

VIII

ISRAEL'S MISSION TO THE WORLD, AND THE
CHURCH'S MISSION TO ISRAEL

“Ye are My witnesses, saith the Lord, and My servant whom I have chosen ; that ye may know and believe Me, and understand that I am He ; before Me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after Me. I, even I, am the Lord, and beside Me there is no Saviour. I have declared, and have saved, and I have showed when there was no strange God among you ; therefore ye are My witnesses, saith the Lord, that I am God.”—ISA. xliii. 10-12.

“Ye shall be witnesses unto Me, both in Jerusalem and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth.”—ACTS i. 8.

VIII

ISRAEL'S MISSION TO THE WORLD, AND THE CHURCH'S MISSION TO ISRAEL ¹

AS we look at the passage quoted from Acts i. "Ye shall be witnesses unto Me," we cannot but be reminded of the very similar words addressed by God through the prophet Isaiah, to Israel as a nation, and we may well ask how is it, that instead of Israel at the present time witnessing for God among the nations, it is necessary that witness should be borne to Israel about their own God, their own Messiah, and their own Scriptures? The answer is given by the Apostle Paul in Rom. xi. 25, "Blindness in part is happened to Israel." It is true that certain leaders among modern Jews claim still to have a mission, even at this present day, in their dispersion among the nations—a mission, as they say, to bear witness to the unity of God. But if we examine this supposed witness that the modern Jew gives to the unity of God, we find it very defective; for it is not a testimony to God as He has been pleased to reveal Himself in His word—that is, as the infinite,

¹ The first part of this chapter was an address delivered at the Mildmay Conference in June, 1897, the subject that year being "The Evangelisation of Our Own Generation." It was afterwards written out in full for the *Missionary Review of the World*, from which excellent magazine it is reproduced here.

yet personal, triune, holy, loving God—but a testimony to an abstract formula with regard to the unicity of the Godhead. Of a *personal*, living God, modern Judaism knows, alas, very little. As a matter of fact, it is not due to the testimony to the unity of God, as given by the synagogue, that Gentiles have been brought to believe in one living and true God, but to the more truly Jewish testimony as given by the Jewish Apostles of the New Covenant, who went about preaching one God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; one Mediator between God and man, Jesus Christ the righteous; and one Holy Spirit, by whom the knowledge of God is communicated to man; and these three, one blessed Trinity.

But, speaking generally, it is the boast of modern Jews that they are not a missionary people. Thousands of times have I had it thrown in my teeth by Jews in various parts of the world, who have said, "Why do Christians trouble themselves with trying to convert us? We do not try to convert anybody." My reply usually is: "Why don't you? If you boast of the fact that you are not a missionary people, you simply boast of your shame; you simply testify to the fact that you are not now answering the purpose for which God called Israel into existence. Was not the very purpose of God in creating the Jewish nation that they might be witnesses for Him, to make known His name among the nations? The fact that you are not now a missionary people is accounted for by the reason that you have no mission. In this respect it is true that the Kingdom of God has been taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. If you had a message you could not be silent, even if you tried, for you would find the word of God like a burning fire in your heart shut up in your bones, so that you would weary in for-

bearing to run and communicate it to others." Israel at the present day has no message. The Jews do not, and cannot, bear witness for God, excepting that passive testimony which the *diaspora* gives to the righteous severity of God—a testimony which, would to God Christendom took to heart, because it contains the solemn lesson to them, that they also, if they continue not in His goodness, shall be cut off.

But has the purpose of God in relation to Israel in this respect, that they should be His witnesses, been frustrated, or has it been already accomplished in the testimony that the Jews gave in the past? No; the Jew has yet a future of testimony for God on the earth. "Blindness in part," as the Apostle Paul says, "has happened unto Israel," and it is "in part" in a double sense. It is partial in its extent, for there is the remnant, according to the election of grace, who are not blinded, but can behold the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ even now, and it is partial also in its duration. There is a great contrast in the Word of God in this respect, between the condition of the Jew now, and the condition of the Jew in the future. "Blindness in part has happened unto Israel," says the Apostle Paul in Romans xi.; but we read of a wonderful transformation that is to come over the Jewish people. "Then," says the prophet, Isaiah xxxv. 5, 6, "the eyes of the blind shall be opened." The very nation that has been destined by God to point all the other nations to the Sun of Righteousness, has been itself struck blind, but it is only for a time.

The present condition of Israel may be very beautifully illustrated by a touching incident which I heard not long ago. It was about a child who met with an

accident and suddenly lost his eyesight. At first he did not know what had happened to him, and used to follow his mother about the house, crying: "Mother, mother, when will it be day? When will the sun shine?" The poor mother had not the heart to tell her child all at once that it *was* day, that the sun was shining, but that something had happened to his eyes. This is the condition of the Jews to-day. "We wait for light, but behold obscurity; for brightness, but we walk in darkness." But "the eyes of the blind shall be opened." Soon the cry will go forth, "Arise, shine, for thy light has come; the glory of Jehovah is risen upon thee." And then "the Gentiles shall come to thy light and kings to the brightness of thy rising."

The prophet continues: "Then the lame man shall leap as an hart." I never read this verse in Isaiah xxxv. without being reminded of Acts iii., where we have the account of a notable miracle that was wrought in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. We read there about a poor man who was carried every day to the gate of the temple called Beautiful, where he begged for alms of those who were going to worship God. One day Peter and John came along, and he asked alms from them also; but Peter, fastening his eyes upon him, with John, said: "Look on us!" expect something different from us than you would from others; and we read that he gave heed to them, expecting something from them. But Peter said: "Silver and gold have I none, but such as I have give I unto thee: in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk!" and he took him by the right hand, and the lame man, leaping up, stood and walked, and entered with them into the temple, walking and leaping and praising God.

My dear friends, that lame man is a type and parable of Israel. Israel is that lame man. Beautiful upon

the mountains should be the feet of Jewish evangelists and preachers bearing the glad tidings of Messiah's Gospel to the nations ; but Israel is lame now and outside the temple of God ; that is, out of communion with God, because the temple was the visible symbol of fellowship with Jchovah. They are like the poor lame man also in this respect, that all their thoughts are fixed on money. Money, money ; alms, business. I do not wish to say here, because it would not be true, that the Jew is exceptional in this respect. It is the tendency of the human heart that knows not the treasure that is at the right hand of God, to cleave unto the dust, and the Jew and Gentile are alike in this respect. I am only touching upon the fact that the Jew, like the Gentile, is at present occupied with worldly things, and he will readily deal with Christians in business. Peter and John have come to Israel and have said, "Look on us," and, blessed be God, there is a remnant whose eyes have been opened by the Spirit of God to see that power to heal lies only in the name of Jesus, and they are leaping and rejoicing. But as far as the nation is concerned, Israel is still sitting lame, incapable of going on an errand for God among the nations. For centuries it has been in that condition ; but will it always remain so ? Oh, no ! There is a greater One yet than Peter and John to pass Israel again. We sometimes sing a hymn, "Jesus of Nazareth passeth by." He passed by Israel once, and Israel was then already sick ; but Israel let Him pass without as much as touching the hem of His garment, and Jesus returned unto His place until they acknowledge their offence and seek His face. When He departed, He said : "Your house is left unto you desolate, for I say unto you, ye shall not see Me henceforth, until ye shall say, Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the

Lord." Yes, Jesus will yet pass Israel again, and they will assuredly use the words of the prophecy from Psalm cxviii. which He quoted. Jesus will say to Israel, "Look on Me," and the spirit of grace and supplication will be poured out upon the Jewish nation, and they *shall look* on Him whom they have pierced. *Jesus* will again take Israel by the hand. "I will build again the tabernacle of David, which has fallen; I will build again the ruins thereof;" and then "shall the lame man leap as an hart," and a tremendous sensation will be created on the earth. This is the hope of missions, and of the evangelisation of the world. When this national lame man is healed, all the peoples of the earth will see this wonderful miracle performed by Jesus Christ of Nazareth. We read in the same prophecy that at that time in *the wilderness* shall waters break out. This is a picture of Israel's present condition—a wilderness, a howling desert, spiritually; but God has said that out of this wilderness rivers will spring up for the refreshing of the whole world.

Now, in the interval between Israel's rejection and Israel's reception of Christ, when the Jews shall be reinstated as the witnesses of Jehovah on the earth, the Church, which is made up of Jews and Gentiles, is put into the very position of Israel, both in relation to privilege and to responsibility. (a) In relation to privilege: "Ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto Me above all people . . . and ye shall be unto Me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation," was God's word to Israel in Exodus, the Book of Redemption: "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased possession," says Peter, to all who have been redeemed with precious blood, whether Jew or Gentile.

(b) In relation to responsibility: "Ye are My

witnesses," saith Jehovah, "and My servants . . . This people have I formed for Myself; they shall show forth My praise," are God's words to Israel: "*Ye shall be witnesses unto Me* both in Jerusalem and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth," were the parting words of the ascending Christ to the Church: "That ye should show forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness into His marvellous light."

Yes, one of the chief ends of the Church's existence on earth is, that she may bear witness to the nations; and in her witness she dare not lose sight of the Jew, for, as the late Professor Franz Delitzsch once said, at a great missionary meeting, "Gentlemen, if you speak about the evangelisation of the world, and forget the Jew, you are like a bird that tries to fly with one of its wings clipped."

But generally I find that in speaking to Christians about the Jew, it is very easy to carry them with you if you speak of the Jews of the past—the Jew of Bible history—or the prophetic Jew of the future; but when it comes to the actual Jew of the present day, and you want them to enter into the thoughts and mind of God in reference to Israel of the present, that is a most difficult task. Let me illustrate it practically. At the present day there is, perhaps, no country in the world where such a lively interest is taken in the Jew, and where so much is done in proportion for Jewish missions, as in Norway, although in Norway itself there are scarcely any Jews. You will ask how this interest in Israel originated in Norway. Well, it originated, for the most part, in the prayers and devotion of a noble-minded Christian lady. About fifty years ago, when the cause of foreign missions was taking hold of Christians in Norway, this lady's heart was

moved by the Spirit of God with compassion for Israel. One day, as the pastor of her church was coming down from the pulpit, she said to him: "I am very glad to hear you always pray for the heathen, but I wish you would also include poor scattered Israel." The pastor turned round rather hotly, and said: "The Jews! We have nothing to do with them. They have been cast off, and now it is the time of the Gentiles." She tried to reason with him, but it was of no avail. But one day she called on her pastor, and said to him: "I have a very sad story to relate to you, and I am sure it will draw out your sympathy." He said: "What is it?" She replied: "Not far from here there lives a good man and his wife. They have one son, whom they love as their own lives. They did everything possible for him, but the son turned out most unworthy of his parents' love; he returned it only with disobedience and ingratitude. After a time, when his conduct became no longer tolerable, with great grief of heart, they let him go, and he is now a wanderer. Instead of this son of theirs they adopted a poor gipsy boy. Him they put in their own son's room, gave their own son's clothing and books—in fact, they treated him in every possible way as their own child. The boy was very happy, but the parents could not forget their own child. In the evening sometimes a mist steals over the mother's eyes, and a sigh escapes from the heart of the father, and when the boy asks, "What is the matter?" the father answers, "Oh, our son, our son; would that he would come back; there is room in our hearts for him as well as you." But this the boy does not like, and now it has come to this, that every time the parents mention their son, he gets into a temper. What do you think of it?" The pastor stood up and said: "Oh, the ungrateful youth; if I were the parents, I would let him go; he is not a

bit better than the other." The lady paused a minute or two, and then said: "Dear pastor, forgive me; Israel is that wandering son, and we are the gipsy boy; and although God was obliged to send the Jews into captivity, and has 'given over the dearly beloved of His soul into the hands of her enemies,' His heart has not ceased to yearn for them, and His 'hands are still outstretched all the day long to His disobedient and gainsaying people.' Harken! 'Is Ephraim my dear son? Is he a pleasant child? for, since I spake against him, I do earnestly remember him still. Therefore my bowels are troubled for him. I will surely have mercy on him, saith Jehovah.'"

The pastor's heart was won, and the result was the first society that was established in Norway for the evangelisation of the Jews.

May God give us the same spirit of compassion, that our hearts may go out in pity with His for this poor national Prodigal Son!

Our testimony to-day to the Jews is with regard to Jesus Christ, that "this Jesus," whom they crucified and think to be dead, is Israel's true Messiah, exalted to the right hand of God, a prince and a Saviour. If time permitted, I should like to speak of the peculiar methods which we should adopt in our testimony to the Jew; and also as to the right kind of witnesses who should be sent forth by the Church, because I believe that, to this day, God has His instruments adapted for this work, and for that work, and it is not every one who is called of God to be a missionary to the Jews.

On this point it will not be out of place if I quote from a report of Professor Gustaf Dalman of the Leipzig Institutum Delitzschianum, as to the necessary qualifications of a properly equipped missionary to the Jews, with which I most heartily concur.

"1. The missionary among the Jews must have a thorough knowledge of their languages. This comprises not only a knowledge of the languages of Jewish literature, Hebrew and Aramaic; and, if possible, a good practical acquaintance with the former, which is most extensively used by the Jews in their written communications, but also ability at least to speak German, and to understand Hebrew-German, or 'Yiddish,' the vernacular spoken by two-thirds of the Jewish people.

"2. The missionary must be acquainted with the religion of the Jews. Without this knowledge he will find it impossible to set forth our holy religion to Jews in such a way as to commend it to them, or even to be understood by them, much less to bring it home to heart and conscience. Those who are not cognizant of the world of Jewish religious thought, cannot conceive how unintelligible the terminology of our holy faith is to the Jew. Even the great scriptural key-words of Christianity—Sin, repentance, faith, righteousness, Redeemer, Christ-Messiah have a different meaning to the Jew, while, of course, all ecclesiastical terms are utterly incomprehensible to him. And thus experience has shown that the plainest and most heartfelt Gospel message coming from an untrained, though earnest Gentile Christian, will sound as a dark riddle in Jewish ears.

"3. The missionary should have studied the doctrines and sacred documents of the Christian faith in their bearings on Israel. Tracing the history of Israel through the Old Testament, and viewing their election and future in the light of law and prophecy, and noting the differences between the Jewish and Christian conceptions of Bible doctrine and statement, he should seek to obtain such a grasp of the Scriptures as to

be able to meet and answer any difficulty or objection that may be propounded by the inquirer or caviller.

"4. The missionary must be conversant with the history of the mission to Israel, its nature, aims, and methods, and the lines on which the work has hitherto been carried on. Practical knowledge and insight is best obtained by commencing work under the supervision of experienced missionaries.

"Even for the Hebrew-Christian candidate special training is most desirable and necessary. As a rule, his knowledge of Jewish and Hebrew matters is insufficient and incomplete, in spite of his former surroundings, and though his own faith be firm and clearly evinced, yet in the nature of things his grasp of Scripture truth cannot be such as to fit him, without any further training, for the work of an evangelist among his brethren. We cannot fix a high enough standard of attainment for those who desire to devote themselves to this work. A training that may fully qualify a man to go out and proclaim the Gospel to the uncivilised heathen world, is utterly insufficient for a worker among the Jews, although we would never have ourselves or others forget, that technical qualifications and even Scriptural knowledge are worthless, unless accompanied by a living faith and the burning desire to promote the interests of Christ's kingdom among His brethren according to the flesh. Better to send out no missionaries at all than to send out such as are spiritually and intellectually unfit for their task."

Tremendous injury to the Jewish mission has resulted from two causes :—

(1) The putting into the work of "workers," both Jews and Gentiles, who were utterly unfit for the holy and delicate task of holding up the banner of Christ before the Jews ; sometimes mere novices, whose cha-

racters were not sufficiently tested ; or even brilliant impostors, who captivated the hearts of some whose zeal for the Jewish cause is not according to knowledge. In this part of the Lord's vineyard more particularly, we need not only the spirit of love and of wisdom and power, but also of *a sound mind*, a spirit of Scriptural sobriety, not dissociated from a true Holy Ghost enthusiasm, for the salvation of a people in whom is bound up the hope of the world, but in whose midst Satan is entrenched more powerfully at the present day than in any other nation.

(2) There is also a great lack of knowledge of the peculiar people, and of God's present and future purposes in and through them, which is accountable for certain methods in some Jewish missions, which, however much momentary sensation they may create, and however much interest they may arouse among Gentile Christians, can only work disastrously as far as the Jews themselves are concerned. I am not speaking as a theorist, but from knowledge and experience. After being permitted to serve the Lord in the evangelisation of my people for over twenty years, I am more and more convinced that in the Jewish mission, as in the Lord's work generally, it is not sensation, but self-sacrificing hard toil, and patient continuance in well-doing that will accomplish anything of permanent value for the glory of Christ.

Then, as to the manner of presenting the Gospel to the Jews, a great deal might very usefully be said. For instance, Jewish opposition is sometimes owing to the fact that Christianity has been presented to them as a system, altogether detached from, and, to some extent, *opposed* to Moses and the prophets. Now, in order to remove such impressions, it is of the utmost importance in dealing with Jews to show them that the

New Testament is in historic continuity, and true order of sequence to the Old Testament, and that there is not a single essential doctrine in the New Testament, the roots of which are not to be found in Moses and the prophets. This will not be successfully accomplished by always pointing the Jews to a few well-known Messianic passages, but by a methodic unfolding of Scripture as a whole. Indeed, if there is one need greater than another in the Jewish field at the present day, it is that of men mighty in Scriptures, who, in the power of the Spirit, can show to Israel how that, not only an isolated passage here and there, but that *in the whole* "scroll of the book it is written of Him."

It is not my intention to enter into a review of Jewish missions, and into what has been accomplished within this century, so eventful in the history of Jewish emancipation and evangelisation. All I can do now is just briefly to remark on the great change in relation to the Gospel which is at present undoubtedly passing over the Jewish nation.

Putting aside the vague, exaggerated reports based on no solid foundation, which lead those unacquainted with the facts of the case to believe that untold thousands of Jews are now pressing into the Church, and that we are on the verge of the entire nation becoming Christian, I have no hesitation in saying that the tone and attitude of large numbers of Jews in relation to Christ, in countries where hard, persevering Gospel work has been carried on for some time, have undergone a remarkable change.

It is a great thing in itself that the Christ-question is becoming familiarised in the minds of Jews, and that Talmudic Judaism is putting out its hand, however tremblingly, to receive the New Testament, and listening, though as yet with hesitating ear, as to who this Jesus of

Nazareth, whom it has hitherto hated without knowing why, really was.

To an eagerness on the part of many Jews in all parts of the world to hear of Christ and to receive the New Testament, I can bear personal testimony. In Germany, Austria, and the Balkan States, North Africa, in many places on the Mediterranean coast as well as in Egypt, Palestine, and Asia Minor, we have had Jews flock to us in some places from early morning till late at night to hear and dispute about Christ. Even in centres of Chassidic Jewish bigotry, in Galicia and Roumania, we have had our rooms packed with Jews in their long kaftans and peyoth, eagerly and respectfully discussing the claims of Christ, some of whom gratefully accepted the New Testament, which but a few years ago they would not even touch with their hands because they regarded it as an unclean thing. I cannot here enter into the causes which by the overruling providence of God have brought this change about, but I may just mention two.

I. It is the outcome of nearly a century's prayerful toil on the part of Jewish missions and societies, some of whom, alas! have not continued long in their first love and zeal, and are now in danger of degenerating into mere "organisations." What she has sown in tears more than half a century ago the Church of Christ is now permitted to reap in joy. It is a remarkable fact that however much interest in the Jewish mission cause has lacked in *quantity*, it has not lacked in *quality*. The sympathies of some of the holiest as well as the ablest of the servants of Christ within this century, have been enlisted in this truly Christ-like work, so full of hope for the world and in reflex blessing to the Church itself.

While painfully conscious of the inadequacy and questionable means and methods which have sometimes

been adopted, I am struck, in studying the history of Jewish missions, with the amount of self-sacrificing love, devotion, and sanctified ability which have been brought to this task.

We sometimes hear it said that the most notable conversions from among Jews—my friends Joseph Rabinowitz and Rabbi Lichtenstein for example—are not the results of missions to the Jews, but of the study of the New Testament. Every conversion, if true, is directly the result of the Word of God applied by the Spirit of God ; but how came it that Rabinowitz and Lichtenstein had New Testaments to read ? Until this century, until the Jewish mission saw to its translation and printing, there was no Hebrew New Testament for use among the Jews.

II. Secondly, anti-Semitism and the grosser forms of persecution to which the Jews have been subjected in Russia and other countries, have contributed indirectly to bring about this spirit of change in the Jewish world in relation to the Gospel. Our God ever brings good out of evil and causes the wrath of men to praise Him. The whole movement, based for the most part on shallowness, lies, and inhumanity, by which these already apostate nations are hastening the filling of the cup of their iniquity, has nevertheless served to remind backslidden, apostate Israel of the long-standing controversy between them and their God, and has caused some to ask themselves what the sin can be which has brought upon them the retribution of so many long centuries, and in this indirect way their hearts have been to some extent prepared to listen to the claims of Christ.

As may be said of all missions, so may it perhaps more especially be said of the Jews, the present is undoubtedly a great day of opportunity for the Church of

God. A door is open as never before, and, blessed be God, the Church is awaking to a sense of her duty to the Jew, for never before has there been such an interest manifested in missions to the Jews.

What is needed at this juncture above all things are the right kind of *labourers*—men of God and with the fitness and ability for this peculiar work ; men with the faith of Abraham, and with the sincerity, and missionary zeal, and unquenchable love for Israel which characterised the Apostle Paul ; men who from the present darkness can look to the coming dawn when “all Israel shall be saved” and “the glory of the Lord cover the earth as the waters cover the sea.”

IX

ANGLO-ISRAELISM AND THE TRUE HISTORY
OF THE TEN "LOST" TRIBES

IX

ANGLO-ISRAELISM AND THE TRUE HISTORY OF THE TEN "LOST" TRIBES

(A Letter to an Inquirer)

DEAR Friend,—I shall endeavour to comply with your request, and to give you in this letter a few reasons for my strong aversion to the Anglo-Israelite theory, which I cannot help regarding as one of the saddest symptoms of the mental and spiritual shallowness of the present day. I am not a man delighting in controversy, and I only consent to your wish because I believe that you, like many other simple-minded Christians, are perplexed and imposed upon by the plausibilities of the supposed "Identifications," and are not able to detect the fallacies and perversions of Scripture and history upon which the whole theory is based.

The theory is, that the "lost" Israelites who were carried captive by the Assyrians under Sargon, are identical with the Saxæ, or Scythians, who appear as a conquering horde there about the same time. These Scythians next swarmed westward into Northern Europe, and became the progenitors in particular of the Saxon invaders of England. The Anglo-Saxons therefore are the "lost" ten tribes, now identified. They are the Israel of the Bible, to whom belong the covenants and

the blessings. It is owing to this fact that the British Empire is so great and prosperous.

As to the Jews, they are not Israel at all, but, as the descendants of Judah, are still under the curse. In fact, the Anglo-Israelite by another and more mischievous method is doing exactly what the allegorising, or so-called spiritualising, school of interpreters did. The method was to apply all the *promises* in the Bible to the "spiritual" Israel, or the Church, and all the curses to the literal Israel, or the Jews; but by this new system, while the curses are still left to the Jew, all the blessings are applied not even to those "in Christ," but indiscriminately to a nation, which, *as a nation*, is as apostate from God as any other of which "Christendom" is composed, though I thankfully recognise the fact that there are many of God's true people in it.

The supposed ethnological and philological proofs for the British-Israel theory have been again and again demolished by competent authorities. Thus Professor Rawlinson, commenting on Hine's "Identifications," said that the pamphlet is not calculated to produce the slightest effect on the opinion of those competent to form one. "Such effect as it may have, can only be on the ignorant and unlearned—on those who are unaware of the absolute and entire diversity in language, physical type, religious opinions, and manners and customs, between the Israelites and the various races from whom the English nation can be shown historically to be descended." As a matter of fact, there is as little absolute proof that the Anglo-Saxons are the Saxæ, or Scythians, as that the Saxæ are the Israelites.

The Scriptural "Identifications" with which Anglo-Israel literature abound, turn out on examination to be mere verbal, and sometimes very childish quibblings on the English letter, depending for their success on the

reader's ignorance of Hebrew exegesis. Some of their interpretations I can only characterise as bordering on blasphemy. Let me quote one or two examples.

I. *Great Britain is declared to be the stone cut out without hands which smote the image of Nebuchadnezzar.*¹

"We will see what is to be the future of the British Empire, or, in other words, the stone that smote the image. It is to become a great mountain and fill the whole earth. Our Colonial Empire, then, will continue to grow till it covers the whole world. We have tried to avoid extending our Empire many and many a time, and yet God has caused it to grow larger and larger, and I believe will still do so. We are already by far the greatest empire there is, or ever has been, and we shall yet be far greater.

"The British Empire, again, can never be conquered. Daniel says, 'The God of Heaven shall set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed: it shall stand for ever.' Consequently we shall never be conquered; we must continue till the end of time, so that we are to continue to exist as the last Kingdom or Empire this world is to see."

II. *The smoke of London identified with the Shekhinah glory.*²

"During their wanderings in the desert His presence was manifested by the pillar of cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night, and during the captivity of the Two Tribes of Judah in Babylon He was with them, until, at the expiration of the seventy years, He stirred up Cyrus to release them. The same Lord still watches

¹ "Nebuchadnezzar's Dream" in "The British Empire of Ephraim." A whole collection of similar perversions of Scripture may be found in an excellent pamphlet by Pastor Frank H White, called "Anglo-Israelism Examined."

² From an article in *The Banner of Israel*.

over the Ten Lost Tribes of Israel in England, and continues to bless them. The same miracles that were wrought in Egypt were intended to foreshadow the realisation of God's future dealings with the Israelites ; and if a gigantic panoramic view of England could be taken from an elevation above the centre of the island at midnight, a temporal pillar of fire would be as remarkable from the blazing furnaces, the gas, and steam engines, as the pillar of cloud and smoke arising from the same sources in the daytime, marking the chief position and prosperity of Israel."

Once again the solemn words of the apostle are fulfilled in the teachers of Anglo-Israelism : "Professing themselves to be wise they became fools," or how else could they descend to such impious trivialities, or dare to liken the glory of the Personal Presence of the uncorruptible Jehovah, of which the shekhinah cloud was the visible symbol, to the smoke ascending from "blazing furnaces" and "steam engines."

III. *Edward Hine, author of the forty-seven "Identifications," is the promised Deliverer who should come out of Zion.*

The following is taken from an article on Romans xi. 25-27, which appeared in "Life from the Dead," which was edited by Edward Hine himself:—

"Are the British people identical with the lost Ten Tribes of Israel? And is the nation, by the identity, being led to glory? If these things are so, then where is the Deliverer? He must have already come out of Zion. He must be doing his great work ; he must be amongst us. It is our impression that, by the glory of the work of the identity, we have come to the time of Israel's national salvation by the Deliverer out of Zion, and that Edward Hine and that Deliverer are identical."

I have said above that Anglo-Israelism applies the promises given to converted Israel indiscriminately to the English nation. It does not stop even here, as the above extracts show, but goes on to rob Christ Himself of His glory by applying to the British people prophecies which belong, not even to Israel, but to Israel's Saviour. I have seen, for instance, again and again, the second Psalm, with the address of the Father to the Son, "Ask of Me and I will give Thee the heathen (or 'nations') for Thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for Thy possession," interpreted of the British Empire; while not long ago a champion of the British-Israel theory preached on the words of the Lord in Matthew, "Therefore say I unto you, the Kingdom of God shall be taken from you and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof"—taking it for granted that England is that "nation," which, as a nation, is bringing forth the fruits of God's kingdom.

Now I need not explain to you that this is an utterly unspiritual and baseless assumption, for it is the Church—God's elect and converted people out of all nations, which is that "nation," which during the period of Israel's national unbelief, bears fruit unto God; as is clear from 1 Peter ii. 9, where believers in Christ are addressed as, "a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation (*ἐθνος*) that ye should show forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness into His marvellous light."

But now discarding the whole heap of Anglo-Israel trash, let us glance at the question of the so-called "lost" ten tribes in the light of Scripture history and prophecy. Anglo-Israelism first of all loses the ten tribes, for whom it claims a different destiny from the Jews, whom it supposes to be descendants of the two tribes only, and then it identifies this "lost" Israel with

the British race. But there is as little historical reason for the supposition that the ten tribes are lost, in the sense in which Anglo-Israelism uses the term, as there is Scriptural basis for a separate destiny for "Israel" apart from "Judah."

The most superficial reader of the Old Testament knows the origin and cause of the unfortunate schism which took place in the history of the elect nation after the death of Solomon. But this evil was to last only for a limited time; for at the very commencement of this new and parenthetical chapter of the nation's history it was announced by God that He would in this way afflict the seed of David, but *not for ever*. (1 Kings xi. 39.)

A separate kingdom, comprising ten of the twelve tribes, was set up under Jeroboam in 975 B.C., and its whole history, of about 250 years, is one long, dark tale of usurpation, anarchy, and apostasy, unrelieved by the occasional gracious visitations of national revival which light up the annals of the Judean kingdom under the house of David. After many warnings and premonitory judgments the kingdom of the ten tribes was finally overthrown in the year 721 B.C., when its capital, Samaria, was destroyed, and the bulk of the people carried captives by the Assyrians, and made to settle in "Halah and Habor, and by the river Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes" (2 Kings xvii. 6; 1 Chron. v. 26).

Before passing on I would beg you to notice two or three facts.

I. Firstly, the kingdom of "Judah" after the schism consisted not only of Judah and Benjamin, but also of the Levites who remained faithful to the house of David and the theocratic centre.¹ Even those who were

¹ According to Grätz, "History of the Jews," vol. i. p. 186, the tribe of Simeon, which was merely a subsidiary of that of Judah, also remained faithful to the House of David, but this is doubtful.

in the northern cities forsook all in order to come to Jerusalem, as we read 2 Chron. xi. 14: "And Rehoboam dwelt in Jerusalem, and built cities for defence in Judah . . . and the priests and Levites that were in all Israel resorted to him out of all their coasts. For the Levites left their suburbs, and their possessions, and came to Judah and Jerusalem; for Jeroboam and his sons had cast them off from executing the priest's office unto the Lord."

II. Apart from Judah, Benjamin, and Levi there were in the southern kingdom of Judah after the schism, many out of the other ten tribes whose hearts clung to Jehovah, and the only earthly centre of His worship which He appointed. Immediately after the rebellion, we read that "after them" (that is following the example of the Levites) "out of all the tribes of Israel, such as set their hearts to seek Jehovah, the God of Israel, came to Jerusalem to sacrifice to Jehovah, God of their fathers. So they strengthened the kingdom of Judah" (2 Chron. xi. 16).

In every reign of the kingdom of Israel numbers of the religious and more spiritual of the ten tribes must have seceded and joined "Judah." This we find to have been more especially the case during the times of national revival in the southern kingdom, and in the reigns of those kings who feared and sought the Lord.

Thus, for instance, we read of Asa, that "he gathered all Judah and Benjamin, with the strangers with them out of Ephraim and Manasseh, and out of Simeon; *for they fell to him out of all Israel in abundance*, when they saw that Jehovah his God was with him, so they gathered themselves together at Jerusalem . . . and they entered into a covenant to seek Jehovah God of their fathers with all their heart, and with all their soul" (2 Chron. xv. 9-15).

There are also several other mentions of "the children of Israel that dwelt in the cities of Judah" and were subjects and members of that kingdom.

III. The final overthrow of the northern kingdom took place, as we have seen, in the year 721 B.C., but when we read that the "king of Assyria took Samaria and carried Israel away into Assyria," we are not to understand that he cleared the whole land of all the people, but that he took the strength of the nation with him. There were, no doubt, many of the people left in the land, even as was the case after the overthrow of the southern kingdom by the Babylonians later on (2 Kings xxv. 12). The historical proof for my assertion is found in the fact that about a century after the fall of Samaria we find in the reign of Josiah some of Manasseh and Ephraim, "and a remnant of all Israel" in the land, who contributed to the collection made by the Levites for the repair of the house of the Lord in Jerusalem, and joined in the celebration of the great Passover in the eighteenth year of that zealous and promising young king.

These were the component elements of which the southern kingdom of "Judah" was made up, when it, too, reached the stage, when, on account of its idolatries and apostasy from the living God, "there was no more remedy" (or "healing" 2 Chron. xxxvi. 16). It consisted, as we have seen, of Judah, Benjamin, Levi, and many out of all the other ten tribes of Israel, "in abundance."

Jerusalem was finally taken in 588 B.C., by Nebuchadnezzar—just 133 years after the capture of Samaria by the Assyrians. Meanwhile the Babylonian Empire succeeded the Assyrian; but although dynasties had changed, and Babylon, which had sometimes, even under the Assyrian *régime*, been one of the capitals of the

Empire, now took the place of Nineveh, the region over which Nebuchadnezzar now bore rule was the very same over which Shalmaneser and Sargon reigned before him, only somewhat extended.¹

The exact location of the exiles of the southern kingdom we are not told, beyond the Scripture statements that all the three parties of captives carried off by Nebuchadnezzar (that in the first invasion in the reign of Jehoiakim, 606 B.C., and in the second, in the reign of Jehoiachin, 599 B.C., and in the final overthrow of Jerusalem, in the reign of Zedekiah, 588 B.C.), were taken "to Babylon" (2 Kings xxiv. and xxv. ; Daniel i.).

Now Babylon stands not only for the city, but also for the whole land, in which the territories of the Assyrian Empire, and the colonies of exiles from the northern kingdom of "Israel" were included. Thus, for instance, we find Ezekiel, who was one of the 10,000 exiles carried off by Nebuchadnezzar with Jehoiachin, by the river Chebar in the district of Gozan—one of the very parts where the exiles of the ten tribes were settled by the Assyrians more than a century previous.

With the captivity the divisions and rivalry between "Judah" and "Israel" were ended, and the members of all the tribes who looked forward to a national future were conscious not only of one common destiny, but that that destiny was bound up with the promises to the house of David, and with Zion or Jerusalem as its centre, in accordance with the prophecies of Joel, Amos, and Hosea, and of the other inspired messengers who ministered and testified more especially among them until the fall of Samaria. This conviction of a common and united future, no doubt, facilitated the merging process, which cannot be said to have begun with the

¹ See 2 Kings xxiii. 29, where the King of Babylon is called "King of Assyria."

captivity, for it commenced almost immediately after the rebellion under Jeroboam, but which was certainly strengthened by it.

Glimpses into the feeling of the members of the two kingdoms for one another, and their hopes and aspirations for unity, we get in the writings of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel, who prophesied during the period of exile. The most striking prophecy in relation to this subject is Ezek. xxxvii. 15-28 : "The word of the Lord came again unto me, saying, Moreover, thou son of man, take thee one stick, and write upon it, For Judah, and for the children of Israel his companions (that is, those of Israel who before the captivity fell away from the ten tribes and joined the southern kingdom): then take another stick, and write upon it, For Joseph, the stick of Ephraim, and all the house of Israel his companions: and join them one to another into one stick; and they shall become one in thine hand." Then follows the Divine interpretation of this symbol: "Behold, I will take the stick of Joseph, which is in the hand of Ephraim, and the tribes of Israel his companions, and I will put them with him (or literally, I will add them upon, or to him), namely, with the stick of Judah, and make them one stick, and they shall be one in my hand. And the sticks whereon thou writest shall be in thy hand before their eyes. And say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I will take the children of Israel from among the nations, whither they be gone, and will gather them on every side, and bring them into their own land; and I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king to them all: and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all: neither shall they defile themselves any more with their idols, nor with their

detestable things, nor with any of their transgressions : but I will save them out of all their dwelling-places wherein they have sinned, and will cleanse them ; so shall they be My people, and I will be their God. And My servant David shall be king over them ; and they all shall have one shepherd ; they shall also walk in My judgments, and observe My statutes, and do them. And they shall dwell in the land which I have given unto Jacob My servant, wherein your fathers dwelt ; and they shall dwell therein, they, and their children, and their children's children for ever : and David My servant shall be their prince for ever " (Ezek. xxxvii. 20-25, R.V.).

Likewise Jeremiah in his great prophecy of the restoration (chaps. xxx. and xxxiii.) and future blessing, links the destinies of "Judah" and "Israel," or Israel and Judah together ; and speaks of one common experience from that time on for the whole people. "For, lo, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will turn again the captivity of My people Israel and Judah, saith the Lord : and I will cause them to return to the land that I gave to their fathers, and they shall possess it. And these are the words that the Lord spake concerning Israel and Judah " (Jer. xxx. 3, 4, R.V.).

Now let it be remembered that the foreground and commencement of the restoration and future in these prophecies, especially to all the exiles at that time, was the restoration from Babylon, or Assyria, as it was sometimes called. So, Daniel also, towards the end of the seventy years' captivity, includes not only the men of Judah and inhabitants of Jerusalem in his intercessory prayer, but "*all Israel* that are near, or far off, from all the countries whither thou hast driven them," who, he confesses, were alike involved in sin and judgment, and equally cast on the mercy of God on the ground of promises made to the fathers.

Now let us go a step farther. Just seventy years had elapsed since the first band of captives were carried away to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar in the year 606 B.C. "That the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah might be fulfilled, the Lord stirred up the spirit of Cyrus, king of Persia, that he issued a proclamation throughout all his kingdom, and put it also in writing, saying : Thus saith Cyrus, king of Persia, the Lord God of heaven hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth ; and he hath charged me to build him a house at Jerusalem that is in Judah. Who is there among you of all his people? His God be with him, and let him go up to Jerusalem, which is in Judah."

This proclamation, which was in reference to all the people "of the Lord God of heaven," was issued in the year 536, two years after the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus, and was, we are told, promulgated "throughout all his kingdom," which was the same as that over which Nebuchadnezzar and his successors reigned before him, only again somewhat extended, even as the kingdom of Babylon was identical with that of Assyria, as already pointed out. Indeed, Cyrus and Darius I. are called indifferently by the sacred historians by the title of "king of Persia" (Ezra iv. 5), "king of Babylon" (Ezra v. 13), and the "king of Assyria" (Ezra vi. 22).

The first response to this proclamation was a caravan of "forty-two thousand three hundred and sixty, beside their servants and their maids, of whom there were seven thousand three hundred and thirty-seven, and two hundred singing men and singing women," who, under the leadership of Zerubbabel, who was a lineal descendant of the royal house of David, and of Joshua the high priest, made their way from "Babylon to Jerusalem."

Now the leading spirits of this returned party of

exiles were, no doubt, "the chief of the fathers of Judah and Benjamin, and the priests and Levites"; at the same time they included "all those" from all the other tribes without distinction, "whose spirit God had raised to go up to build the house of the Lord, which is in Jerusalem" (Ezra i. 5).

They are no longer counted after their tribal origin, but in families, and after the cities to which they originally belonged, which, for the most part, are not easy to identify; hence it is difficult to say how many belonged to "Judah," and how many to "Israel," but that there were a good many in this company of those who belonged to the northern kingdom of the ten tribes, is incidentally brought out by the mention of two hundred and twenty-three men of Ai and Bethel alone. Now, Bethel was the very centre of the ancient rival idolatrous worship instituted by Jeroboam, and though on the boundary of Benjamin, belonged to "Ephraim." Between the first organised large party of immigrants under Zerubbabel and Joshua, and the second under Ezra, a period of fifty-eight years elapsed, but we are not to suppose that in the interval there were no additions to the community, which now represented the whole united nation in Jerusalem. We read, for instance, incidentally, in Zech. vi. 9, 15, of a party of four prominent men who arrived in Jerusalem in 519 as representatives of "the captivity" (that is, of those who still remained in those parts where they were exiles), bringing with them a present of silver and gold for the Temple, the building of which was resumed about five months before, as a result of the stirring appeals of Haggai. This shows that there was continual intercourse and communication between the community in Palestine and the majority of the people who were still "in Babylon"; and we may be certain that little parties

and individuals, "whose spirit God had raised," continually found their way to the holy city.

In 458 B.C. Ezra, "the scribe of the law of the God of heaven," in accordance with the decree of Artaxerxes Longimanus, organised another large caravan of those whose hearts were made willing to return to the land of their fathers. Part of this most favourable royal proclamation, was as follows: "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 up-with thee"; and in response to it "this Ezra went up from Babylon . . . and there went up (with him) of the children of Israel, and of the priests and of the Levites, and the singers and the porters, and the Nethinim, unto Jerusalem in the seventh year of Artaxerxes the king" (Ezra vii. 7).

This party consisted of about one thousand eight hundred families; and apart from the priests, Levites, and Nethinim, was made up of "the children of Israel," irrespective of tribal distinctions, from all parts of the realm of "Babylon," or Assyria, now under the sway of the Medo-Persians.

The narratives contained in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, under whose administration the position of the restored remnant became consolidated, covers a period of about 115 years, and brings us down to about 420 B.C. Jewish history during the second period of the Persian supremacy is wrapped somewhat in obscurity, but we know that nearly throughout the whole period of its existence it was more or less friendly to the Hebrews. There was certainly no revocation of the edicts of Cyrus and of Artaxerxes permitting those "which were minded of their own free will to go and join their brethren in Palestine; and that there were many other large and small parties of exiles

who did so, subsequent to those mentioned in Ezra and Nehemiah, may be taken for granted.¹ Anyhow it is a fact that the remnant in the land grew and grew until, about a century and a half later, in the time of the Maccabees, and again about a century and a half later still, in the time of our Lord, we find "the Jews" in Palestine a comparatively large nation, numbering millions; while from the time of the downfall of the Persian Empire, we hear but very little more of the Israelite exiles in ancient Assyria or Babylon. By the conquest of Alexander, who to this day is a great favourite among the scattered nation, the regions of ancient Babylonia and Media were brought comparatively near, and a highway opened between East and West. From about this time settlements of "Jews" began to multiply in Asia Minor, Cyprus, Crete, on the coasts and islands of the Ægean, in Macedonia and other parts of Southern Europe, in Egypt and the whole northern coast of Africa, whilst some made their way further and further eastward as far as India and China. There is not the least possibility of doubt that many of the settlements of the Diaspora in the time of our Lord both north, south, and west, as well as east of Palestine, were made up of those who had never returned to the land of their fathers since the time of the Assyrian and Babylonian exiles, and who were not only descendants of Judah, as Anglo-Israelism ignorantly presupposes, but of all "the *twelve tribes scattered abroad* (James i. 1).

As a matter of fact, long before the destruction of the second Temple by Titus, we read of currents and counter-currents in the dispersion of the "Jewish"

¹ It is inconceivable," says Dr. Pusey, "that, as the material prosperity of Palestine returned, even many of the ten tribes should not have returned to their country."

people. Thus Artaxerxes III., *Ochus*, on his way to re-conquer Egypt, "having taken Apodasmus in Judea, conveyed the Jewish population into Hyrcania near the Caspian Sea." When he made himself master of Egypt we read of his finding Jews there, and, being incensed against them on account of a stubborn defence against him of places entrusted to their keeping, "he sent part of them into Hyrcania, in the neighbourhood of the country which the tribes already inhabited, and left the rest at Babylon"; while soon after many thousands were taken to Egypt by Alexander; and Ptolemy Soter, one of his chief generals, who had become King of Egypt, and had invaded Syria and taken Jerusalem in 301 B.C., carried off one hundred thousand of them, and forced them to settle chiefly in Alexandria and Cyrene.

To summarise the state of things in connection with the Hebrew race at the time of Christ, it was briefly this:—

I. For some six centuries before, ever since the partial restoration in the days of Cyrus and his successors, the descendants of Abraham were no longer known as divided into tribes, but as one people, although up to the time of the destruction of the second Temple, tribal and family genealogies were for the most part preserved, especially among those who were settled in the land.

II. Part of the nation was in Palestine, but by far the larger number were scattered far and wide, and formed innumerable communities in many different lands, north and south, east and west.¹ But wherever dispersed and to whatever tribe they may have belonged, they all looked to Palestine and Jerusalem as their national centre, and,

¹ Thus Strabo (quoted by Josephus in "Ant." xiv. 7, 2) could already say in his day that "these Jew had already gotten into all cities; and it is hard to find a place in the habitable earth that hath not admitted this race and is not mastered by it."

with the exception of those (and they were no doubt many) who had ceased to cherish "the Hope of Israel" and were gradually assimilating with their Gentile neighbours, were all one in heart with their brethren in the Holy Land. "They felt they were of the same stock, stood on the same ground, cherished the same memories, grew up under the same institutions, and anticipated the same future. They had one common centre of worship in Jerusalem, which they upheld by their offerings; and they made pilgrimages thither annually in great numbers at the high festivals." Thus Philo could represent to the Roman Emperor Caligula that "Jerusalem ought not to be considered only as the metropolis of Judea, but as the centre of a nation dispersed in infinite places, who were able to supply him with potent succours for his defence. He reckoned among the places that were still stored with Jews, the isles of Cyprus and Candia, Egypt, Macedonia and Bithynia, to which he added the empire of the Persians, and *all the cities of the East*, except that of Babylon from whence they were then expelled."

There is ample confirmation on this point in the New Testament. Thus, for instance, we are incidentally told in the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles that among the representatives from the Diaspora who were found in Jerusalem at that memorable feast of Pentecost, who were doubtless there also during the previous Passover, when the crucifixion took place, were "Parthians and Medes and Elamites, and dwellers in Mesopotamia, in Judea and Cappadocia, in Pontus and Asia, in Phrygia and Pamphylia, in Egypt and parts of Libya and Cyrene, and sojourners from Rome, Cretans and Arabians"—all of them either Jews or proselytes miraculously hearing in their own tongues the mighty works of God,

Here it is to be noted that, at the commencement of the Christian era, we find in this motley and cosmopolitan Jewish crowd representatives from Israelitish settlements in the very parts where they were carried by the Assyrians and Babylonians some seven centuries before, but who are all called "Jews," and all alike regarded Jerusalem as their national metropolis.¹

III. The name of "Jew" and "Israelite" became synonymous terms from about the time of the Captivity. It is one of the absurd fallacies of Anglo-Israelism to presuppose that the term "Jew" stands for a bodily descendant of "Judah." It stands for all those from among the sons of Jacob who acknowledged themselves, or were considered, subjects of the theocratic kingdom of Judah, which they expected to be established by the promised "Son of David"—the Lion of the tribe of Judah—whose reign is to extend not only over "*all the tribes of the land*," but also "from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth."

"That the name 'Jews,'" writes a Continental Bible scholar, "became general for all Israelites who were anxious to preserve their theocratic nationality, was the more natural, since the political independence of the ten tribes was destroyed." Yes, and without any hope of a restoration to a separate national existence.

¹ "Everywhere we have distinct notices of these wanderers," says Dr. Edersheim, "and everywhere they appear as in closest connection with the Rabbinical hierarchy of Palestine. Thus the Mishnah, in an extremely curious section, tells us how on Sabbaths the Jewesses of Arabia might wear their long veils, and those of India the kerchiefs round their head, customary in those countries, without incurring the guilt of desecrating the holy day by needlessly carrying what, in the eyes of the law, would be a burden; while in a rubric for the Day of Atonement we have it noted that the dress which the High Priest wore 'between the evenings' of the great feast—that is, as afternoon darkened into evening—was of most costly Indian stuff."

What hopes and promises they had were, as we have seen, linked with the Kingdom of Judah and the House of David.

Anglo-Israelism teaches that members of the ten tribes are never called "Jews," and that "Jews" are not "Israelites," but both assertions are false. Who were they that came back to the land after the "Babylonian" exile? Anglo-Israelites say they were only the exiles from the southern kingdom of Judah, and call them "Jews." I have already shown this to be a fallacy, but I might add the significant fact that in the Book of Ezra this remnant is only called eight times by the name "Jews," and no less than *forty* times by the name "Israel." In the Book of Nehemiah they are called "Jews" *eleven* times, and "Israel" twenty-two times. As to those who remained behind in the one hundred and twenty-seven provinces of the Persian Empire, which included all the territories of ancient Assyria, Anglo-Israelites would say they were of the kingdom of "Israel"; but in the Book of Esther, where we get a vivid glimpse of them at a period subsequent to the partial restoration under Zerubbabel and Joshua, they are called forty-five times by the name "Jews," and not once by the name "Israel"!

In the New Testament the same people who are called "Jews" one hundred and seventy-four times are also called "Israel" no fewer than seventy-five times. Anglo-Israelism asserts that a "Jew" is only a descendant of Judah, and is not an "Israelite"; but Paul says more than once: "I am a man which am a *Jew*." Yet he says: "For I also am an Israelite." "Are they *Israelites*? so am I?" (Acts xxi. 39; xxii. 3; Rom. xi. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 22; Phil. iii. 5).

Our Lord was of the house of David, and of the tribe of Judah after the flesh—"a Jew," yet it says that it is

of "*Israel*" "that He came, who is over all, God blessed for ever" (Rom. ix. 4, 5). Devout Anna was a "Jewess" in Jerusalem, yet she was "of the tribe of Aser." But enough on this point.

IV. From the time of the return of the first remnant after the Babylonian exile, sacred historians, prophets, apostles, and the Lord Himself, regarded the "Jews" in the land as representatives of "all Israel," and the only people in the line of the covenants and the promises which God made with the fathers.

At the dedication of the Temple, which was at last finished "on the third day of the month Adar, which was in the sixth year in the reign of Darius the king," they offered "for a sin-offering *for all Israel, twelve he-goats according to the number of the tribes of Israel*" (Ezra vi. 17).

Similarly on the arrival of Ezra with the new caravan of immigrants they "offered burnt-offerings unto the God of Israel, *twelve bullocks for all Israel . . . and twelve he-goats for sin-offering*" (Ezra viii. 35), showing that the returned exiles regarded themselves as the nucleus and representatives of the whole nation. In the post-Exilic prophets we have no longer two kingdoms, but one people—one in interests and destiny, although they had formerly for a time been divided.

To show that the revived nation was made up of members of the Northern, as well as the Southern kingdoms, the prophet Zechariah calls them by the comprehensive name of "Judah, Israel, and Jerusalem" (Zech. i. 19), or, "the house of Judah, and the house of Joseph" (Zech. x. 6). In the prophecy occasioned by the question addressed by the deputation from Bethel, in reference to the continuation of the observance of the fasts, he says: "And it shall come to pass that as ye were a curse among the nations *O house of Judah* and

house of Israel, so will I save you, and ye shall be a blessing ; fear not, and let your hands be strong" (Zech. viii. 13).

Here the formerly two houses are included ; together they are for a time *among the nations* "a curse," and together they shall be saved, and be "a blessing."

Malachi, nearly a century later, when the people in the land had become a prosperous nation, and when, in consequence, the majority was rapidly falling into a state of religious formality and godlessness, addresses them as "Israel," or "Jacob," which surely includes all his descendants, in contrast to Esau and his descendants (Mal. i. 1-3).

In the last words of the last of the post-Exilic prophets we have the expression "all Israel" addressed to the people in the land, and then the long period of silence sets in, lasting about four centuries, during parts of which Jewish national history is lost somewhat in obscurity. When the threads of that history are taken up again in the New Testament, what do we find ? Is there one hint or reference in the whole book to an Israel apart from "that nation" of the "Jews," to whom, and of whom, the Lord and His apostles speak ? There is, indeed, reference and mention of the Diaspora, "the dispersed among the Gentiles" (John vii. 35), forming, as we have seen, the greater part of the nation, and some of them still settled in the ancient regions of Assyria and Babylon, but wherever they were, they are all interchangeably called "Jews," or "Israelites," who regarded Jerusalem, with which they were in constant communication as the centre, not only of their religion, but of their national hopes and destiny.

The "Israelites" who in the time of Christ were dispersed among the Parthians, Medes, and Elamites (Acts ii.), were as much one with the sojourners in

Egypt, Greece, and Rome, as the "Jews" in Bagdad, Persia, or on the Caspian Sea to-day, are one with their wandering brethren in London, Berlin, New York, or Australia, although they then, as now (apart from the Hebrew which ever remains the sacred tongue, and thoroughly understood only by the minority), spoke different languages, and dressed differently, and conformed to different social and family customs.

But let me give you a few definite passages from the New Testament in justification of my statement that the Lord Jesus and the apostles, equally with the post-Exilic prophets centuries before, regarded the "Jews" as representatives of "all Israel," and as the only people in the line of the "covenant, and the promises which God made unto the fathers."

(a) In Matthew x. we have the record of the choice, and of the first commission given to the apostles. "These twelve," we read, "Jesus sent forth, and commanded them saying, Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not; but go rather *to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.*" Of course the merest child knows that this journey of the twelve did not extend beyond the limits of Palestine, but the "Jews" dwelling in it are regarded as the house of Israel, although many members of that "house" were also scattered in other lands.

In this charge of the Lord to the apostles, we see also by the way, in what sense Israel is regarded as "lost." Now Anglo-Israelites are very fond of this word, but they use it in an unbiblical and unspiritual sense. The ten tribes were in the time of Christ, even as they still are, "lost"; but not because they have forgotten their *national* or tribal identity, but because they "all like sheep have gone astray, and have turned every one to his own way." Or, as Jeremiah patheti-

cally puts it : " My people hath been lost sheep ; their shepherds [their false teachers and leaders] have caused them to go astray, they have turned them away on the mountains ; they have gone from mountain to hill, they have forgotten [not their national origin, but] their resting place," viz., Jehovah, who is the true dwelling-place of His people in all generations.

(*b*) On the first day of Pentecost, Peter with the eleven, addressed the "men of Judea," and the great multitude from among the dispersed "Jews," as "Ye men of Israel," and wound up his powerful speech with the words : " Let *all the house of Israel*, therefore, know assuredly that God hath made Him both Lord and Christ—this Jesus whom ye crucified." In the third of Acts, as "all the people ran together unto them in the porch that is called Solomon's, greatly wondering," at the notable miracle in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, Peter said : " *Ye men of Israel*, why marvel ye at this man ? . . . The God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob, the God of our fathers, hath glorified His servant Jesus, whom ye delivered up and denied before the face of Pilate when he had determined to release Him. . . . Repent ye, therefore, and turn again that your sins may be blotted out, that so there may come seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord. . . . *Ye are the sons of the prophets and of the covenant which God made with your fathers*, saying unto Abraham, 'and in thy seed shall the nations of the earth be blessed.'"

From Acts xiii. onward, we find Paul among the "Jews" in the dispersion, and how does he address them ? By the same name as Peter addressed their brethren in Palestine : " *Men of Israel . . . the God of this people Israel* chose our fathers, and exhorted the people when they sojourned in the land of Egypt" (Act xiii. 16–17) ; and when he was at last brought to

Rome, "and gathered the chief of the Jews" in that city to him, he assured them that he had neither done anything "against the people, or the customs of our fathers," nor did he come to Rome "to accuse my nation," but "because of the *hope of Israel* am I bound by this chain," namely, "the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers; as he had previously explained before Festus and Agrippa—unto which *our twelve tribes*, earnestly serving God night and day, hope to attain" (Acts xxviii. 17-20; xxvi. 6-7).

Paul knew of no "lost ten tribes," but on his testimony the "Jews" in Palestine and in the dispersion were the "Israel" of *all the twelve tribes*, to whom the "hope of the promise made of God unto the fathers" belonged.

(c) And, as it is in the Gospels, and in the Acts of the Apostles, so also in the Epistles. It would be easy to multiply passages, but one more must suffice.

The ix., x., and xi. of Romans form the prophetic, or "dispensational" section of that great epistle, and was written for the special instruction of Gentile believers in the "mystery" of God with Israel. Now I cannot, of course, stop here to give you an analysis of that wonderful and comprehensive scripture, which is also a vindication of God's ways with man; but there is not a hint or suggestion in it of a "lost Israel," apart from the one nation whose whole history he summarises from the beginning to the end, and which is now, alas! divided into the small minority—the "remnant according to the election of grace" who believe, and the majority who believe not, until the day of grace for the whole nation shall come, and "so *all* Israel shall be saved, even as it is written, 'There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer; He shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob.'"

But in the touching introduction to this section

(Rom. ix. 1-6), in which the Apostle gives utterance to his "great sorrow and unceasing pain of heart" because of the unbelief of his own nation, "his brethren and his kinsmen according to the flesh," for whose sake he had been wishing, if it were possible, even to be himself "anathema from Christ"—how does he call these unbelieving "Jews" who had rejected their Messiah, and were blindly persecuting His servants? Here are his words: "*Who are Israelites; whose is 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 is Christ as concerning the flesh, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen.*"

Now I must try to draw this very long letter to an end. I have not followed Anglo-Israelism in all its crooked paths of misinterpretation of Scripture and history; I have only shown you the baselessness of its foundations, and that the premises upon which the whole theory rests are misleading and false. I have also given you a summary of the true history of the tribes, which I trust may prove helpful to you in the study of God's Word; and the conclusion at which you and every unbiassed person must arrive on a careful examination of the facts which I have adduced is, that the whole supposition of "lost tribes," in the sense in which Anglo-Israelism uses the term, is a fancy which originated in ignorance; and that "*the Jews*" are the whole, and the only national Israel, representing not only the "two tribes," but "*all the twelve tribes,*" who were "*scattered abroad.*"

I have thought it necessary to enter all the more fully into this point, because even some otherwise sober-minded teachers and writers, who are not Anglo-Israelites, have fallen into some confusion in dealing with this subject; and no wonder, for already Josephus, who

vaguely locates a separate multitude belonging to the ten tribes somewhere beyond the Euphrates ("Antiq." xi. 1-2)—a Jewish tradition which locates a mighty kingdom of the ten tribes beyond the fabled miraculous river Sabbatyon, which no one can cross because it throws up stones all the week, and only rests on the Sabbath; and the Talmud (Jer. Sanhedrin, 29, c.), which speaks of three localities whither they had been banished, viz., the district around the above wonderful Sabbatyon, Daphne near Antioch, and the third locality could neither be seen nor named because it was continually hidden by a cloud—all these show how early people's minds became muddled on this subject.¹ Some Christian writers have accepted the view that while some of the "ten tribes" amalgamated with the "Jews," there is nevertheless a distinct people somewhere, who are descendants of the Israel of the ancient northern kingdom, which is to be brought to light in the future, and, together with "Judah," will be restored to Palestine, and enter into the enjoyment of the promises. Thus the Nestorians who inhabit the inaccessible mountains of Kurdistan (which is part of ancient Assyria), the Afghans, and even the North American Indians, have been variously identified as that people; but this view rests upon what I believe

¹ It has also been supposed that the references by Agrippa in his remarkable oration (reported by Josephus' "Wars," ii., xvi. 4)—to those who dwelt "as far as beyond the Euphrates," and to "those of your nation who dwell in Adiabene," upon whom the Jews might rely for help in their struggle against Rome, but would not be permitted by the Parthians to render them any assistance—were to some unknown settlements belonging to the ten tribes. But this is a mistake. These dwellers in Adiabene might or might not have belonged to the ten tribes, but they formed part of the known Dispersion and of "your nation"—the Jews.

to be a misconception of the meaning and scope of some of the prophecies.

Even if it were true that the Nestorians, or the Afghans, or some other Eastern tribes are descendants of the original Israelitish exiles in Assyria, having more or less mixed themselves up by intermarriage with the surrounding nations, and having given up the distinctive national rites and ordinances, they have, like many "Jews" in modern times (who gradually assimilate with Gentile nations) cut themselves off from the hope of Israel, and are no longer in the line of the purpose which God has in and through that "peculiar" and separate people.

In conclusion, let me very briefly call your attention to the remarkable prophecy in Amos ix., which will show you that the view which I have enunciated in my letter is the only one in keeping with the sure word of prophecy.

The prophet Amos, though himself a Judean, his native village Tekoa being about twelve miles south of Jerusalem, was commissioned by God to prophesy more particularly to the northern or ten-tribed kingdom; and for that purpose he went and took up his abode in Bethel, which was the centre of the idolatrous worship set up by Jeroboam in opposition to the worship and service of the Divinely appointed sanctuary in Jerusalem. There, his duty was to announce the coming judgment of God on the Israel of the ten tribes, on account of their apostasy. The last paragraph of his book (chap. ix. 8-15), uttered not more than about seven years before the final overthrow of Samaria in 721 B.C., is one of the most remarkable and comprehensive prophecies in the Old Testament, and this is the inspired forecast of the history of the

ten-tribed kingdom which is given in it: "Behold the eyes of the Lord God are upon the sinful kingdom, and I will destroy it from off the face of the earth; saving that I will not utterly destroy the house of Jacob, saith the Lord. For lo, I will command and I will sift (or 'toss') the house of Israel among all the nations, like as corn is sifted (or 'tossed' about) in a sieve, yet shall not the least grain fall upon the earth. All the sinners of thy people shall die by the sword, which say: The evil shall not overtake or prevent us."

Here, then, we have the whole subject as to what is to become of the ten tribes in a nutshell.

(a) First, *as a kingdom* they were to be destroyed from off the face of the earth, *never to be restored*; for its very existence as a separate kingdom was only permitted of God for a definite period as a punishment on the house of David: and when, after a period of about two hundred and fifty years of unbroken apostasy, it was finally broken up by the Assyrians, there was an end of it, without any promise of a future independent political existence.

(b) But when it was destroyed as a kingdom, what became of them as a people? This prophecy tells us: "Saving that I will not utterly destroy the house of Jacob, saith the Lord"—that is, they are to return to the house of Jacob. They are to form part of the one family made up of all the descendants of Jacob without distinction of tribes. But as one house of Jacob, or "of Israel" (as the next verse interchangeably calls them), something terrible and unique is to befall them; and what is it? To be "lost" for some two thousand six hundred years, and then to be identified with the Anglo-Saxon race? Oh no! this is what was to happen: "For lo, I will command and I will sift (or 'toss') the house of Israel among all nations even as corn

is tossed about in a sieve"—or, in the words of Hosea, another prophet who spoke primarily to the ten tribes, "My God will cast them away" (not for ever, as the whole book shows, but for a time), "because they did not hearken unto Him; and *they shall be wanderers among the nations.*"

I draw your attention all the more to this point, because a good deal has been made by some writers of the expression in Isa. xi. where Israel is called "outcast," from which they infer that "Israel" is to be found somewhere in one place, in contradistinction to the "dispersed of Judah." But this is a fallacy. In Jer. xxx. Judah and Israel are together called "an outcast," but it by no means implies that they are therefore to be sought for and found in one particular region of the world.

It is clear from the prophecies of Amos and Hosea, which, as we have seen, were primarily addressed to the ten tribes, that if they were in the first instance "cast out" by force, from their own land, as the word in the Hebrew means, it was with a view that they should be "tossed about" and "wander" among "all nations."

Now note, Anglo-Israelism tells you to identify the ten tribes with one nation, but if you are on the line of Scripture and true history, you will seek for them "among all nations." And which people is it that is known all over the earth as "the tribe of the weary foot and wandering breast"? Anglo-Israelites call them "Jews" in the limited sense of being descendants of "Judah"; but God's Word tells us that it is "*the house of Israel*," or "the house of Jacob"; and, as a matter of fact, since "Judah" joined their brethren of the ten tribes on the destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans in 588 B.C. the two have kept on their weary march together—"wandering among the nations." Eastward

and westward (only a remnant of all the tribes returning to the land for a time), nowhere finding ease for any length of time, nor do the soles of their feet have rest, even as Moses, at the very beginning of their history, and long before the division among the tribes, prophesied would be their united experience in case they apostatised from Jehovah their God. And thus they will continue ever more mixed up and intermingled among themselves, with all genealogies lost, and not one of them either east or west being able to prove of what tribe or family he comes—until the day when He that scattered Israel will gather him, and by His own Divine power and omniscience separate them again into their tribes and families.

My last words on this subject must be those of warning and entreaty. Do not think, as so many do, that Anglo-Israelism, even if not true, is only a harmless speculation. I consider it nothing short of one of the latter-day delusions by which the Evil One seeks to divert the attention of men from things spiritual and eternal. Here are a few of its dangers:—

I. It goes, sometimes to the length of blasphemy, (as shown in the extracts I have copied for you at the beginning of this letter), in misrepresenting and misapplying Scripture. One of its foundation fallacies is that it anticipates the millennium, and interprets promises—which will only be fulfilled in that blessed period, after Israel as a nation is converted—to the British nation at the present time. But by this process it makes all prophetic Scripture meaningless.

II. It fosters national pride, and nationalises God's blessings in this dispensation, which is individual and elective in its character. It diverts man's attention from the one thing needful, and from the only means by which he can find acceptance with God. This it does

by teaching that "a nation composed of millions of practical unbelievers in Christ, and ripe for apostasy, in virtue of a certain fanciful identity between the mixed race composing that nation and a people carried into captivity two thousand five hundred years ago, is in the enjoyment of God's special blessing and will enjoy it on the same grounds for ever, thus laying another foundation for acceptance with God beside that which he has laid, even Christ Jesus." After all, in this dispensation it is a question only as to whether men are "in Christ" or not. If they are Christians, whether Jews or Gentiles, their destiny is not linked either with Palestine or with England, but with that inheritance which is incorruptible, and undefiled, and which fadeth not away; and if they are not Christians, then, instead of occupying their thoughts with vain speculations as to a supposed identity of the British race with the "lost" ten tribes, it is their duty to seek the one and only Saviour whom we must learn to know not after the flesh, but in the Spirit, and without whom a man, whether an Israelite or not, is undone.

III. Then, finally, it not only robs the Jewish nation—the true Israel—of many promises in relation to their future by applying them to the British race in the present time, but it diverts attention from them as *the* people in whom is bound up the purpose of God in relation to the nations, and whose "receiving again" to the heart of God, after the long centuries of unbelief, will be as "life from the dead to the whole world."

Excuse such a very long epistle, and praying that you may be led in all things by the Spirit of Truth,

I am,

Faithfully yours,

DAVID BARON.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

THE URIM AND THUMMIM

NOTE TO CHAPTER I., PAGE 26.

ALL that has been written on the subject, from Philo and Josephus down to this day, is more or less conjectural and much of it pure fancy. Apart from the views quoted below, it has been maintained by some that the response to an appeal to the Urim and Thummim was given by an audible voice to the high priest arrayed in full pontificals, and standing in the holy place with his face turned towards the ark ; while some commentators have given it as their opinion that the Urim and Thummim were two small oracular images which were placed in the cavity or pouch formed by the folds of the breastplate and which uttered oracles by a voice—a view most objectionable, and altogether abhorrent to the spirit of Scripture.

The most thorough handling of this difficult subject is that by a Hebrew Christian brother,¹ which I reproduce. It gathers up the Jewish and Rabbinic views and may be taken as the most probable explanation.

The white linen habiliments of the priests signified purity and sanctity. They consisted of a coat, a girdle, and bonnet, and were common to priest and high priest, as described in Exod. xxviii. 40-43. There were several other garments peculiar to the high priest, when engaged in his holy office, especially when he had to enter into the Most Holy, on the Day of Atonement. Some of these glorious and significant garments deserve particular notice and attention. The high priest first put on a long robe, which was called "the Robe of the Ephod," or Meeil.

¹ Benjamin Weiss in his book, "A Christian Jew on the Old Testament."

This vestment was of blue colour, and did not consist of several pieces sewed together; it was woven throughout (Exod. xxxix. 31, 32). It had apertures left for the neck and for the hands. Such seems to have been the coat of our Saviour for which the soldiers cast lots (see John xix. 23, 24). At the bottom of this garment were fringes like the pomegranates of blue, of purple, and of scarlet, round about the hem thereof. Between every two pomegranates a golden bell was fastened; so that between every two bells there was a pomegranate, and between every two pomegranates a bell. This long and curious robe was tied round about with a girdle, which was woven and embroidered with the same colours as those of the robe. The reason for putting bells on the hem of this robe is given in the following words: "And his sound shall be heard when he goeth in unto the sanctuary before the Lord, and when he cometh out, that he die not" (Exod. xxviii. 35). This makes it evident that the sound of the bells was intended to impress upon the Israelites who stood in the outer court when the high priest entered the Most Holy, the awful holiness of that place, and to show unto them the shortness of time which the mortal high priest was allowed to remain in the presence of the Shechinah. Otherwise we can give no explanation why the sound was to be heard, "when he goeth in unto the sanctuary before the Lord, and when he cometh out, that he die not."

Over the long garment described above the high priest put on another short coat, called "Ephod." This was woven of blue, of purple, of scarlet, and of fine twined linen, and woven with gold threads, and curiously embroidered. It covered his front from his neck unto his girdle, where it was tied round about with a girdle of the same materials, and of the same workmanship. It had also two shoulder-pieces, which were to be joined behind, with two precious buttons. These two buttons were made of two onyx stones, set in sockets of gold. On these two precious stones the names of the twelve tribes of Israel were engraven—six names on each of them, according to the birth of Jacob's twelve sons. See Exod. xxviii. 6-12. In the 12th verse we read, "And thou shalt put the two stones upon the shoulders of the ephod, for stones of memorial unto the children of Israel; and Aaron shall bear their names before the Lord, upon his two shoulders, for a memorial." An express intimation was thus made unto Israel that they could not stand before the holy Jehovah in themselves. They required a Mediator to carry them, to atone for them, and to reconcile them to the Holy One of Israel. But

even the high priest himself (type as well as antitype) could not appear with their names, to reconcile them to God, without the blood of atonement. In the above-described ephod there was left a square aperture over the breast. Into this aperture was placed a most wonderful piece of ornament.

This ornament was the Choshen Mishpat, "the breastplate of judgment," which, according to the description in Exodus, was made as follows: Its materials were the same as those of the ephod, and were wrought with cunning work. It was made four-square and doubled. It was a span in length and a span in breadth. This breastplate filled up exactly the aperture left in the ephod and was fastened to it by golden rings and chains above, and by the girdle of the ephod below. Into the front of this breastplate four rows of precious stones were inserted; each of these rows had three different stones, making twelve in all, according to the number of the tribes of Israel. On these stones the twelve names of the tribes of Israel were graven, one name upon each stone. Thus one had the name "Reuben" on it, in Hebrew letters, another "Simeon," a third, "Levi," and so on. The four rows of precious stones were set in ouches of gold, and so fastened that they could not fall out.

In Exod. xxviii., from verse 15 to 28, a minute description is given of this breastplate, and also of the stones and their different names. In the 29th verse we have the reason given for which that glorious ornament was made. "And Aaron shall bear the names of the children of Israel, in the breastplate of judgment, upon his heart, when he goeth in unto the sanctuary, for a memorial before the Lord continually." The expression "Aaron shall bear the names of Israel upon his breast before the Lord," is exactly the same with the reason given in the 12th verse, concerning the two stones of the ephod—"And Aaron shall bear their names before the Lord, upon his two shoulders, for a memorial."

So we see clearly that both the two stones of the ephod, with the names of the tribes of Israel on them, and the twelve stones of the breastplate with the same names, served the selfsame purpose, namely, that Aaron might bear the names of Israel as a memorial before the Lord.

Now there remains one thing to be considered. It is this. Why was this ornament, with the twelve precious stones, called Choshen Mishpat, "the breastplate of judgment," while the two stones of the ephod, which had also the twelve names

of the tribes of Israel engraven on them, and which had seemingly the same signification as the twelve stones of the breastplate, were called only Avneh Sicharon, "stones of memorial," and not "stones of judgment"? This question will be answered when we read *Exod. xxviii. 30*—"And thou shalt put into the breastplate of judgment the Urim and the Thummim, and they shall be upon Aaron's heart, when he goeth in before the Lord, and Aaron shall bear the judgment of the children of Israel upon his heart before the Lord continually." From this verse we draw the following conclusions: 1st. The breastplate, without the Urim and Thummim within it, had the same signification as the two stones of the ephod. So these twelve stones could also have been called Avneh Sicharon, "stones of memorial," as the same signification is ascribed to both. In verse 12 we are told that the two stones of the ephod were for a memorial, and in verse 29 we are told that the twelve stones of the breastplate were for the same purpose. 2nd. We see, from the 30th verse, that the ornament with the twelve stones received the name Choshen Mishpat, "the breastplate of judgment," only because the Urim and Thummim were put into it. When we read that Moses was commanded to put the Urim and Thummim into the breastplate there is no mention made any more of a memorial, as is done in verse 29. We merely read, "And Aaron shall bear the judgment of the children of Israel upon his heart before Jehovah continually." As soon as the Urim and Thummim were put into the breastplate it was changed from a "breastplate of memorial" into a "breastplate of judgment."

In *Deut. xxxiii.* we are told that Moses blessed the children of Israel before his death. In the 8th verse we read, "And of Levi he said, Let thy Thummim and thy Urim be with thy holy one" (*viz.*, with the priests of Levi's tribe). And again, "They shall teach Jacob thy judgments, and Israel thy law" (*Deut. xxxiii. 8-10*). From this it is evident that the priests were to be instructed by the Urim and Thummim in all matters of judgment.

Therefore, when the Urim and Thummim were put into the breastplate it was called "the breastplate of judgment." Israel was commanded to have recourse with every hard matter of judgment, which could not be decided in the small towns, unto Jerusalem, unto the priests of the tribe of Levi, and unto the judge who was in office at that time (*Deut. xvii. 8-11*). In the 12th verse we read, "And the man that will do presumptuously,

and will not hearken unto the priest that standeth to minister there before the Lord thy God, or unto the judge, even that man shall die." When the prophet Malachi complains that Israel has neglected to obey the priests, and has therefore violated the law, he speaks thus, in the name of God : "The law of truth was in his mouth (namely, in the mouth of the high priest), and iniquity was not found in his lips ; he walked with me in peace and equity and did turn many away from sin. For the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they (Israel) should seek the law at his mouth : for he is the messenger of the Lord of Hosts." All these expressions refer to the oracle of the Urim and Thummim, by which the priest was instructed of God in every matter of judgment.

Every hard thing and every doubtful argument about the law was settled by it ; and as this oracle was directed by God there was no fear of the priest erring ; as the prophet says, "The law of truth was in his mouth, for he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts."

There was no need of instruction by the Urim and Thummim, all the days of Moses, with whom the Lord spoke in an audible voice from between the cherubim, out of the Most Holy. This oracle, therefore, was intended for the future after the death of Moses, as we read, "And there arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face" (Deut. xxxiv. 10). This evidently refers to the great privilege which the Lord was pleased to bestow upon Moses in speaking unto him in an audible voice (see Numb. xii. 6-9). When Moses ordained Joshua to be the leader of Israel in his place, we read as follows : "And he (Joshua) shall stand before Eliezer the priest, who shall ask counsel for him after the judgment of the Urim before the Lord ; at his word shall they go out, and at his word shall they come in, both he and all the children of Israel with him, even all the congregation" (Numb. xxvii. 21). Here we see, first, that the audible voice, in which the Lord spoke to Moses, was to cease after Moses was dead ; secondly, that Joshua was to stand before the priest, who was to ask for him the judgments or directions of the Urim.

How absurd, then, is the opinion of some who maintain that the answer of the Urim was also by an audible voice ! If such had been the case, would not the voice rather have continued to speak from between the cherubim ? Such an opinion is surely against all testimony of Scripture, which says that after Moses there arose none unto whom the Lord spake directly. The

manner of the visions of the prophets is described in the twelfth chapter of Numbers, "If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make Myself known unto him in a vision, and will speak unto him in a dream" (see verses 6-8). By the Urim and Thummim, therefore, must have been given signs and directions only, as it is said, "He shall ask counsel for him (viz., the priest shall ask for Joshua) after the judgment (or directions) of the Urim," not "after the words of the Urim," for it never answered by words. We have seen now how Joshua was ordered by God to come before the priest with every doubtful matter, and ask direction of the Urim. Let us now see what was the first difficulty in judgment that occurred in the times of Joshua, and how he asked counsel of the Urim. When Achan committed a trespass, in that he took of the accursed things of Jericho, the wrath of God was kindled against Israel, and they were defeated in their expedition against Ai. Joshua, therefore, rent his garments, and cast himself down in dust and ashes before the ark of the Lord (see Josh. vii. 7-9). Then we read in verse 10, "And the Lord said unto Joshua, Get thee up, wherefore liest thou thus upon thy face? Israel hath sinned; they have also transgressed My covenant which I commanded them; for they have even taken of the accursed thing, and have also stolen, and dissembled also, and have put among their own stuff." It was evident that the Lord spoke these words unto Joshua in the same manner as he spoke to the other prophets, namely, in a vision. When Joshua lay upon his face mourning and supplicating, he fell into a trance, and the Lord communicated unto him the reason of the punishment which he had sent upon Israel. But the name of the criminal the Lord did not tell unto him.

As this was a public affair, the searching and finding out of the guilty individual was to be done by the oracle Urim, and publicly. Therefore the Lord was pleased, to show unto Joshua, for the first time, how to use the oracle and how to find out the guilty person who had the accursed things. We read: "Up, sanctify the people, and say, Sanctify yourselves against tomorrow: for thus says the Lord God of Israel, there is an accursed thing in the midst of thee, O Israel; thou canst not stand before thine enemies, until ye take away the accursed thing from among you. In the morning, therefore, ye shall be brought according to your tribes, and it shall be that the tribe which the Lord taketh shall come according to the families thereof; and the family which the Lord shall take shall come by households; and the household which the Lord shall take shall come man by man" (Josh. vii. 13, 14).

From this direction given unto Joshua, we see that there was no such a thing as an audible voice here. Had this been the case, what need was there of so much trouble? The oracle could have said at once who the guilty person was, and to what tribe he belonged. We also see that the oracle was to be asked single questions; and only single answers were to be expected, as the words of verse 14 show. The tribes were first to present themselves, and the oracle was to indicate the tribe to which the guilty person belonged. That tribe was then to present itself, and the oracle was to indicate the family of which the guilty person was a member. That family was then to present itself, and the oracle was to point out the guilty individual.

We shall now describe the nature and construction of that wonderful oracle, and the manner in which its answers were given. We have already seen how the breastplate of judgment was made like a four-square box, a span in length, and a span in breadth. Into the front of it were inserted twelve precious stones of different natures and colours. They were set in golden frames, and were fastened to the breastplate, and formed the splendid front of the same. On each of these twelve stones the name of one of the sons of Jacob was engraven in Hebrew letters. One bore the name "Reuben," the other "Simeon," and so on. The front of this breastplate which contained these gems was not very thick, and the breastplate itself was empty within. Into the inside of the breastplate the Lord commanded Moses to put the Urim and the Thummim. The Hebrew word "Urim" signifies "lights," or "illuminators." It was no more than a lamp, with twelve lights, put into the breastplate. Within, each light was directed towards one of the precious stones, by which means the brilliancy and lustre of the gems were heightened to a great degree. But all the letters of the Hebrew alphabet did not occur in the twelve names on the breastplate. These four, ד. ז. ט. ה. were wanting. To supply this defect Moses was directed to make another stone with these four letters on it. This stone was called "Thummim," which signifies "the completers," or "the perfecters"; inasmuch as these four letters upon it completed the alphabet, and perfected the oracle for the purpose of giving answers. These lights and perfecters were put into the breastplate whenever the high priest had to enter the Most Holy, or when a matter of difficulty occurred in Church or State affairs. The Urim, or illuminating lights, were supplied with holy oil, and kindled with that sacred fire which came down from heaven upon the altar at the dedication of the tabernacle

(Lev. ix. 24). This fire was carefully preserved in the tabernacle till the time of Solomon. When that king dedicated the Temple and brought sacrifices upon the new altar which he had made, fire came down again from heaven upon the altar (2 Chron. vii. 1-3).

The wonderful manner in which the Divine revelations were made by this oracle may be explained in the following illustration. When Joshua came unto Eleazar the high priest (according to his received commandment, Numb. xxvii. 21) that he might ask counsel for him, according to the judgment of the Urim, before the Lord, the high priest put on his holy pontifical robes, and above it the ephod with the breastplate, which was illuminated by the Urim, and had the Thummim joined to it, on the side thereof. The high priest then directed his face towards the Most Holy, entreating the Lord to reveal the guilty individuals, while Joshua presented himself with the twelve elders of the tribes of Israel, in the open court of the tabernacle. Then the high priest put the simple question, "Which of the twelve tribes have sinned?" He looked upon the illuminated breastplate with its brilliant stones and saw that the first stone in the second row, which bore the name of Judah, was darkened and ceased to shine.

Then he called with a loud voice, "Judah!" The eleven princes were then dismissed, and the prince of Judah presented himself again with the fathers of the families of his tribe. The priest then again put the question, "Which family has sinned?" He looked again upon the breastplate and found that the family of the Zarchites was taken. But as this name is composed of four different letters, י, ה, ר, ז, which were not to be found complete in any of the twelve names of the breastplate, he found these different letters in different names. Thus he had to look over all the stones. He then saw, first, that the letter ז, in the name זבולן (Zebulun), was taken (viz., darkened); he next saw that the letter ר, in the name ראובן (Reuben), was taken. And when he saw no more letters upon the breastplate taken, and could make nothing of the two letters, ר, ז, which he had already got, he looked upon the Thummim on the right side of the breastplate and found that of its four letters the letter ה was taken. But no name was yet completed. He therefore looked once more upon the twelve stones, and found that the letter י, in the name Joseph, was taken. Now he had a complete name, זרחי (Zarchi); he therefore called aloud that "Zarchi" was taken. In the same manner, when the family of the Zarchites appeared man by man, and when the priest asked,

"Which man has sinned?" he looked upon the stones and saw letter after letter taken, of which, when he put them together in the same order in which they were taken, he made the name זבדי (Zabdi). He then communicated this name unto the public, and when they brought the household of Zabdi man by man, Achan was taken. When he was examined by Joshua he confessed his crime, in consequence of which he and all those who were involved in his crime were put to death as the Lord had commanded.

Such wonderful services this holy breastplate, and the Urim and Thummim, rendered unto Israel all the time of Joshua. By it the land of Canaan was divided (Josh. xviii. 6-10). By it Israel was directed in battle. By it every difficulty was removed, and every great and hard matter of controversy in judgment was decided. After the death of Joshua Israel asked the Lord which tribe should go first to fight against the Canaanites. The Lord's answer by this oracle was quite brief. "Jehudah yaleh" ("Judah shall go") (Judges i. 1-12). When Israel asked again who should go first to fight against Benjamin, the answer was, "Judah first" (Judges xx. 18). That this was done by the oracle is evident from the ninth verse of the same chapter, where Israel says, "We will go up by lot against it." Compare this with verse 18, "And the children of Israel arose, and went up to the house of God" (or to Bethel, where the tabernacle stood at that time, as verse 27 shows), "and asked counsel of God." Compare this with Numb. xxvii. 21, "Who shall ask counsel for him, after the judgment of the Urim, before the Lord." In every passage in the Old Testament scriptures where it is said that Israel or any person asked the Lord, and He answered, reference is made to the oracle Urim and Thummim, except in the lifetime of Moses, with whom the Lord spake face to face. King Saul, in his victorious war against the Philistines, asked the Lord if he should pursue his enemies the second day, but received no answer, because Jonathan his son had ignorantly transgressed against his father's oath in eating of the honey. Then Saul brought the people before the oracle, and said unto them, "Be ye on one side, and I and Jonathan, my son, on the other." He then said, "Lord God of Israel, give a perfect lot." So Jonathan and Saul were taken. Again the priest asked between Saul and Jonathan, and Jonathan alone was taken. Jonathan then confessed his guilt, and his readiness to die for it; but Israel prevailed with his father to spare his life (1 Sam. xiv. 18-20, 26-46). In Saul's last and unfortunate battle the Lord would not answer him by the Urim

and Thummim because of his manifold transgressions (1 Sam. xxviii. 6). He therefore betook himself in his despair to the witch of Endor (xxviii. 7-25). When he destroyed the priests of Noph, Abiathar, the son of the slain high priest, escaped and fled unto David, with the ephod and the oracle, Urim and Thummim. This rendered great and important services unto David, for he was instructed by it in all his afflictions and dangers.

David was the first person who consulted it without the tabernacle and was answered by it, for all the former consultations took place in the tabernacle, or at least before the ark of the covenant. But the Lord was pleased to answer David by this oracle in any place. According to the documents whence we have drawn the above information, this oracle ceased to answer after the death of David. Afterwards there was no other means of receiving instructions than by the prophets. Ezra and Nehemiah indeed wished that the Urim and Thummim would be restored unto Israel in the second Temple (Ezra ii. 62-64; Neh. vii. 64-66), but neither ark nor cherubim, nor Urim and Thummim, were ever restored unto Israel.

* Josephus indeed speaks of the breastplate occasionally shining during the second Temple, which shining, he says, ceased two hundred years before he commenced his work. But Josephus might have saved himself the trouble of making such an assertion, for we affirm on undeniable authority that neither were Urim and Thummim in the second Temple at all, nor did they in the first Temple return answers by shining, as that historian seems to imagine. Josephus would have acted much more honestly if he had let this matter alone altogether.

APPENDIX II

DEAN FARRAR ON THE "TERAPHIM"

NOTE TO CHAPTER I., PAGE 28.

AN example of the handling of Scripture by the "modern" critical school may be found in an article on the "Teraphim" by Dean Farrar in the third edition of Kitto's "Cyclopædia," which manifests the greatest confusion of thought imaginable. After summarising the earlier passages where the word is found, he comes to Hosea iii. 4, of which he says, "Here it would certainly be the *primâ facie* impression of every unbiassed reader that the *matzêbâh* and the *teraphim* are mentioned without blame as ordinary parts of religious worship.

"Without, however, entering into the question (which perhaps cannot be decided) whether Hosea did or did not mean to commend or tolerate these material adjuncts to a monotheistic worship, it is certainly not surprising that the reverence paid to the teraphim should have continued in Israel side by side with that paid to the calves, which beyond all doubt were intended to be mere Elohistical symbols."

This is unpardonable ignorance on the part of a would-be teacher, for it confounds God and Belial, and the symbols of the worship of Jehovah with the symbols of idolatry.

There cannot be the least question as to whether the prophet "did or did not mean to commend or tolerate these material adjuncts to a monotheistic worship," since he treats them not as appositions but as oppositions of the symbols of the worship of the true and living God. On this point the unconverted Rabbi whom I have quoted on page 9 has more spiritual and historical insight than the prominent Church dignitary. It is "certainly not at all surprising that the reverence paid to the teraphim should have continued in Israel side by side with that paid to

the calves" set up by Jeroboam, for both alike were idolatrous practices equally abominable in the sight of God, and a violation of His law.

Further down in his article, after summarising Spencer's absurd arguments to the effect that the teraphim and Urim and Thummim were identical, he says, "On the other hand, if in the above passages we have convincing proof that the use of teraphim was common, if not universal, among the early Hebrews, there are other passages which show that it was condemned, and that strongly, by the stricter Jehovahists." Some of "the main and certain results" which he gathers from his whole review of the subject are, "that the resort to teraphim was not a practice confined to Jews; that their use continued down to the latest period of Jewish history; and lastly, that although the more enlightened prophets and strictest later kings regarded them as idolatrous, the priests were much less averse to such images, and their cult was not considered in any way repugnant to the pious worship of Elohim, nay, even to the worship of him under the awful title of Jehovah. In fact they involved a monotheistic idolatry very different indeed from polytheism; and the tolerance of them by priests, as compared with the denunciation of them by the keener insight and more vivid inspiration of the prophets, offers a close analogy to the views of the Roman Catholics respecting pictures and images as compared with the views of Protestants. It was against this use of idolatrous symbols and emblems in a monotheistic worship that the Second Commandment was directed, whereas the first is aimed against the graver sin of direct polytheism. But the whole history of Israel shows how early and how utterly the law must have fallen into desuetude. The worship of the golden calf, and of the calves at Dan and Bethel, against which, so far as we know, neither Elijah nor Elisha said a single word; the tolerance of high places, teraphim and *baetylia*; the offering of incense for centuries to the brazen serpent destroyed by Hezekiah; the occasional glimpses of the most startling irregularities, sanctioned apparently even in the Temple worship itself, prove most decisively that a pure monotheism and an independence of symbols was the result of a slow and painful course of God's disciplinary dealings among the noblest thinkers of a single nation, and not, as is so constantly and erroneously urged, the instinct of the whole Semitic race; in other words, one single branch of the Semites was under God's providence educated into pure monotheism only by centuries of misfortune and series of inspired men."

This is a fine specimen of the new method : first misunderstand Scripture statements, and then represent the Bible as made up of conflicting "Codes," some written by more "tolerant priests" and "Eloists," and some by "the stricter Jehovahists," who differ on the legitimacy of such a cardinal point as idolatry which is most solemnly forbidden in the Ten Commandments. But some, at any rate, of Dr. Farrar's "certain results" are drawn purely from his own imagination.

There is not the slightest ground on a careful examination of the eight scriptures in question in which the teraphim are mentioned for the assertion that there is any difference of opinion in reference to them among the inspired writers. They all alike regarded them in the same light as iniquity, witchcraft, idolatry, and other "abominations" (1 Sam. xv. 23 ; 2 Kings xxiii. 24), and if one or another simply refer to them in passing as a matter of history, as they do to some of the other notorious sins of Israel, without stopping at the time to denounce them, it is no more fair to argue from the negative that they approve of them, than is the Dean's astounding conclusion that Elijah and Elisha did not object to the worship of the calves at Dan and Bethel because, "so far as we know, they said not a single word against it" !

It never seems to have struck the writer that in their faithful witness to the one true and living God, and in their denunciations of all apostasy from Him, this sin too was included. We might as well argue that because, "so far as we know," they did not say a single word in particular against breaches of some of the other of the Ten Commandments of which Israel was guilty, that therefore they approved of those transgressions !

The only grounds which Dean Farrar adduces (in a note) for the assertion that "the priests were much less averse to such 'images' and more tolerant to 'monotheistic' idolatry"—which, by the way, is an absurd paradox—are the conduct of Aaron in the matter of the golden calf ; the story of the vagrant Levite Jonathan in those wild and ignorant times, "who for his board and clothing and ten pieces of silver a year hired himself out to the Ephraimite Micah to become the obscure priest" of a cult in which the imperfect knowledge of Jehovah was mixed up with a "graven image and a molten image," which are an abomination in His sight ; and finally the conduct of the pliable priest Urijah, who at the command of the wicked King Ahaz introduced into the Temple of God an altar after the fashion of an idolatrous altar which the king saw in Damascus.

Now it would be quite as fair and logical to argue from the

fact that because two or three priests were guilty of the crime of murder or adultery that therefore the priests as an order were "less averse" and "more tolerant" of these sins than "the keener-sighted" prophets!

As to Aaron's conduct, into which, according to his excuse to Moses, he was driven out of fear for the people. Moses, too, was a priest, and what he and the whole tribe of the Levites thought of it is answered by their slaughter among the people in one day of three thousand men. And as to Jonathan, whom Dean Farrar quotes as an example of the priests, the inspired (priestly) chronicler (1 Chron. xxiii. 15, 17) is so ashamed of him that he does not record his name among the sons of Gershom, and therefore stops with the firstborn. That Gershom had other sons may be inferred from the fact that of his brother Eliezer, who only had one son, the fact is recorded.

This desire to efface Jonathan from the priestly register, or at any rate from the register of the family of Moses to which he really belonged, is to be observed from the insertion of the hanging Hebrew letter *nun*, by which the name of "Moses" is turned into "Manasseh" (see the Hebrew of Judges xviii. 30), by which the early scribes meant to convey the hint that he was more worthy to be a descendant of the wicked and idolatrous king of that name than of the great lawgiver.

Then, finally, as to Urijah, who introduced that unauthorised altar into the Temple, the connection of which with the subject of the teraphim I fail to see, he was as much a model priest as Ahaz, by whose command he acted, was a model king.

In the last paragraph of Dr. Farrar's article which I have quoted, we observe in veiled language the great fallacy common to this school of writers. Instead of judging the conduct and failures of Israel by the divinely revealed law, which was perfect from the beginning, they are apt to form certain notions about the law from the conduct of the people; thus the non-observance or transgression of certain laws has been used by these writers as a proof of their non-existence at the time, and as an argument for the theory of a much later origin.

It was not the result "of a slow and painful course" of discipline "among the noblest thinkers" that men finally arrived at "a pure monotheism and independence of symbols," but as the result of a self-revelation on the part of the true and living God, to which man is ever slow to respond.

As already said in the section in Chapter I. which I have devoted to this subject, the history of Israel as of Christendom

teaches man the humbling lesson that not only can he not by searching find God, but that even when the knowledge of God is divinely communicated to him he is unable, left to himself, to retain that knowledge in his heart, and is apt to fall back into idolatry whether literal or spiritual.

APPENDIX III

THE STRUCTURE OF THE SECOND HALF OF THE BOOK OF ISAIAH

NOTE TO CHAPTER II., PAGE 43.

“THE Book of Consolations,” as the Rabbis call the second half of Isaiah, consists for the most part of the general announcement of a glorious future of salvation and peace, but often the salvation which the prophet foretells, is defined and specified. The message embraces a twofold promise.

First, the certain restoration from the Babylonish captivity, which is portrayed in terms which far exceed what actually took place at that restoration, and which will only be exhausted and fulfilled in the greater restoration of Israel “from all the four corners of the earth.” The very instrument who should be the means of the minor restoration (Cyrus) is foretold, and called by name more than 150 years before he was born.

But the theme with which the prophet’s soul is full and to which his thoughts ever recur, even while he deals with the minor deliverance, is the grand redemption and salvation to be accomplished by one greater than Cyrus, even by Messiah—a salvation of which Israel is the centre, and all the ends of the earth the circumference.

In dealing with this greater salvation the relation of time is not observed. “Now, the prophet beholds the author of it in His humiliation and suffering, then the most distant future of Messiah’s kingdom presents itself to his enraptured eye—the time when Israel shall walk in the light of Jehovah and all the Gentile world shall be converted to Him; when all that is opposed to God shall be destroyed; when inward and outward peace shall prevail and all evil caused by sin shall be removed.” Elevated above time and space, his own soul full of rapturous

enthusiasm for the Redeemer-King, Isaiah in these twenty-seven chapters surveys the whole development of the Messianic kingdom from its small beginning to its glorious end, and gives us the fullest portrayal of Messiah's person and mission, humiliation and exaltation to be found in the Old Testament.

On examining this glorious prophecy closely we find that the twenty-seven chapters range themselves into three equal smaller cycles of nine chapters each, all ending with nearly the same solemn refrain, "there is no peace saith my God to the wicked." The subject is the development and certain overthrow of the evil and the wicked, who are excluded from all the blessings of Messiah's kingdom; and the sufferings but final glory of the righteous remnant who are the subjects of that kingdom, whose King is described as passing through the same path of suffering to the glory that should follow. The subject treated throughout the three sections becomes developed and intensified as we go along until it reaches its climax in the last chapter. The first section is brought to a close at the end of chapter *xlvi*., where the blessedness of the righteous who are "redeemed" (verse 20) and peacefully led and satisfied even in the desert, is contrasted with the state of the wicked to whom "there is no peace."

In the second division the same subject becomes intensified, there is development of both evil and good, righteousness and wickedness, and it ends with chapter *lvii*. where "Peace! peace!" is announced to the righteous, but the wicked have not only "no peace," but having grown in wickedness, have become like the troubled sea when it cannot rest, whose waters cast up mire and dirt.

In the last division the destiny of both is brought to a climax and become fixed for ever. "Therefore thus saith Jehovah God, Behold My servants shall eat, but ye shall be hungry; behold My servants shall drink, but ye shall be thirsty; behold My servants shall rejoice, but ye shall be ashamed; behold My servants shall sing for joy of heart, but ye shall cry for sorrow of heart and shall howl for vexation of spirit. And ye shall leave your name for a curse unto My chosen, for the Lord God shall slay thee and call His servants by another name." This contrast is continued until finally we find the righteous dwelling for ever in the new heavens and the new earth wherein shall dwell righteousness, while as to the wicked who have transgressed against God, "their worm shall not die neither shall their fire be quenched, and they shall be an abhorring to all flesh."

The heart and Messianic climax of the whole prophecy is to

be found in its inmost centre, which, instead of a prophecy uttered centuries in advance, reads like an historic summary of the Gospel narrative of the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow. Taking our position at this central point we are almost overwhelmed with the evidence of design in the very structure of this prophecy, for on closer examination we find that each book is subdivided into three sections of three chapters each, nearly corresponding to the divisions in the Authorised Version. Thus the middle book is xlix.-lvii. The middle section of the middle book is chapters lii., liii., liv., and chapter liii. is the middle chapter of the middle section of the middle book—forming, as it were, the heart and centre of this wonderful Messianic poem, as well as the heart and centre of all Old Testament prophecy. The central verse of this central paragraph, which begins properly with chapter lii. 13, is: "He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement with the view to our peace was upon Him, and with His stripes we are healed." The doctrine it enshrines (substitution) is the essence of the teaching in Old and New Testaments, as well as the central truth of the prophecy. It is moreover, the essence of the message of comfort with which the prophet begins (xl. 1, 2), solving the problem as to how "her iniquity is pardoned."



University of California
SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1388
Return this material to the library
from which it was borrowed.

Q1 OCT 18 1999

OCT 09 '01

1A
Vr



3 1158 01125 5931

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A 000 046 910 6

