both branches of the nation); for, lo! I will save thee from afar, and thy seed from the land of captivity; and Jacob shall return, and shall be in rest, and be quiet, and none shall make him afraid," (vs. 3, 9, 10). This is manifestly a prediction of the restoration then about to take place, with a glance at the future blessings of the Messiah's reign; those blessings being promised in Jewish phrase, clothed in Jewish dress, as it was most natural should be the case.

In chap. xxxi, are some expressions much relied on as proving a literal restoration yet to come: "I have loved thee with an everlasting love. — I will build thee, and thou shalt be built. — I will bring them from the north country, and gather them from the coasts of the earth. — He that scattered Israel will gather him, and keep him, as a shepherd doth his flock. — They shall come and sing in the heights of Zion," (vs. 3, 4, 8, 10, 12). But may not all this be said in reference to the restoration then about to take place when the prophet wrote? Why need we look further than that, for a fulfilment of the predictions?

In the latter part of the chapter is notice of a new covenant which God would make with his people; not such a one as he made with them when he took them from Egypt; but a covenant of a deeper and more enduring character. "I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people." And the assurance is given, that the ordinances of heaven, the courses of the sun, and the moon, and the stars, are no more enduring, than these engagements of God to his chosen, (vs. 31—40). But in all this, may we not understand the spiritual covenant which God makes with his people, which is strictly eternal? It looks like a spiritual transaction: "putting his law in their inward parts, and writing it in their hearts." If there be an earlier application of it, connected with a literal restoration, the time intended may be that when the people came back from Babylon, tender and broken-hearted, grateful and devoted to the service of God. But whatever was wanting there, a spiritual religion, like that of the Messiah, when truly embraced, will entirely fulfil.

Other promises in this prophet are to be interpreted in the same manner. "I will gather them out of all countries, whither I have driven them in mine anger, and in my fury, and in great wrath; and I will bring them again into this place, and I will cause them to dwell safely; and they shall be my people, and I will be their God; and I will give them one heart, and one way, that they may fear me forever, for the good of them, and of their children after them. And I will make an everlasting covenant with them, that I will not turn away from them," (32: 37—40). "I will cause the captivity of Judah and the captivity of Israel to return, and will build them as at the first." — "I will cause the Branch of righteousness to grow up unto David; and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land. — If ye can break my covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night, and that these should not

be day and night in their season; then may also my covenant be broken with David my servant, that he should not have a son to reign on his throne; and with the Levites the priests, my ministers," (33: 7, 15, 20, 21). "Be not afraid of the king of Babylon, of whom ye are afraid; be not afraid of him, saith the Lord; for I am with you to save you, and to deliver you from his hand," (42: 11). "Fear not thou, O my servant Jacob, and be not dismayed, O Israel; for, behold, I will save thee from afar off, and thy seed from the land of their captivity," (46: 27).

Such is a specimen of the predictions in Jeremiah relating to the restoration of the Jews. And now taking into view the fact, that he lived in the time of the dispersion, and died leaving the people in their captive state, of which is it most reasonable to believe that he spoke, of the restoration then about to take place, glancing occasionally, as the subject was suggested, to the more important work the Messiah was to perform in the world? or to some literal restoration now at this far distant period? Let the prophet speak of the subject in hand, and let his glances at the far future be at the Messiah and his dispensation, that great idea ever present to the Jewish mind; and all is natural and easy—just as we should expect. But the attempt to make out a course of prediction in reference to a literal restoration from present dispersions, overlooks the subject in hand, introduces a principle of interpretation that tends to secularize religion; and, by depriving many passages of their spiritual import, robs them of their chief richness and glory.

[To be concluded.]

ARTICLE VII.

MEIER'S LEXICON OF HEBREW ROOTS.

Hebräisches Wurzelwörterbuch, nebst drei Anhängen über die Bildung der Quadrilätern Erklärung der Fremdwörter im Hebräischen, und über das Verhältniss des Ägyptischen Sprachstammes zum Semitischen; von Dr. Ernst Meier, Privatdocenten an der Universität zu Tübingen. pp. 783. Mannheim, 1846.

By Rev. Charles A. Hay, Professor in Lutheran Theol. Sem., Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.

THE consanguinity of the Semitic and Indo-European languages is now generally acknowledged. But as to the degree of