

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE JEWS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN MIRROR.

DEAR SIR,—A few words respecting my first communication, under the above heading, appears to me to be necessary. I had heard it stated in a certain place, by a high authority, that "the Jewish nation is the only one of all the nations of antiquity, that remains to the present time." This proposition I considered incorrect, and to prove it so, adduced the Arabs and Chinese.

The Arabs of the desert, or Bedouin Arabs, are confessedly the descendants of Ishmael the son of Abraham, and, therefore, are of *equally remote antiquity* with the Jews.

The Chinese are allowed on all hands to be one of the oldest nations in the world; if their own statements be correct, they are *older* than the world itself. There is no doubt of their antiquity *being equally remote* as the Jews.

I also heard it stated by the same authority, and have frequently met with the remark in the course of my reading, that "the fact of the Jews having mixed with other nations, and yet remaining distinct and separate, is a *standing miracle*, and is to be attributed solely to a Divine Providence." To show that they are not the only people who have mingled with other nations without amalgamating, I referred to the Gypsies; to whom, by the way, if Johnson and Walker be correct, we may apply the term *nation* without any "concession of courtesy." This people have mixed with nearly all the nations of the earth for centuries, and are still as distinct and separate as are the Jews. My argument is this: If a Divine Providence be absolutely required in one case, it is in the other also; but if the phenomenon with respect to the Gypsies can be accounted for on simple and natural principles, without referring it to Providential interference, then it is possible, nay probable, that similar causes may have operated in preserving the Jews, as they are, a separate and a wicked people. In order to show the extent to which the Gypsies are scattered, and also to make it appear that in all cases they are not a mere "predatory tribe," I cite the following:—

"There is scarcely a part of the habitable globe where they are not to be found; their tents are alike pitched on the heights of Brazil and the ridges of the Himalayan hills, and their language is heard at Moscow and Madrid, in the streets of London and Stamboul."—*Borrow's Gypsies of Spain*.

"For near four centuries they have wandered thro' the world, and in every region, and among every people, whether barbarous or civilised, THEY HAVE CONTINUED UNCHANGED."—*Encyclop., art. Gypsies*.

"Those who have been accustomed to consider the Gypsy as a wandering outcast, incapable of appreciating the blessings of a settled and civilised life, or of abandoning his vagabond propensities and becoming stationary; as one who never ascends higher than the condition of a low trafficker; will be surprised to learn, that amongst the Gypsies of Moscow there are not a few who inhabit stately houses, go abroad in elegant equipages, and are behind the higher orders of the Russians neither in appearance nor mental acquirements."—*Borrow's Gypsies of Spain*.

And yet, whether moving in the highest circles, or mixing among the lowest of his race, he is still *separate*.

Your respected correspondent, "A Believer in a Millennium," &c. has employed the whole of his second letter, embracing nearly three columns, in an attempt to nullify the conclusions which may plainly and obviously be gathered from these facts. Whether he has succeeded is not for me to say,—let your readers judge. The whole of his argument reduces itself to a small compass, and may be summed up as follows:—

"There are six striking points of difference between the Jews and those nations to whom J. H. has compared them. Therefore, the Arabs and Chinese must not be compared to them, as being of equally remote antiquity; nor the Gypsies be compared with them, as retaining their identity and distinctness, though scattered through all the nations of the earth."

The "inconclusiveness" of such reasoning must be manifest to every reader, and will, I fear, fail to sa-

tisfy even those whose views respecting the Jews agree with those of your correspondent.

Your correspondent introduces the learned Dr. Taylor, supported by Dr. A. Clarke. Now I question whether, with all his "deep acquaintance with the Greek and Hebrew scriptures," "A Believer" would be willing to endorse ALL his opinions; and if he be wrong in an important doctrine, surely he may be fallible on a question of comparatively small moment. I may here mention once for all, that human authorities alone weigh not a feather in the balance of my own judgment. To the "law and the testimony," and to that only, let your correspondent appeal, or acknowledge that he has lost his argument. His own unsupported opinion, I value as much as any of the most learned authorities he can quote.

When men, and good men too, assert that Divine Providence is engaged in preserving the Jew in all his sins and ceremonies, his prejudices against the Gentiles, and implacable hatred to Christ and his people,—is it any wonder that the sneers of infidelity are excited?

"Ye are," says the Saviour, "of your father the devil, and the works of your father ye will do." John viii. 44. And again, by his servant John to the church of Smyrna, "I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan." Rev. ii. 9. The wicked character of this people is the same now that it was then—they have actually become proverbial for wickedness; and yet, forsooth, some will say, Divine Providence sustains them thus, and great and glorious blessings are in reversion for them! I must here suppress expressions which had nearly escaped my pen, lest I should again excite regret in your esteemed correspondent, by "sympathising even in appearance with a scornful and slipshod infidelity."

But it is not infrequently said that "the preservation of the Jews is a proof of the Divine authenticity and inspiration of the Bible." Thank God, there is plenty of evidence of the Divine authority and inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, independently of the fact of the Jews' preservation. Had every soul of that people been converted centuries ago, and thus become lost by amalgamation among the mass of mankind, there would not be wanting still abundant proofs to explode all the objections of infidelity; and our holy religion would stand where it now stands, on the rock of eternal truth, the "WORD OF GOD ALONE," unshaken neither by the assaults of men nor devils.

I shall now bestow a passing remark on the 11th of Romans. In the 1st and 2d verses, the Apostle plainly declares that "God hath not cast away his people," the Jews, so as to place them beyond the possibility of being saved; but in the 15th, 19th and 20th verses, he speaks of them as being "cast away," "broken off," and "diminished." Does not the Apostle, then, contradict what he had stated in the 1st and 2d verses of the chapter? By no means. The "casting away," in the 15th, and "broken off," in the 19th and 20th verses, as I understand it, simply means, that God no longer regarded them as **EXCLUSIVELY** his church and people, as they had been previously. This sense alone, I conceive, explains how the fall of them was "the riches of the world," as well as their own fulness. By the death of Christ they fell from having the exclusive right of being God's people,—by that death the "middle wall of partition," represented by that which separated the Jewish and Gentile worshippers in the temple, was taken away,—by that death the believing Jew was introduced into a "fulness" to which he was before a stranger,—and now, in order to be a partaker of the blessings of the New Covenant, every Jew must come by the "new and living way," even by Him whom they crucified. Many have already been "grafted in" in this way, and doubtless there will be many more—for "God is able to graft them in" "if they abide not in unbelief." The introduction of the Christian dispensation broke up the Jewish economy and system. It is now "cast away"—but it is "cast away" only to give place to a system of Divine mercy more transcendantly glorious. Hence, the "diminishing" of the Jews was not only the "enriching" of the Gen-

tiles, but was "much more" the "fulness" of the believing Jews. This is paradoxical, but not more so than the language of the chapter. But, "All Israel shall be saved"—yes, all the spiritual Israel—for "the Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith the Lord." Isa. lix. 20.

These remarks are not intended as an exposition of the chapter; but they may serve as a key to its being better understood. THE CHAPTER IS NOT A PROPHECY; and the only ground for supposing the Apostle meant that the Jews as a nation will be converted, is a few incidental hints, which, regarded in the abstract, might and indeed have led some well-meaning persons to imagine that the conversion of the Jews is the *burden* of the chapter.

In order more fully to ascertain the views of the inspired Apostle respecting the ultimate conversion of his kinsmen according to the flesh, let us turn to the 3d and 4th chapters of Galatians. And here let me entreat the Christian reader to lay aside his preconceived notions of the "bringing in of the carnal Jews," though these notions may be as old as a thousand other errors that obtain in Christendom, and be supported by great and venerable names—and hear and consider what the Word of God saith:—

"Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, *which is Christ*." Gal. iii. 16.

"And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Ver. 29.

These verses require no comment; they plainly teach that the *fleshy relation with Abraham is abolished*, and that a *spiritual one alone is established*; agreeably to the words of the Baptist,—*"Think not to say within yourselves we have Abraham to our Father, for I say unto you that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham."* Matt. iii. 9. "Henceforth," says the Apostle, "know we no man after the flesh; yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more." 2 Cor. v. 16. "They answered and said unto him, Abraham is our Father. Jesus said unto them, *if ye were Abraham's children ye would do the works of Abraham.*" John viii. 39. Christ and his people are the seed of Abraham and the heirs according to promise. Where, then, is the ground of hope for the carnal Jew, who can apply the promises to himself only because he is of Abraham according to the flesh, being circumcised?

Turn we now to the 4th chapter of Galatians, from the 22d verse to the end of the chapter: "For it is written that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a free woman. Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from Mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar." Here we are told that Abraham, having two sons, the one by a bondmaid, and the other by a free woman, is an allegory—Christ and his people being represented by the free woman and her son, and the Jewish nation by the bondwoman and her child Ishmael: "for this Agar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with **HER CHILDREN.**" "Nevertheless, what saith the Scripture, *Cast out the bond woman and her son, for the son of the bond woman shall not be heir with the son of the free woman.*" I, therefore, conclude that if the *whole* of the Jewish nation are brought into the Church of Christ at any time, the allegory will not hold correct,—and that as the Ishmaelites, the descendants of the son of the bond woman, were never as a nation incorporated with the Israelites, so the Jews, who in the allegory are represented by Agar and her son, will never as a nation be incorporated with the people of God (the Church of Christ), who in the allegory are represented by the free woman and her son.

These views will probably have more weight with your correspondent, when I remind him that they are corroborated by him whom he justly styles "that devout scholar, Dr. A. Clarke." In his comment on Gal. iv. 25, he says:

"Hagar the bond woman bringing forth children in a state of slavery, answereth to Jerusalem that now is, points out or bears a similitude to Jerusalem in