

THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR;

OR,

NOTES AND QUERIES ON SCRIPTURAL SUBJECTS.

[PUBLISHED ON ALTERNATE SATURDAYS.]

VOL. IV.—No. 91.

JANUARY 17, 1857.

[Price Threepence.
Stamped Edition, 4d.]

THE ANNOTATOR:—

The Lord of Glory, by the Rev. R. J. McGhee—Justification, by the Rev. R. W. Dibdin—The Times of the Gentiles, by the Rev. S. Madden
Prov. xiv. 24, by Rev. A. Roberts—1 Cor. i. 20—Proper Names in Scripture, by Rev. B. W. Savile—Lookings

1—3
3, 4

THE REPLICANT:—

Matt. vii. 8—xvi. 25, 26—xvi. 28, and Luke xxii. 36, by Rev. D. Nihill—xxii. 44, by Rev. A. Roberts—Acts ii. 27, by the Bishop of Cashel
Rom. viii. 19-22, by W. Weekes—1 Cor. xv. 29—2 Cor. v. 9—Col. i. 18, by Rev. H. E. Brooke
Heb. ii. 11, by Rev. T. Myers—xl. 21, by C. E. Stuart—Rev. v. 9, 10, by W. Kelly
Atonement—Letter from Professor Tischendorf

4—7
8, 9
10, 11
11, 12

THE QUERIST:—

Dent. xxviii. 68, by the Rev. J. F. Beddy—Psalm xvii. 14, by J. G. Child—Psalm cx. 1, with 1 Cor.

xv. 26, and Rev. xx. 14—Psalm cxxxvi. 15, by C. E. Stuart—Ecc. iv. 9, 10—Dan. vii. 11, with Rev. xix. 20, by A. Hall—Dan. ix. 27, 28—Hab. ii. 4
Matt. xlii. xlii. 24, &c. by the Rev. Z. J. Edwardes—xxiv. 3—Mark i. 24—John v. 29—xviii. 15—1 Thess. iv. 1, 2—Bengel's Gnomon, by the Rev. F. Baldey
The Church—The Literal Interpretation of Unfulfilled Prophecy—On the Lord's Supper—Greek Testaments, by the Rev. C. J. Coombe

12—14
14
15, 16

THE CRITIC.

The Bible Treasury—The Abuse of the Decalogue—"Christ is all," by Archdeacon Law—The Friends of Christ in the New Testament, by Neh. Adams, D.D.

16

NOTICE

16

The Annotator.

THE LORD OF GLORY.

It has frequently occurred to me, and, as I have not seen it noticed, I venture to suggest it to your readers, that one very conclusive and direct proof of the Godhead of our blessed Redeemer appears in the fact that none of the inspired writers, none of the prophets or apostles, nor any one whose name is mentioned in the Holy Scriptures, our blessed Lord alone excepted, ever voluntarily performed any act for the purpose or with the object of fulfilling a Divine prediction. All those who fulfilled any prediction unconsciously, did so as those who crucified the Lord of Glory, or the soldiers who parted His garments among them, and cast lots upon His vesture. But who but Jehovah, in the contemplation of events, could say, "How then shall the Scriptures be fulfilled that thus it must be?" (Mat. xxvi. 54). Of whom but God manifested in the flesh could it be written, "Jesus, knowing that all things were now accomplished, that the Scripture might be fulfilled, saith, I thirst" (John xix. 28). It is unnecessary to offer as a comment on the facts that none but God could really know the mind of God; and that none but He

who inspired a prediction could certainly affirm of any act that that act was its intended accomplishment.

Thus, in the very act of riding into Jerusalem on an ass, "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet," the meek and lowly Jesus evinced, in fulfilling the first part of that prediction (Zec. ix. 9, 10), that He was indeed the King of Glory as much as when He shall fulfil the second part of it—when "His dominion shall be from sea even to sea, and from the river even unto the ends of the earth"—when the heaven shall be opened, and He who maketh the clouds His chariot shall come forth on the white horse, wearing His many crowns on His head, with "His name written on His vesture and His thigh, KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS" (Rev. xix. 11—16). I merely suggest the idea—it might be expanded into volumes.

It might, perhaps, be objected that John the Baptist appears an exception to this, because he stated of himself that he was the fulfiller of a prophecy—nay, the very predicted one himself—"I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness," &c. (John i. 23.)

But, in answer to that, it is clear that, in the first place, this was a revelation made of John to his father Zacharias (Luke i. 76); and, in the

next place, that it was directly revealed to John himself by the Holy Spirit, as he states in the same chapter (John i. 29—34).

The more the subject is investigated in the light of Divine truth the more interesting will its development appear; and that the predictions concerning the Lord of Glory do not more fully testify the inspiration of the sacred volume than His own intentional fulfilment of them demonstrates that, as "the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy," the testimony of prophecy flows from the spirit of Jesus. R. J. M'GHEE.

JUSTIFICATION.

There may be many counted righteous before God who are far from having a clear intellectual perception of the doctrine of justification by faith. It is not believing doctrinal truths but believing in Christ which renders a sinner acceptable to God. A sinner may confound pardon and justification and yet be pardoned and justified. There are some who say that acquittal, pardon, and justification, mean all the same thing, and that these three terms may be used as synonymous; but to me they convey three different meanings. Acquittal implies that the accused is pronounced not guilty; pardon, that he is declared guilty but his punishment remitted; justification, that he is counted righteous, not merely innocent, but entitled to reward. Instead of being acquitted, a saved sinner pleads guilty, and is forgiven, and, being forgiven, the righteousness of Christ is imputed to him through faith, and thus he is justified. Christ bore his punishment as a substitute, that he might be forgiven—Christ fulfilled the righteousness of the law, as his substitute, that he might be justified.

However clear and scriptural this statement appears to me, I by no means think that none will be saved but those by whom it is received. All error compatible with an undivided dependence on Christ for salvation may be held, if not without loss, at least without eternal destruction. When error leads the sinner from entire trust in Christ it becomes fatal. Hence all dependence on works, whether ceremonial or moral, for justification, is deadly error. No hope of salvation is warranted by the Bible in such a case, because God never taught any one, either by His word or by His spirit, to trust in anything but His Son for acceptance. And none but such as are taught of God will be saved.

They who interpret Scripture so as to confound sanctification with justification shew thereby that they are not led of the spirit in this matter, for justification relates to what has been done *for* a sinner, sanctification to what has been done *in* him.

R. W. DIBDIN.

THE TIMES OF THE GENTILES.

Luke xxi. 24—27. . . . and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.

A consideration of this passage may throw some light on the litigated question, whether the Second Advent of our Lord is pre or post-millennial. Our Lord, looking onward into the future, gives us a picture of what shall be the state of things till the event predicted in the twenty-seventh verse—and the picture is in dark colours. Many apply this and its parallel passages to the destruction of Jerusalem; but this plainly reaches on far beyond that event, for here the continuous treading down of Jerusalem is predicted, and its period is "till the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled." No one can deny that Jerusalem has been trodden down of the Gentiles ever since Titus destroyed it. The mosque of Omar standing on the ruins of the temple bears a present witness to the fact. How long is this to continue? "Till the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." But what are these times? Can there be a doubt that they are those times during which the Gentiles bear rule in the earth, over and to the exclusion of the Jews? The times included in Daniel's visions of the image, and of the four beastial empires, seem to be those meant by "the times of the Gentiles;" for since the beginning of those times the Jews have been more or less a distressed people, persecuted and trodden down by Gentile oppressors. Now if the times of the image and four beastial kingdoms of Daniel are the same as the times of the Gentiles, then, if we can find out when or by what event any one of them is terminated, that will tell us the termination of all. And there is a very remarkable coincidence in the termination of all these times. The image, Dan. ii. is destroyed, i. e. its time fulfilled, by "a stone cut out without hands," which smites it on its feet, and which then becomes "a great mountain and fills the whole earth;" a prophecy interpreted thus: "the God of Heaven shall set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed" (ver. 44). The fourth beastial kingdom continues "until the Ancient of days comes," and "the time comes that the saints possess the kingdom" (Dan. vii). And so in the place before us. "Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled," and then sundry signs having been given, "and then shall they see the Son of Man coming in a cloud with power and great glory." I do not delay to prove that this means a real visible coming: for, besides that the natural meaning of the words leaves no room for doubt, I do not wish to occupy too much space. We find then that in these three places a most remarkable event closes the times of the Gentiles; and there can be no hesi-

tation, as I suppose, if it is agreed that the three times are the same, to agree also to use the terminating event (as described by the Son of Man himself) to interpret the other two. If this be done, we conclude that the times of the image—which are the times of the beastial kingdoms—which are the times of the Gentiles, all close at the visible coming of our Lord Himself. But where in any one of these three synchronising prophecies have we the least hint of a Millennium intervening before the great concluding event? Take our Lord's own prophecy—is it not one of darkness and woe “until the times of Gentiles be fulfilled?” Is there a word in it of an over-spreading of the earth with true religion—in fact of a Millennium—between the time when visible on Mount Olivet he uttered this prophecy, and the time when He is to be seen again? Or do either of Daniel's prophetic visions promise such a time previous to the coming of the Ancient of days? All are silent on the subject—the Lord gives no promise of a Millennium intervening between the times of the Gentiles and that time when they shall “see the Son of Man coming:” we therefore have no right to expect it. But as a Millennium is promised, and will be given in its right place, if it is not before it must be after our Lord's coming; and therefore His coming must be pre and not post-millennial.

Attanna, Durrow.

SAML. MADDEN.

Proverbs xiv. 24. The foolishness of fools is folly.

There is a seeming truism or tautology here. Are Schultens and Parkhurst authorised in giving to the first *חילוק* the sense of “opulence,” and conceiving that the adage plays, as it were, on the double meaning of the word? They render it “The crown (or diadem) of the wise is their riches, but the opulence of fools is gross folly.”

Woodrising Rectory.

ARTHUR ROBERTS.

1 Corinthians i. 30.—The object of this verse is to secure for God all the glory of our salvation (ver. 31). Hence the Apostle (1) assigns the work to God; and (2) dilates on its excellency.

(1) He assigns the work to God alone—*ἐξ αὐτοῦ*, “of Him.” That the phrase means, “it is God's doing altogether, it is His alone: here none acts but God,” &c. (See Rom. xi. 36; 1 Cor. viii. 6; xi. 12; 2 Cor. v. 18.) The opposite to this is *ἐξ ἑαυτῶν*, *ἐξ ὑμῶν*, &c. (2 Cor. iii. 1, 5). Thus the glory belongs of right to God exclusively.

(2) He dilates on the excellency of the work of salvation.

i. “Ye are in Christ Jesus.” This is a translation out of the old Adam into the new man—

“the Lord from heaven” (1 Cor. xv. 22). “In Christ,” as the member is in the body, the branch in the vine, the stone in the building, &c. (2 Cor. v. 17; Ephes. v. 30; John xv. 5; 1 Peter ii. 4, 5).

ii. “Who is made unto us wisdom from God.” Here Christ is spoken of, not personally, as “the all-wise God;” but relatively, as preached and offered to us in the Gospel. “Who” is used in the same sense as “Christ crucified” (ver. 23; chap. ii. 2). And thus Christ becomes to believers “the wisdom of God” (ver. 24), *i. e.* “the word of the Gospel,” which is “foolishness to the carnal mind,” when it becomes to the soul “the power of God unto salvation,” illustrates and magnifies “the wisdom of God,” proves that this means of salvation is wisdom from God—*αὐτοῦ Θεοῦ* (vers. 18—21). Thus the instrumentality in our salvation is “of God,” and therefore His is the praise.

iii. And, then, the full tide of consequent blessings to the believer is “of God,” and to His glory. For Christ “is made unto us righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.”

a. “Righteousness.” This is the benefit of justification (Rom. iii. 21—26; 2 Cor. v. 21).

β. “Sanctification.” This follows on justification, and is continued, and increases, in this present life-time by the operation of the Holy Ghost (Rom. vi. 22; viii. 4, 29; 2 Cor. iii. 18; Titus ii. 14; Jude 1).

γ. “Redemption.” This is not redemption from guilt and wrath (Rom. iii. 24; Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14; Heb. ix. 15), for that has been mentioned as “righteousness;” but redemption from mortality, death, &c. at “the resurrection of the just” (Rom. viii. 23; Eph. i. 14; iv. 30).

“Salvation to God and the Lamb!”

Bexley.

T. H.

P.S. Since writing the above, your remarks (in p. 465) have met my eye. May I add an observation or two, then, without claiming for myself the character of an “honoured and revered divine?”

There are four principal steps in the salvation of believers—justification, adoption, sanctification, and redemption.

Justification affects the believer's standing before God as his Judge. It is a forensic term, a legal act. It includes the acquittal from sin, guilt, and condemnation—and the accounting righteous and entitled to eternal life—at the bar of God (Rom. v. 1, 2; Titus iii. 7). This benefit is received by virtue of Christ, our atonement and law-fulfiller, with whom, in this respect and to this end, we are made one in believing (2 Cor. v. 21).

Adoption is consequent on justification (the sinner must be legally acquitted and accounted righteous before he can be admitted into the family); and is a transition, in respect of relationship to God, from being an enemy and an abomi-

nation to being a child and beloved. This also is a benefit enjoyed, not for our perfection before God "as obedient children," but again through union with Christ, the well-beloved by faith (Gal. iii. 24—27; iv. 5); and the title to heaven, won for us by Christ and accounted to us in justification, then becomes our own by inheritance with Christ (Rom. viii. 17).

Sanctification is consequent on adoption, and is our being made meet for our inheritance as children, and is progressive during our earthly course. In adoption we receive the spirit of children to make us children in spirit and practice by sanctification; and this sanctification is being carried on by the Holy Ghost, in the use of means of grace, by the help of corrections, amidst tribulations, and against all oppositions, until death (Rom. vi. 22; viii. 24—30). This benefit, likewise, is received from Christ, and by abiding union with Him, in believing (John xv. 5).

Finally, redemption closes the whole blessed series of consequences with "everlasting life," in body and spirit, in the "new heavens and new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness," and still again in union with Christ (1 John iii. 2, 3; 1 Thes. iv. 14—17). Then the inheritance is taken possession of (Matt. xxv. 34).

PROPER NAMES IN SCRIPTURE.

The learned Dr. Kennicott observes that "men who have read their Bible with care must have remarked that the name of the same person is often expressed differently in different places. Indeed the variation is so great that we can scarcely persuade ourselves that one and the same person is really meant." He gives more-over a list, which your readers, when "searching the Scriptures," may be glad to know exists, of no less than twenty-three instances of the same word being written in two different ways in the Hebrew, as *e.g.* Gen. xlv. 21, a person is termed "Ard," which in 1 Chron. viii. 3, is written "Addar;" to which I would add a twenty-fourth instance, as throughout Jeremiah, with but one or two exceptions, and in Ezekiel, the king of Babylon is called Nebuchadrezzar, whereas elsewhere in Scripture he is universally known as Nebuchadnezzar. So also in our English version, the same word in Hebrew is variously translated in no less than thirty-one different places, *e.g.* *Cainan* (Gen. v. 9) is called *Kenan* (1 Chron. i. 2), *Saul* (Gen. xxxvi. 37) is *Shaul* (1 Chron. i. 48), *Raames* (Exod. i. 11) is written *Rameses* (Exod. iii. 37).

In the event of any authorised attempt at improving our noble version, it is to be hoped such a matter as this may receive consideration and correction.

Newport.

B. W. SAVILE.

LOOKINGS.

I. A word for all:—

2 John 8.—"Look to yourselves," to see what manner of persons you are in the sight of God—born of water only, or also of the spirit.

II. A word for the impenitent:—

Hebrews x. 27.—"A certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries."

III. A word for those who are convinced of sin:—

Hebrews xii. 2.—"Looking unto Jesus." Look to Him, incarnate, suffering, atoning. Look, till the love of Christ constrain you.

IV. A word for the Christian:—

Titus ii. 13.—"Looking for that blessed hope,"—yea, and what is the blessed hope? not, verily, the peace and rest of the separate spirit, true and unbroken though they be, but "the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ."

M—Manse.

M. S. J.

The Replicant.

Matthew vii. 8. Every one that asketh receiveth.

Vol. III. 422, 492.

Is not Peter's counsel to Simon the sorcerer, "Repent, therefore, of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee," an exhortation to a dead sinner to pray? "Every one that asketh receiveth;" and who have more need to ask than those who have nothing? When we call on sinners to pray, we do not call on them to offer dead, unbelieving prayers, any more than, when we call on sinners to believe, we call for a dead faith. Does not the very first exercise of faith almost always vent itself in prayer? Witness the publican. Suppose that he went to pray, following out the counsel given him by a minister (a thing easily supposable), would any one say that that minister had done wrong? Suppose the same thing of the thief on the cross. Where there appears to be prayer there appears to be also faith; but we are very sure that there is no faith where there is no prayer. And to call on sinners to pray is just to call on them to exercise faith in a perceptible and tangible manner.

Morayshire.

W. D.

[Is it not the safest, and the most scriptural plan, to tell a sinner to "believe in the Lord Jesus Christ?" Without faith he cannot certainly pray; once he has faith, prayer will instantly follow. Judgment and discrimination are needed.—Ed.]

Matthew xvi. 25, 26. Vol. II. 201.—The late Professor Scholefield, on a parallel passage to this, in Mark viii. 36, translates *χρῆν* by life.

He says, "The same word is rendered 'life' in the preceding verse; and it is a violent and unnatural perversion of the common usages of language to suppose the same word to be employed so differently in the same argument."

The sentiment of the passage may be illustrated by Job ii. 4.

Dover.

R. K.

Matthew xvi. 28. Vol. III. 294, 337, 350, 399, 415, 431, 461.—Mr. CAINE asks "Mr. NIBILL and those who think that the passage refers to the transfiguration, to harmonise with their view that which has always presented a difficulty, viz. what Dr. Blomfield calls the 'air of the words suggesting a distant event.'"

To so insubstantial an argument as "the air of the words," may well be opposed the stronger current of the entire context. In the three Evangelists who record the transfiguration there is a marked connection between that event and Our Lord's previous assertion that some then present should see, before death, the kingdom of God come with power. The transfiguration seems both a fulfilment and an explanation of his words. When else did any then living see the kingdom of God come with power? We should remember the ambiguous tone in which our Lord frequently spoke. No doubt one wise reason for such ambiguity was to put his hearers upon the exercise of serious and discriminative reflection. His use of the word "heaven" is an instance. We may likewise remember his answer to the inquiry of Peter, as to what should become of John, and the error founded upon it. As to the fulfilment within a few days of the promise of seeing the kingdom of God, it is perfectly consistent with the language. The mere phrase "shall not taste of death" settles nothing, but that it should be in their lifetime. It is as indefinite indeed as the parties themselves, whose names Our Lord did not specify. On another occasion Christ said to a fig-tree, "Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward for ever." These words on the surface seem to indicate the perpetual barrenness of the tree during the many years it might naturally live rather than its immediate destruction; and it would seem that, like Dr. Blomfield, the disciples took this to be "the air of the words." But they were wrong, "and marvelled, saying, how soon is the fig-tree withered away."

Compare the Evangelists with themselves. St. Luke represents Christ saying, he shall be ashamed of some when he comes in his glory. "But" (he adds, connecting the sentences by the word "but,") there be some present who shall see the kingdom of God before they die. Is not the kingdom of God then the glory referred to? Luke makes this plainer, for he then proceeds, "And it came to pass about an eight days after

these sayings," thus connecting what came to pass with what went before. What he describes is Christ taking up three of the persons so present at the previous conversation, and being transfigured before them. Nor is this all. He plainly tells us that to see Christ transfigured was to see "his glory." What glory? That in the context no doubt. But in what sense did they see his glory, or, in other words, "the kingdom of God?" Not certainly in all that plenitude in which it will yet be displayed. We cannot understand it as meant of that glory in which he will shew himself ashamed of those now ashamed of him—of that kingdom which was not to come for above a thousand years after the death of all then present; but we can understand it as a sample of that glory in which he will appear when he cometh in his kingdom—a sample and an earnest calculated to strengthen his apostles then, and to revive the drooping hopes of his people in all ages. With what animation does Peter afterwards revert to this (2 Pet. i. 17, 18).

Mr. CAINE wonders at Mr. NIBILL's expressing surprise that he, Mr. CAINE, should think that the words "there be some standing here," &c. evidently indicate a distant event. He adds, that the most eminent divines and commentators have held the same opinion.

What excites my surprise is that Mr. CAINE or any commentator should adopt a summary mode of setting aside all explanations but their own, by coolly asserting that their own is the evident meaning of the text. What is evident admits of no question.

The commentators whom Mr. CAINE quotes wrote for the most part when it was the custom to enervate the sense of Scripture by weak spiritualising interpretations. This drove them to the necessity of making the kingdom of God to signify the destruction of Jerusalem by the Roman armies. As the three Apostles saw Christ at the transfiguration, so will his people see Him when he comes in that glory of which the transfiguration was a sample. Like Peter, they will say "Lord, it is good for us to be here;" but who could have said this amid the desolations of Jerusalem—what Apostle or Christian could have looked upon her smoking ruins and her captive sons, and said, This is what our Lord promised and what Daniel prophesied when they spoke of Messiah's coming in the clouds with power and great glory?

Fitz, Salop.

DANIEL NIBILL.

Luke xxi. 36. Vol. III. 437.—SIMPLEX asks, "Why did the Lord tell his disciples to buy a sword, when in the parallel passage (Matt. xxvi. 52) he tells Peter to put up again his sword?" I would suggest that the passages are not parallel. Moreover, they are easily reconcilable. In Luke

our Lord, speaking metaphorically, indicates the greatness of the dangers coming upon his disciples. It was his wont to express his strong thoughts in figurative language, which his disciples often misunderstood; as when he warned them against the leaven of the Pharisees. The sword, the weapon most popularly known in war, bought at the expense of a man's garment, is a striking figure to indicate extreme danger on the part of those exhorted to buy it at that sacrifice. But it no more followed from this mode of speaking that the weapons of Christ's disciples were to be carnal than it follows from describing future happiness by pearls, rubies, or riches—things valued amongst men—that these are to constitute celestial bliss. When our Lord commanded Peter, subsequently, and not in a parallel passage, to put up his sword, he gently reproved the misunderstanding of his zealous Apostle, who had erroneously taken his words in a carnal sense. He plainly intimated that a resort to such weapons by his disciples would not only be at variance with the spirit of their Christian warfare, but would bring down upon those, whom it was the divine plan to send forth as sheep among wolves, destruction at the hands of their enemies, so much more powerful than they at carnal weapons. For all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.

Fitz, Salop.

DANIEL NICHILL.

Luke xxi. 44. His sweat was as it were great drops of blood. Vol. III. 309, 432.

I cannot but think that we are correct in believing that our Blessed Lord's sweat in the garden was actually a bloody sweat, and that the *ῥοαὶ* must be understood as modifying *θρομβοί*, not *ἀνταρῶς*.

Let me add to the instances of a bloody sweat in the case of a disappointed Cardinal, as referred to by Mr. BINGHAM (CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR, p. 415), the following from Thuanus, and quoted by Bishop Pearce. It is the case of an Italian gentleman named Maggi, who was under the apprehension of being executed. "Observatum," says Thuanus, "tam indignæ mortis vehementi metu adeo concussum animo eum fuisse, ut sanguineum sudorem toto corpore funderet." (Lib. xi.)

Woodrising Rectory.

ARTHUR ROBERTS.

Acts ii. 27.—Because Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hell. Vol. III. 481.

I cannot but dissent from your Correspondent the Rev. C. E. PALMER's views as to the word *ᾅδης*, "Hades."

I do not mean to enter into a controversy as to whether our Lord went into the place of torment, though I may say that I do not agree with Mr. PALMER on that point. I merely mean to give

my reasons for not agreeing with his assertion that this is the right interpretation of Acts ii. 27; and that "Hades" is then to be taken in a bad sense, not as signifying the same as Paradise, but the place of torment, is further confirmed from the use of this word "Hades" in all the other places when it occurs in the New Testament, Matt. xi. 23, and xvi. 18; Luke xi. 15, and xvi. 23; 2 Cor. xv. 55; Rev. i. 18; vi. 8; and xx. 13, 14.

In my judgment, the word in all these places signifies the place of departed spirits generally, comprehending both the lost and the saved, and not the place of the damned. To take each text quoted: Matt. xi. 23, "Thou Capernaum which art exalted unto Heaven shalt be brought down to Hell (Hades)," where heaven, the habitation of God, is used to represent the greatest height, and "hades," the habitation of departed spirits, to represent the lowest depth as it was supposed to be in the lower parts of the earth or under the earth: like as is said in Job xi. 8, "It is high as heaven; what canst thou do? deeper than hell (Hades); what canst thou know?" Matt. xvi. 18: "The gates of hell (Hades) shall not prevail against it." The gates of that place which confines the departed spirits shall not prevail to hinder their resurrection. Luke xi. 15, is a misprint for x. 15, which is the same as Matt. xi. 23. Luke xvi. 23: it is said of the rich man that he died, and "in hell (Hades) he lift up his eyes, being in torment, and seeth Abraham afar off and Lazarus in his bosom." "Hades" there represents the common place of departed spirits, in which was the rich man in torment, and, afar off, Abraham, and Lazarus in his bosom. It is not the word "Hades" that marks out the miserable place of the rich man, but that which is added—"being in torment." 2 Cor. xv. 55, another misprint for 1 Cor. xv. 55: "O Death, where is thy sting? O Grave (*ᾅδης*) where is thy victory?" where "death" evidently represents the prison-house of the body, and "Hades" (very ill translated "Grave") that of the spirit. In the resurrection both body and spirit shall have their victory. Rev. i. 18: "I have the keys of hell (Hades) and of death:" I have the power to open the receptacle of the spirits and the bodies of the dead. Rev. xx. 14: "Death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them:" that is, there should be a resurrection of both body and spirit. This view of the meaning of *ᾅδης* is confirmed by considering that, when the sacred writers meant to speak of the place of the damned, they have a word for it—*γεέννα*—which will be found twelve times in the New Testament in that sense. Our translators, in places where the context clearly pointed out that the word did not mean the place of the damned, have translated it by the word "grave;" but, if it is carefully looked

into, it will be found that *ἀδης* always refers to the spirit, whilst the grave is as uniformly referred to the body. There is a very satisfactory passage (Psa. xxx.) referring, I have no doubt, to the Saviour: "Thou hast brought up my soul from the grave" (in the Hebrew, "sheol;" in the Septuagint, "hades")—Thou hast brought up my soul from the place of departed spirits—"and hast kept me alive that I should not go down into the pit"—and hast not doomed me to endure that awful death of going into the place of the damned. Our translators could not have rendered the clause so as to convey that he had been brought up from the place of the damned, when in the next clause it is said he had been kept from going into it. They therefore, as I conceive, unfortunately translated the word by "grave."

I have trespassed more than is usually allowed upon your space, yet have not said half what might be said. I would direct your readers who may wish for further suggestions on the subject to look into a preliminary dissertation in Campbell on the Gospels. ROBT. CASHEL.

Romans viii. 19–22. Vol. III. p. 270.—I cannot agree with Mr. T. J. BUCKTON that the supposition that *κτίσις*, in Rom. viii. 19–22, means the brute creation is erroneous; because—

1. The effect of the fall was to involve, not only man and the earth and its products (Gen. iii. 16–19), but the beasts of the field also; for

2. The covenant made with Noah was made also with "every living creature of all flesh" (Gen. ix. 10, 16,* 17).

From these texts it appears that the earth and all things in it were blighted by Adam's fall: and Acts iii. 19, 20, speaks of future "times as refreshing from the presence of the Lord," which are clearly the same as "the times of restitution of all things." Now, as we are here told all things are to be restored to their first condition, the interpretation which makes *η κτίσις*, Rom. viii. include "every living creature of all flesh," the vegetable world, and even the earth, although it be inanimate, is not of necessity incorrect, and is strengthened by *τη κτίσει*, c. i. 25, being used for the host of heaven, the animal and vegetable creations, the earth and the sea, man having worshipped at least some of each of these; and also by verses 38–39, c. viii. (see 7). We are now prepared to interpret the passage.

3. In verse 18, the present time is said to be, as all men know it is, a time of suffering, and it is

* The LXX add in this verse *καὶ τῆς γῆς*—(It is however said by Grube, Bagster, Polyglot, to be absent from some copies): they most probably understood (see verses 11, 13) the earth to be included in this covenant, as it was in the curse (c. iii. 17).

contrasted with the [future] glory which shall be revealed in (*εἰς*) us. In verse 19, it is *τῆς κτίσεως*, "the creation," or rather, as more explicit, "the created things," which wait "for the redemption of the body" of the sons of God. It would be absurd to apply *τῆς κτίσεως* to believers, as in such case they would be said to be waiting "for the manifestation" of themselves to themselves; whereas the passage says the sons of God are to be manifested to *τῆς κτίσεως*: nor can it be said of the rest of mankind, for they have nothing, in the future, in common with the sons of God, who inwardly, even as also *πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις*, groan and travail, waiting for the redemption of the body of the sons of God (see 6).

4. In verse 20, we are told, *η κτίσις* were made subject to vanity (see 1 and 2), not willingly—not because they had sinned—but by reason of him who hath subjugated (them to vanity)—i. e. Adam, who by his disobedience was the cause of their being subjected to vanity.

5. If verse 20, except *ἐν ἐλπίδι* be read parenthetically, then verse 21 tells us more particularly that *η κτίσις* are now in hope that they shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption*—that state in which God placed them after the fall—*εἰς*, towards the glorious liberty of the children of God, literally "the liberty (as opposed to bondage—the subjugation, verse 20) of the glory of the children of God." By this I understand "when the children of God shall be taken to receive the glory prepared for them," then will "the creation" begin to be restored to its pristine state.

6. Quite in conformity to and confirmatory of this are verses 22, 24, *πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις* "the whole creation"—"all created things," "groan and travail in pain"—and they have groaned and travelled in pain from the fall (see 1 and 2), for they were made "very good (Gen. i. 31) until now, and not only they"—not only do all created things groan and travail—"but ourselves also, who have the first fruits of the Spirit"—we who have a foretaste of heavenly things through faith

* I beg leave to ask your learned Correspondents whether *ἐν ἐλπίδι* can be rendered by "against hope?" If it can, then I would put the argument in the following form: "But by reason of him who hath subjected *η κτίσις* to vanity—he who by his disobedience was the cause of their being subjected to vanity *ἐν ἐλπίδι*—"against hope"—when Adam fell he could not have any hope—he sinned against hope* of forgiveness, this proceeded entirely from the free grace of God.

5. If verse 20 be read parenthetically, then verse 21 tells us more clearly *η κτίσις* shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption, &c.

* I trust no one will imagine from this expression that I consider there has been at any time since the fall a license for sin under a persuasion that "sacramental grace" can blot it out.

—“even we also”—as well as the rest of the things created by God—“groan within ourselves”—we do not complain of God's dealings with us, which through the gift of speech we are specially able to do, knowing that we suffer through Adam's transgression—“waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our bodies”—our resurrection—“for we are saved by the—this hope,”* which Christ's resurrection makes sure to us.

7. Verse 39 has no connection with verses 19—22. Yet it is well to show that it does not contradict what has been already advanced, but rather confirms it to be true. Mr. T. J. BUCKTON is correct in saying *κτισις* is evidently in the same category as “height” and “depth;” but that it is of the same nature as he affirms it to be I must demur to, for it is joined with death, life, angels, principalities, powers, things present, things to come, as well as “height” and “depth.” The words are *τις κτισις ἑτερα*, “any other created thing,” and is fully equivalent to “all created things” (verses 22—24); and most surely it is created things only which are, at any time, able to separate us from Christ.

What has been shown?

1st. That all God's creation was blighted by Adam's fall. It will be restored in part at the Second Advent of Christ. (Isaiah xi. 1—9).

2nd. That it will be restored to its first condition. This will not be until after the conflagration (2 Peter iii. 7, 10)—the purification of created things by fire. It was the means ordered for the purification of “everything that may abide the fire,” of those which had been taken from the Midianites. (Numbers xxxi. 23.)

3rd. That *κτισις* can be well rendered by “created thing.” This is in accordance also with the change which takes place in a man when he is “born again;” he is then made a “new creature”—is a new-created thing—has been created a second time—born of the Spirit—born of God. It is therefore better to interpret *κτισις* and the verb in 2 Cor. v. 17, Gal. vi. 15, Eph. ii. 10, iv. 24, 1 Peter ii. 13, in conformity to the above, rather than to modern phraseology.

Nevis.

WM. WEEKES.

1 Corinthians xv. 29. Vol. III. 483.—May not the simplest and most natural sense of *ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν* be the right one—“for, in the stead of,

* Would not this be better rendered by “to this thing”—“the redemption of our body”—which is the object of our hope—the result of Christ's work for us: and as this can be only through Christ's work, the singular *σωματός* appears to be used to denote that the passage speaks of the resurrection of believers as forming the one body of Christ, and as a sure prelude to a full “restitution of all things” through him, for which “the whole creation” groans,

the dead?” And in this respect: “Why, then, do any come forward and present themselves for baptism as successors to them that have died, especially as successors to our martyred brethren? They see them die, either peaceably or by martyrdom, and yet they offer themselves to be baptized all the more, as taking their place among men, as well as encouraged and quickened by their example. Why this, if yet they thought that all hope perished to Christians with their death, and these deaths have been evidently under their eyes?”

The early Christian martyrologies, as well as the martyrologies of the Reformation, contain several instances of persons drawn out to an open profession of faith in Christ by the constancy of dying believers. These were, then, in a certain sense, “baptized for the dead,” as successors, and to supply the place, of the dead.

Bexley.

T. H.

2 Corinthians v. 9. Vol. III. 359, 401.—The discrepancy which appears in the English version of this text and Ephes. i. 6, does not exist in the Greek: for the latter speaks of the acceptance, in full grace, of the person—the former, of the desire that our service should be acceptable to Christ. “We may be well-pleasing (or acceptable) to Him” would be, I apprehend, more correct in point of doctrine, as well as in point of rendering.

W. KELLY.

Ephesians iii. 15.—Of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named. Vol. III. 466.

Allow me one line in reply to Mr. GIPPS's remark on my rendering of *πᾶσα πατριὰ*. Others beside myself consider this expression an exception to the general rule, and that it is to be translated, not “every,” but “the whole, family.” Mr. Green, in his “Grammar of the New Testament Dialect,” admits this instance as such an exception, “in apparent defiance of the rule” (page 195). Dr. Eadie also, in his “Commentary on the Ephesians,” classes this instance, as well as chap. ii. 21 (according to the reading he adopts), as such an exception, and adds, “The sense or ultimate reference is not different, though the word be rendered ‘every family’” (page 228). He also says, on chap. ii. 21, “In the later Greek, as in the earlier, *πᾶς*, without the article, bore the sense of ‘whole’” (Winer. xix. 1, &c.). So also in Josephus (Antiq. iv. 5, 1), *ποταμός δια πάσης ἐρημίου πρὸν*, “a river flowing through the whole desert” (page 187). Whiston translates this passage of Josephus, “a river running through all that wilderness.” Dr. Bloomfield also, in his Greek Testament, on Ephes. iii. 15, contends against Bishop Middleton in his argument in this instance drawn from the absence of the article. I think, therefore, I have said enough to justify myself.

As to the language of the Psalms, I plainly admit that there is in them phraseology which is unsuitable to Christians literally, because derived from the ceremonial law, which is done away (as for example, "Purge me with hyssop"); but I cannot part with the persuasion that the saints under the old dispensation had "the same spirit of faith" (2 Cor. iv. 13), "the spirit of adoption," with saints under the new. And surely the aspirations of the heart toward God are not so much dependent on information in the head (Isa. xxxv. 8; Matt. xi. 25).

Bexley.

T. H.

Colossians i. 18. He is the head of the body, the Church.
Vol. III. 310, 372, 485.

I cannot but think that Mr. WILLIAM KELLY, in denying to the Pre-Pentecostal saints participation in "Christ's body," the Church, is, from well-grounded premises, urging a conclusion which those premises do not justify.

His scriptural proofs of the peculiar blessings belonging to the Church since its Pentecostal formation are convincing, and all that he says on the importance of the subject is interesting and instructive.

But admitting that "the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven" did, on the day of Pentecost, gather into spiritual union and unity with their risen Head the members of Christ's body, and that from that time, and not before, dates the existence of the Church (properly so called), yet it by no means follows that the Old Testament saints (as we do not believe in their annihilation at death) were not at the same time, and by the same or similar means, brought into the same union and unity with Christ, which they now may enjoy in heaven, as believers do on earth. An illustration may make this clearer. If a large body of emigrants left France, towards the close of the late Republic, for some distant French colony, would it be fair to deny to them a participation (as subjects) in the empire on its establishment, because they had left their country before it was possible that they could be subjects of the empire? it not having been then in existence.

It is plain that in this case their connection with the nation and subjection to its head (the President of the Republic), would involve them in sharing the advantages of whatever change might take place in the constitution of the nation after their departure.

In like manner, though Old Testament saints may not during their sojourn on earth have belonged to the Church (a body not then formed) yet, on its formation, what authority have we for denying that to the colonies of Christ's kingdom (to carry out the illustration) might also be extended the change of constitution which took

place on earth amongst His subjects, on the occasion of His being glorified? (John vii. 39.)

Mr. KELLY might urge in answer what he says in p. 485,

It must be borne in mind that, when Scripture speaks of the "one body," it is in reference to the earth. It is now, and on earth, that the saints are baptised by the Holy Ghost into one body, though I am far from believing that such a relationship will cease by and by in heaven.

But, if such a relationship can hereafter exist in heaven, why cannot it now extend to heaven? Does the expression "the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven" limit to earth only the operations of His divine agency? Do we not read of "the seven spirits which are before the throne," which, from the context, can mean no less than the third person of the ever blessed Trinity, in reference to the perfection of His nature and offices?

Again, if Mr. KELLY admits that "those who sleep in Jesus" since Pentecost—those who are "absent from the body, present with the Lord," still retain their membership of the "one body, the Church"—if they, now present with Christ, are not to be excluded from this spiritual union, why must Old Testament saints (also with Christ) be excluded?

The union wrought by the Holy Ghost, in the constitution of the Church, is between Christ in heaven and believers on earth. Therefore those who are in heaven (Old Testament saints) are not necessarily excluded from this unity by their being in heaven, for such a cause would exclude Christ also.

I feel thankful to Mr. KELLY for his drawing our attention to such an important subject as the peculiar privileges of the Church, and it is really with a desire to separate from what is so interesting and instructive in this subject an inference, unsupported I think by Scripture, and calculated to repel many from giving it the consideration it deserves—that I have ventured to make these remarks. I should like (if permitted) hereafter to bring forward the question, What evidence does Scripture afford of a change having taken place at Christ's resurrection and ascension to glory, in the position of the Old Testament saints? and how far this change may be supposed to correspond to that change in the position and privileges of believers on earth on and after the day of Pentecost? Such correspondence being perhaps alluded to in Psa. lxxviii. 18, "Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive: thou hast received gifts for men; yea, for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them."

H. E. BROOKS.

Hebrews ii. 11. Vol. III. 343, 372.—This verse has been variously interpreted. Bengel takes

ὁ ἀγαθὸν for Christ, οἱ ἀγαθοί for all Christians, and εἰς ἑνός for Abraham. He quotes Mal. ii, 15; Isa. li. 2; Ezra xxiii. 24, and adds, "Ex uno Adam, omnes homines: ex uno Abraham, omnes Abrahamide;" and, as St. Paul is writing to the children of Abraham, he thinks this explanation most suitable to the context. (See Gnomon, edit. Johan. Steudel, p. 869, Lond. 1855.)

Conybeare and Howson translate εἰς ἑνός, "have all one father" (vol. ii. p. 519), but I prefer the rendering of Moses Stuart, who supplies γενούς after ἑνός, and considers ἀγαθὸν to refer to Christ, translating thus: "Furthermore, both he who maketh expiation, and they for whom expiation is made, are of one nature" (Heb. Com. Henderson, 1834, pp. 250, 308). I think him justified in treating ἀγαθὸν as the equivalent of כִּפֶּה (*piel*), which is translated in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers as "to make an atonement." The Septuagint translation of Exod. xxix. 33, 36, justifies this sense of the word, and consequently the phrase οἱ ἀγαθοί may be rendered into Hebrew thus: יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּפֶּה לָהֶם. The word will bear the same sense in chap. x. ver. 10, and chap. x. verses 11, 19 of this Epistle.

This rendering may be readily shown to be in accordance with the Apostle's reasoning. He had just said that it became the Captain of Salvation to be made perfect through sufferings. He was made somewhat lower than the angels, for the very purpose of tasting death as man: hence it is appropriately said that he who makes atonement, and those who are benefited by it, are all of one nature, so that he is not ashamed to call them brethren.

In the present day, too, every passage which bears direct testimony to the doctrine of the Atonement should be kept prominently before the notice of the Church and the world, that we may be prepared to take up our cross, for verily we have yet to suffer persecution for the cross of Christ.

Sheriff Hutton.

THOS. MYERS.

Hebrews xi. 21. . . . leaning upon the top of his staff. Vol. III. 407, 450.

In reply to F. L. W.'s two observations, I would call his attention first to the LXX reading of Gen. xlvii. 31, which he will find corresponds word for word with the quotation of the Apostle in this passage, shewing that he intended to quote that passage.

As to the difference between the Hebrew and LXX, הִשָּׁתַּחֲוָה means to bow down as well as to worship; indeed, this latter sense is derived from the former just as προσκυνᾶν in Greek means "to bow down before," hence to worship. The difference between "staff" and "bed" is easily ac-

counted for. The consonants in both words are the same: מִשְׁכָּב, "a staff;" מִשְׁכָּב, "a bed." In old MSS. the vowel points are never supplied; and, as the Hebrew ceased to be a spoken language before the LXX was made, the translator, having to supply the points, fell into the error; one easily made considering that the sense admits of either rendering, though the state of Jacob's health would rather have suggested "bed" as more natural.

As to the second observation, "Does not this explanation entirely invalidate the argument that the Holy Spirit, by quoting in the New Testament particular readings of the Old in the language of the LXX, thereby authorised those renderings as correct?" I answer, By no means. For the quotations in the New Testament are of two kinds: some literal, where a particular word is dwelt on, and some general, where the sense only is referred to. As an instance of the former, see Matt. ii. 15. The important word is "son." The Evangelist there quotes the LXX, but inasmuch as that version reads "children" and not "son," which would destroy the force of the quotation, the sacred writer, while he uses the LXX as far as he can, corrects it by the Hebrew.

In the passage now under consideration the sense was all that was needed. The Apostle is shewing Jacob's faith. He refers (I conceive) to two acts of faith: one he quotes, the blessing of Joseph's children, by which Jacob declared his belief in the promise, that Abraham's children should become a multitude of nations; the other act of faith is referred to, viz. his belief in the promise that the Seed of Abraham should return from Egypt, and inherit the land of Canaan (Gen. xv. 16). The patriarch shows his belief in this, by requesting to be buried in the land of promise, instead of in Egypt—a foreign country. Joseph having promised to fulfil this request, Jacob worships God—the outpouring of a grateful heart for the new favour vouchsafed him.

It is clear that Jacob's faith remained the same whether he worshipped on his bed or leaned upon his staff. The Apostle, therefore, did not think it necessary to correct the LXX. If this interpretation be correct, we must take the copulative καὶ as connecting the two acts, and not as belonging to the words which follow it.

In conclusion, we must adhere to the Hebrew as the correct reading, unless we have plain proof that it is wrong and cannot be maintained. If the principle F. L. W. mentions were adopted, we should be quite at a loss oftentimes to know what the reading of the Hebrew should be. How, for example, should we know the correct reading of the original in Isaiah lxiv. 4, which is quoted in 1 Cor. ii. 9; but while the quotation agrees in sense with the Hebrew and LXX, it differs from both in the words. C. E. STUART.

Revelation v. 9, 10. Vol. I. 324; III. 356.—It is one of the special objects of the Revelation, as I judge, to disclose the position and intelligent worship of the heavenly saints, after they have been gathered to the Lord in the air, and previous to His epiphany, and this in connection with the intervening judgments set forth under the seals, trumpets, and vials. Another design is to show that even in those terrible days, "the end of the age," after the Church has been caught up to meet the Lord, God will not leave himself without witness, but will, by His Word and Spirit, commence a new work, suited to the times of special antichristian delusion. Daniel also (ch. vii.—xii.) makes known to us saints involved in these same trials, but they are, I think, Jewish saints exclusively. St. John was the appropriate instrument to reveal a larger company of holy sufferers, and that from the Gentiles, "out of every kindred," &c. The countless multitude seen in Rev. vii. 9 *et seq.* is out of all nations, but, as to time, restricted to "the great tribulation." This transition period, after the rapture of the Church, and before the millennium, is one of great moment, and very little understood.

Bath.

W. KELLY.

Atonement.—Vol. III. 401, 467.

It is pretty well agreed amongst etymologists, that Dr. Johnson's derivation of this word is correct.

Shakspeare furnishes another example:—

Lod.—Is there division 'twixt my lord and Cassio?*Des.*—A most unhappy one: I would do much

T'atone them, for the love I bear to Cassio.

Othello, Act iv. sc. 1.

Chaucer again—

If gentilmen or other of that contree were wroth, she woulde bring hem *at one*, so wise and ripe wordes hadde she.

The Clerkis Tale, v. 1.

Dryden also—

The king and haughty empress, to our wonder,
If not *atton'd*, yet seemingly at peace.

Aurengo-sebe.

Wickliffe explains 1 Tim. ii. 5, thus—

Paul sayth (1 Tim. ii.) one God, one mediatour (that is to say, advocate, intercessor, or an *atone-maker*) between God and man: the man Christ Jesus, which gave himself a ransom for all men.

And Beveridge, in his "Satisfaction of Christ Explained," has the following—

ἵλασθαι and ἐξίλασθαι, all along answer to the ἱλά, which signifies to appease . . . a person offered, to atone, or make him *at one* again with the offender.

A LAYMAN.

Dr. Charles Richardson, in his new Dictionary of the English Language (2 vols. 4to. Pickering,

1844), according to his usual principle of accepting the derivation as the basis of all deducible senses, explains the verb "ATONE, to be or cause to be at one. To be in unity or concord, in friendship or amity; to agree; to return or restore to favour; to reconcile, to satisfy, to propitiate. See ONE and ONEMENT." This is followed up by citations from old English authors, which prove beyond question that the usage of the word once corresponded with its etymology. Webster seems dubious; but the evidence is, to my mind, convincing.

It is clear, however, that the proper current value of a term must not be confounded with its probable ancient origin. The lineal descent of a word is one thing, its present form and use a totally different. Thus, Dr. R. (himself a rigid stickler for a parent groundform, and this too often after the unhappy model of Mr. Horne Tooke) informs the uninitiated that *amere* and *merce* are used by the older writers indifferently; that to be subject to the king's "grievous mercy" was to be subject to a heavy fine payable to the king; that the remission of this is now called his "mercy;" and that, consequently, the modern word is no contraction of the Latin *misericordia*, but a transfer from the fine paid to the pardon granted, and the feeling which thus commutes or forgives. Now what confusion would it not be if people, in discussing Divine mercy in Ephes. ii. or in Rom. xii., were to allow themselves to be carried away with antiquarian questions about the force of the word in an old statute of Henry VI. or in *Piers Ploughman*? To me such disquisitions seem not only foreign to the real question of a fundamental doctrine in the Bible, but are in principle no better than serious jesting, if the expression may be allowed. They are a similar *fallacia equivocationis* to that which is found in the common pun—an ambiguous riddle, as logicians say. Exactly so; it is unsound to draw from the mere root of the English word *atonement* "another Gospel which is not another;" for the question in THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR is Atonement as a theological question, or rather as a truth of the Bible.

Now I deny that the Hebrew or Greek words, properly so translated, ever mean "to be at onement," to be or bring into concord. The true force is expiation, as rightly given even in the modern Jewish version of Dr. Benisch. And such is the actual (if not the old) meaning of the expression "atone for" in our language. How it came to acquire a force so remote from its alleged original composition, is an interesting inquiry for such as study the sources and changes of language; but it is outside a question of orthodoxy. It does not touch the point disputed, that is, whether atonement, in scriptural doctrine, means at-onement? It ought to have been seen

that, if the derivation of words could decide such a matter, we must look into the Hebrew and Greek originals. Now neither of these means to be at one: the Hebrew idea being, as I suppose, that of covering (*i. e.* sins); the Greek, that of appeasing or propitiating (*i. e.* God), or expiating sins. Loose statements may be found in old and modern writers on divinity: but the question is, What saith the Scripture?

In the Authorised Version, "atonement" occurs but once, and there mistakenly; for the Greek is *κατάλλαξη*, and means there, as everywhere, "reconciliation" (so given in the margin). The proper word for "atonement" is *ἱλασμός*, with its kindred forms and compounds: it is translated "propitiation" in 1 John ii. 2; iv. 10. The interchange of these two expressions in our version of the Old and New Testament has given a convenient handle to Socinians, with whom it is a favourite statement, as I cite from one, that "Atonement always means, in the Bible, making two or more persons at one or agreed." My answer is, that, though the term is occasionally applied as a metaphor to human things, "atonement" never means there what Socinians say it always means. It is very often, for example, used of iniquities, where obviously such a term is no sense at all. The truth is that reconciliation is properly toward man, propitiation or atonement is toward God; and both are found by faith in the person and the work of the Lord Jesus Christ.

I solemnly denounce and object to the denial of the substitution of Jesus for us as a sacrifice for sin on the cross. This is what is now called the atonement, as it is the basis of the believer's reconciliation with God. I abhor the notion, which some would insinuate through the sophism of "at-one-ment," that Christ became one with us in fallen human nature. The union of the Christian and of the Church is with Christ in risen life, grounded on the putting away of our sins. Vitally united by the Holy Ghost, we can then say as true of ourselves what is said of Him who died for us and rose again. His incarnation, though indispensable as a means and step toward the grand end, is a wholly distinct truth from our union with Him. WILLIAM KELLY.

Temple of Janus. Vol. III. 423, 452.—Would any light be thrown on this query by a treatise, *De Jano Christo Nasc. reserato*, sect. II. c. 2; or in sect. III. c. 2, in which are other matters relating to this point? I learn this from Decker's note to *Florus*, IV. 12, 64. As Decker's edition was first published in 1722, I infer that this treatise was not written by Jean Papyre Masson, but rather by the Rev. M. Mason, whose letter on Macrobius and Virgil's fourth Eclogue was appended to Bishop Chandler's Vindication of his Defence of Christianity, in 1728.

H. GARDLESTONE.

Letter from Professor Tischendorf, in Answer to Remarks on his 7th Edition of the New Testament.

Vol. III. 467.

Leipzig, ce 13 Déc. 1856.

MONSIEUR LE REDACTEUR,

Je vous remercie de m'avoir communiqué les notices de Mr. KELLY sur ma 7^e édition du N. T. Je serai heureux de répondre dignement à l'éloge que ce savant théologien en a fait; c'est bien mon intention de rendre cette édition supérieure à toutes les autres éditions critiques. L'omission que Mr. KELLY y a trouvée (Mt. xxiii. 39) est bien, comme il a supposé, une faute d'impression. La feuille fautive sera remplacée par une autre. Toute communication de cette sorte me servira à corriger l'ouvrage.

Quant aux scrupules concernant "the laxity as to inspiration," j'ai la conviction que le plus grand respect pour le caractère divin du texte sacré se développe par l'anxiété consciencieuse de n'admettre rien ce qui ne soit parfaitement muni d'autorité critique. Si nous ne faisons pas ainsi, nous n'avons pas raison de rejeter l'autorité de Rome. C'est donc même le principe protestant qui nous oblige de préférer consciencieusement l'autorité des documents, conservés par le doigt de la Providence dans le long cours des siècles, à l'usage de l'église et à nos propres préjugés, tout pieux qu'ils soient.

Je vous suis bien obligé, Monsieur, pour l'intérêt bienveillant que vous prenez à mes travaux, en vous priant d'agréer l'hommage de mes respects.

CONST. TISCHENDORF.

The Querist.

Deuteronomy xlviii. 68.—Ye shall be sold unto your enemies for bondmen and bondwomen, and no man shall buy you.

הִתְמַכְּרוּ.—This verb occurs in 1 Kings xxi. 20, 25, and in each place it is in Hithpaad. Why should it be translated in the passive form in Deuteronomy? Does it not convey a more correct idea of the exact accomplishment of those awful judgments which were to come upon the children of Israel because of their disobedience, that they should be reduced to such a depth of extreme distress as to sell themselves to their enemies for bondmen and bondwomen?

Monmouth.

J. FAWCETT BEDDY.

Psalms xvii. 14.—Whose belly thou fillest with thy hid (treasure) תִּמְלִיךְ.

I have frequently been perplexed by this expression, applying it to that abundance of this world's wealth, and that outward earthly prosperity, which we sometimes see ungodly men enjoying. This is the view which all the com-

mentators I have been able to consult take of this passage. But looking into Parkhurst I found some parallel passages which appear to me to give a different interpretation:—

Job xv. 20.—The number of years is hidden to the oppressor.—English Version. A number of (*i. e.* many) years (of punishment namely) are laid up for the terrible.

Job xxiv. 1.—Why are not stated times (*i. e.* of vengeance) reserved or laid up by the All-bountiful?

Job xxi. 19.—God layeth up his iniquity for his children.

Job xx. 26.—All kind of darkness (misery) is reserved for his hid treasures; unknown misery is treasured up for him.

If, therefore, this be correct, the hid treasure is not worldly good, but the fearful wrath of God—an evil hidden from and for the ungodly. Rom. ii. 5, will then be also parallel, "Treasured up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God."

St. Dennis.

JOHN GLYNN CHILD.

Psalms cx. 1.—Sit Thou at my right hand until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool.

1 Corinthians xv. 26.—The last enemy that shall be destroyed is Death.

Revelation xx. 14.—And Death and Hell were cast into the lake of fire.

Now, since Death is (seemingly) to be destroyed only at the close of the Millennium, and since Christ is to sit at the right hand of the Father until the destruction of all His enemies, it follows, if Christ come at the beginning of the Millennium, that after His coming, and for a thousand years thereafter, He shall continue to sit at the Father's right hand. Is it so? And if so, what are we exactly to understand by Christ's sitting at the right hand of God?

M—Manse.

M. S. J.

Psalms cxxxvi. 15.—But overthrew Pharaoh and his host in the Red Sea.

Will some of your Correspondents give their opinion on this passage, compared with the account in Exodus of the destruction of the Egyptian army in the Red Sea. In the Mosaic account we have no mention of Pharaoh having been destroyed in the sea. The Egyptian hieroglyphics bear out this idea. Does this verse in the Psalms contradict it? Does $\gamma\gamma$ of necessity imply death? may it mean only a discomfiture? Was then Pharaoh drowned in the Red Sea?

C. E. STUART.

Ecclesiastes iv. 9, 10.—Two are better than one; because they have a good reward for their labour. For if they fall the one will lift up his fellow: but woe to him that is alone when he falleth; for he hath not another to help him up.

Dwight, in his sermon on "The Temptation and Fall," makes this assertion:

He (*i. e.* the Devil) accosted the general mother of

mankind when she was alone, and of course most unguarded. Had Adam been present it seems unquestionable that both would have assisted each other; and that their mutual strength might have resisted with success the insidiousness which was sufficient to prevail over one.

Is the above text the authority for this assertion?

Drumbanagher.

G. S.

Daniel vii. 11; Revelation xix. 20.—I should be much obliged if Dr. TREGELLES, or some one holding the same prophetic views, would state whether he considers the same individual is intended in both these passages. The same character—the antichrist—appears to be depicted both by Daniel and John, but the former says the beast was slain; and the latter, that he was cast alive into the lake of fire.

Pimlico.

ARTHUR HALL.

Daniel ix. 27, 28.—Is not the death of the Lord Jesus—the Messiah, or the Christ—the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, that is, prefigured from the beginning of the dispensation that he should, "in the fullness of time," be slain, the most probable interpretation of the confirming of "the covenant?" and the decree in the Seventh of Artaxerxes, B.C. 458, giving Nehemiah permission to rebuild the walls, the time of "the going forth of the commandment?" If to this we add thirty-two years, the seventy weeks are complete. The Jewish polity was not removed until about forty years after, but it was really at an end; and the uncertainty as to whether they had not followed "cunningly devised fables," was a severe trial to the faith of the Jewish Christians.

R. BETA BETA.

Habakkuk ii. 4 . . . but the just shall live by his faith.

Or are we to read, ". . . but the just, by his faith, shall live."

Or as we have it quoted in Rom. i. 17; Gal. iii. 11, and Heb. x. 38, 39—are we to read, "the just by faith shall live."

This question was partially discussed in Vol. III. 37, 61, and 75, but no satisfactory conclusion was attained; the weight of the Hebrew accents, however, were thrown in the scale in favour of the latter reading. I am chiefly induced to re-open this question, because I observe that the Rev. C. J. ELLICOTT, a most careful and cautious commentator, speaks so very decidedly in favour of the reading of our Authorised Version—"The just shall live by faith."

In his note on Gal. iii. 11, Mr. ELLICOTT says:

. . . But as it is certain (how can B. Crus. assert the contrary?) that the original Hebrew (see Hitzig *in loc.*, Kl. Prophet, p. 263, 264) does not bear this meaning,—as St. Paul in quoting the words in the order

in which they stand in the LXX, not in that (ὁ ἐκ πλὴτος δίκ.) most favourable to such a translator the collocation adopted by the Authorised Version appears most probable and most correct.

It is with respect to the Hebrew that Mr. ELLICOTT asserts the meaning so very decidedly, and I should certainly wish to know what there is to lead so irresistibly to such a conclusion. O.

Matthew xiii.—What connection can be traced between the several parables recorded in this chapter? Are they designed to give us different aspects of "the kingdom of heaven?" Some of them were spoken to the multitudes, others to the disciples in private.

HY. M.

Matthew xiii. 24, &c. In our Lord's parable of the tares and wheat, is it not generally considered that "the kingdom of heaven" represents the Church, and that the tares and wheat represent the false and true members of the professing Church? Is it not also the common interpretation that ζιζάνια, translated "tares," is the darnel or *lohus temulentus*, which grows among corn, and has much resemblance to wheat, and therefore represents Christian professors destitute of the power of godliness? If this be true, how can the field be the world, or rather what does our Lord mean by calling it the world?

AXMINSTER.

Z. J. EDWARDS.

Matthew xxiv. 3.—. . . . the sign of Thy coming, and of the end of the world.

How came the Apostles to connect the coming of Christ and the end of the age with the destruction of the city and temple of Jerusalem, of which Jesus had just spoken? Was it not (most probably) because this destruction which Jesus had predicted led back their thoughts to Dan. ix. 26, 27, especially as it stands in the LXX version? There the overthrow of the city (πόλις) and holy place (ἅγιον) is associated with "the coming of the Prince" (συν τῷ ἡγούμενῳ τῷ ἐρχομένῳ), and that Prince is said (verse 25) to be the Messiah (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἡγουμένου); and then, in verse 27, "the end of time" (ὁ τέλος τῆς συντελειᾶς καιροῦ) is also joined on to this destruction, just as here the Apostles speak of "the end of the age" (τῆς συντελειᾶς τῶν αἰώνων). Is not this association of ideas the more probable, as our Lord also proceeds to mention "the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel," without specifying the exact place in the prophecies He referred to; and βδελυγμία τῶν σφραγισμένων (the abomination of desolations) is mentioned in the 27th verse of this chapter.

BEXLEY.

T. H.

Mark i. 24.—Art thou come to destroy us?

Is this the language of the devil or the man?
And why?
Boston. J. C. I.

John v. 39.—For in them ye think ye have eternal life.

Will some of your Correspondents give the full force of "ye think?" J. C. I.

[Has not *δοκτε* here simply the force given to it by our idiom "ye think?"—It is your opinion, you believe that it is so.—ED.]

John xviii. 15.—That disciple was known unto the High Priest.

He generally styled himself one "whom Jesus loved." Why does St. John speak thus of himself here? Why does he repeat it in verse 16? And how came he to be acquainted with the High Priest? J. C. I.

[The first part of this Query admits of an easy answer; but does it not occur to our Rev. Querist that it is simply impossible for us to know how he had become known to the High Priest? We are not told.—ED.]

1 Thessalonians iv. 1, 2.—But of the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you. For yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh, &c.

I suggest a thought on this passage, which occurred to me whilst studying this chapter with a view to eliciting the opinion of subscribers to THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR.

The thought was this: the connection in this passage of "the times and seasons" (οἱ χρόνοι καὶ οἱ καιροί) with "the day of the Lord."

This remarkable phrase, "οἱ χρόνοι καὶ οἱ καιροί," was, if I may so say, set apart by our Lord to a peculiar meaning, viz. the restoration of the kingdom to Israel, when, in answer to the question "Wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" our Lord replied, "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons" (χρόνους ἢ καιρούς), Acts i. 6, 7.

Would not 1 Thess. v. 1, 2, then clearly state that the restoration of the Jews, "the times and the seasons," will take place when the Lord Jesus "appears the second time" (the day of the Lord), or thereabouts?

S. T. C. D.

Bengel's Gnomon.—I shall be obliged if any of your Correspondents will mention whether or not there exists an English translation of this valuable Commentary on the New Testament.

FAREHAM.

F. BALDEY.

[An edition was announced by Messrs. Clark of Edinburgh, some time ago, but we have heard no more of it. See CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR, vol. ii. p. 204.—ED.]

The Church.—I am one of those "who do not seem to understand" the question mooted Vol. III. p. 485, and elsewhere, respecting what "the Church" consists of. That I do not do so is, perhaps, partly owing to the indistinctness with which the views contended for are put forward. I would therefore ask, as a fresh question, to have it clearly stated what those views are respecting "the Church" or "the one body."

But, secondly, much more want of understanding the question arises from the very loose arguments on the subject. There has been much of mere assertion, instead of Scripture quotations; and then, further, there have been very wide references to Scripture, or else very inapplicable references. I would therefore ask, secondly, for close applicable references to Scripture in support of the views in question.

The quotations made Vol. III. p. 149, on Eph. iv. 4, in opposition to those views, have never been answered. I asked, Vol. III. p. 256, for some more exact references to several chapters which had been cited generally, but have received no answer. An extraordinary reference was given to Acts ii. 33, at Vol. III. p. 370, which in no way supports the assertion there made. The previous paper at the same page is a specimen of bare assertion.

I read of the Church in the wilderness; of the angel that was with them; and of the rock, Christ, who followed them. Were those Israelites, who were real Israelites in spirit, not of the one body, the Church? Surely the argument from the figure of a natural body, that, as the head is born before the body, consequently that in the spiritual body of the Church no part of the body could exist before the head, Christ Jesus, perfected his children, is untenable. Besides, he was slain from the foundation of the world. So a similar argument from the figure of the foundation of a building is as untenable.

I am really anxious to obtain information on this point, and am not making these observations from captious hostility to the views in question.

F. L. W.

The literal interpretation of unfulfilled prophecy.—How is it that St. Paul in some cases seems to take figuratively prophecies which appear to relate to Israel's future glory? I will take a few examples to illustrate what I mean.

Rom. ix. 24—26: after stating that both Jews and Gentiles are subjects of God's mercy, the Apostle goes on to say, "As he saith also in Osee, I will call them my people which were not my people, and her beloved which was not beloved. And it shall come to pass that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people, there shall they be called the children of the living God." See also 1 Pet. ii. 9, 10.

The latter part of this passage is taken from Hos. i. 10, in the following verse: "Then shall the children of Judah," &c. the restoration of Judah and Israel is plainly predicted.

The former part of the passage is from Hos. ii. 23, which appears from the context to relate to Israel. Surely these passages cannot relate directly to the Gentiles. Are we, then, warranted to take St. Paul's quotation as a simple accommodation?

With view to this query, will any of the readers of THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR explain Rom. ix. 27, 28, 29, and Gal. iv. 27.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

F. P.

On the Lord's Supper. Ought any one, not knowing his acceptance "in the beloved," to go to the Lord's table? How can such a one really have communion with the body and blood of Christ, while he has any doubt of his own personal interest therein? Would Mr. PARKESHAM, who expressed himself so strongly on Assurance, or some other of your Correspondents, oblige me with an answer to this Query? GAMMA.

Greek Testaments. Several Greek Testaments have been referred to, and quoted from, in THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR. It might be beneficial to many who read this useful publication if the relative and proper merits of each were discussed. Or, perhaps, the Editor himself would, in the Critic, give a brief and condensed review of the most important of them.

Certain it is that a sound and useful edition of the Greek Testament has been a great desideratum. Alford's has received very merited strictures in THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR on various occasions. One has been favourably mentioned several times, that by Webster and Wilkinson. I do not possess it, nor have I seen it. It has, however, been lately recommended to me. An excellent classic, the head master of a school of high standing, speaks of it in high terms.

I have used it (he says) with much interest and profit, and have found it contain the kind of information suitable to the higher classes of a school, and the ordinary run of undergraduates. Correct results are given without the labour of wading through opinions, often fantastic and visionary, which one has to read only to reject. It wisely omits all the more curious speculations and questions respecting MSS. and their comparative value and importance, which, however interesting and valuable to the more advanced student, would only tend to confuse and perplex, without profiting, the majority of readers.

This is high testimony to points very important; and, should the work be sound and evangelical, free alike from Tractarian and Neologian teaching, which, from all I have seen and heard,

it is, I imagine it will supply the great desideratum referred to. I am inclined to regard the subject of Greek Testaments as very important, and should be glad to see it taken up by the Correspondents and Editor of THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR.

Crookes Parsonage.

C. G. COOMBE.

The Critic.

The Bible Treasury; a Monthly Review of Prophetic and Practical Subjects.

Six numbers of this periodical are before us, and we think we may safely recommend it as useful and instructive. The doctrinal principles laid down as the rule upon which it is to be conducted are excellent, and it has so far kept true to them. The Editor must keep down the length of the articles, however, or it will become heavy. We dislike seeing "to be continued in our next" occurring too often.

The abuse of the Decalogue; or, are the Ten Commandments the Christian's Moral Rule? New Ed. Gregg.

Notwithstanding the arguments of this tract, we answer the query on its title-page with "undoubtedly they are." It is easy to heap up many words and much mystery on a very simple matter. With law, as law—with law, as in any way affecting his salvation, or his standing in Christ, the child of God has nothing to do. He is a new creature—old things are passed away—his sins are blotted out, and he is really safe for ever. Moreover he has a promise that "sin shall not have dominion over him;" and moreover, "he delights in the law of God after the inward" and renewed man. Saved by grace, without any works of any law, it is his earnest desire to live to the honour and glory of God. The mind of Christ is in him, and in all things he wishes to walk in a way well pleasing to God. To find out the moral rule which is to guide, he turns to his Bible, and he asks for the teaching of the Spirit. Every revelation of the will of God is "law" to him, and so that emphatic declaration of God's moral will, the Decalogue, together with every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God, whether in the Old or New Testament, are, in all their moral bearings, his rule of life—a light unto his feet, and a lamp unto his path.

"Christ is all;" or, the Gospel of the Old Testament—Leviticus. By the Venerable Archdeacon Law.

Wertheim and Mactintosh.

Another volume of Archdeacon Law's heart-stirring tracts. It is enough for us to name the publication; but if any are unacquainted with this most excellent series of tracts which are also bound up into useful and ornamental volumes, we strongly urge them upon their notice. Short, pointed, warm sentences, that go from heart to heart, are the characteristics of this faithful minister's style. May a great blessing attend this new volume!

The Friends of Christ in the New Testament. Thirteen Discourses. By Nehemiah Adams, D.D. Nisbets.

These are stirring sermons, calculated to benefit many. They are somewhat fanciful, and require an imaginative mind to enable the reader to follow the author; but, as there are many imaginative people in the world, it is well that some books should be written to suit them. Christ is fully and faithfully proclaimed as the Saviour of sinners.

NOTICE.

The following unforeseen and unavoidable circumstance will explain why no "Notices to Correspondents" appear in the present Number, and will also account for the absence of any editorial explanations of the future arrangements of THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR. The Editor had selected a few papers, and no more, towards the preparation of the present Number, when, in the providence of God, severe illness seized him, though not dangerous, yet of a nature entirely to incapacitate him from mental effort. No portion of the present Number has passed under his eye, the absence therefore of his editorial skill and experience will doubtless be felt. A lenient criticism is therefore requested on the management of this Number.

We are thankful to add, that under the good hand of God he is rapidly improving, and we have every reason to hope that he will be able to conduct the next Number through the press, and explain all his future intentions. Prayer is asked on his behalf.

All Correspondents writing for the "ANNOTATOR" or "REPLICANT" must send us their real names; not necessarily for publication, but for our own information and safeguard. Papers not thus authenticated will be invariably laid aside. We allow more latitude in the "QUERIST" department.

Every paper should commence with the text or subject commented upon, written distinctly at the head of the article. Reference should then be made to the page or pages where the subject has been before noticed, and to which the reply, if it be one, is sent. Queries should have the text prefixed from the Authorised Version, or else should have such a heading as the Replicants can with ease refer to.

Every separate article should be written on a separate piece of paper, to allow of our arranging them in Scripture sequence.

We cannot return manuscripts sent to us for publication.

No. 92 will be published (D.V.) on Saturday the 31st of January.

Just Published, Vol. III. well bound in cloth. Price 9s.

Vols. I., II., and III. Price 26s. 6d.

Quarterly Part, No. 12, in a neat wrapper. Price 2s.

All Communications to be addressed to THE EDITOR of THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR, care of Messrs. NISBET and Co. 21, BERNERS STREET, Oxford Street.

All communications respecting the supply of the ANNOTATOR, as well as all Post-office Orders, or enclosures of Stamps, to be addressed to the publishers, Messrs. NISBET and Co. 21, BERNERS STREET, Oxford Street.

THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR;

OR,

NOTES AND QUERIES ON SCRIPTURAL SUBJECTS.

[PUBLISHED ON ALTERNATE SATURDAYS.]

VOL. IV.—No. 92.

JANUARY 31, 1857.

[Price Threepence.
Stamped Edition, 4d.]

THE ANNOTATOR:—

Rom. xv. 1-4, by the Rev. Horatius Bonar, D.D.	18
2 Cor. iii. 16, by T. R. B.	19
Jacob's Dream, Gen. xxviii. 10-15, by the Rev. H. Girdlestone—1 Kings ix. 13, by the Rev. T. Myers	
—Psalm lxxx. 10	20
Mark ii. 5-12, by C. E. Stuart—Luke xxiii. 34-46—	
Acts xxvi. 18—Heb. xi. 24, by the Rev. F. Fyeh—	
—Rev. xvii. 3, 4, by the Rev. A. Roberts	20-22

THE REPLICANT:—

Gen. ii. 24, by C. E. Stuart—Deut. xxviii. 68—	
Psalm cx. 1, by J. Wakefield—Isa. liii. 6	22, 23
Matt. xlii. 24, by G. Mackness—xxiv. 3, by J. Worthington—Luke ii. 40, by T. J. Buckton—Luke v. 36-39—Acts ii. 27, by the Rev. John Harrison	23-25

2 Cor. v. 31, by the Rev. H. T. J. Bagge—Eph. iii. 15, by the Rev. J. M. Taylor—Col. i. 12, by D. Walther—1 Tim. v. 24, 26, by the Rev. Z. J. Edwards	25-27
Son of God and Son of Man, by G. W. Gipps	27
Bengel's Guomon, by J. Hiles—Greek Testaments, by Wm. Kelly	28

THE QUERRIST:—

Deut. xvii. 2-4, by the Rev. W. Caine—Matt. xvi. 18—	
Mark iv. 31, 32—Eph. iv. 19—Col. i. 13, by W. Browne—Rev. viii. 13, by the Rev. J. R. Echlin—	
xiii. 1-3, by the Rev. H. Girdlestone—xxi. 8, by the Rev. W. Caine—Temple of Janus, by the Rev. B. W. Savile	29-31

NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS

31

The Annotator.

ROMANS xv. 1-4.—The strength which God gives He does not give for ourselves alone, but for others. We are called to use that strength as bearers of others' infirmities, not as self-pleasers. We are not called to self-pleasing any more than to man-pleasing or flesh-pleasing. If ever any one might have been at liberty to please himself it was Christ. Yet "even Christ pleased not himself;" and throughout the Psalms he is seen as the man who pleased not himself, but bore cheerfully the very things from which self would most shrink (ver. 3).

And lest any one should hesitate to apply Old Testament Scripture in this way, the Apostle adds, "Now whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our instruction" (ver. 4). God had us in view when He put these words of the Psalmist into the lips of His Son, or rather, we should say, when He made the Psalmist the utterer of words which could find their true fulfilment only in His Son.

But what special thing had He in view for us in these Old Testament Scriptures? This above all others, "that we, through the patience and the consolation derived from these Scriptures, No. 92.

might hold fast the hope" (*την ελπιδα εχουμεν*). The Holy Ghost has thus spoken to us in the Old Testament as possessors of the hope, the Church's one great hope from the beginning, the kingdom and the glory in resurrection. This hope Satan will do his utmost to tear out of our hands, and we are warned to hold it fast. Everything in this present evil world will have the same tendency—to rob us of the hope. What we specially need to enable us to retain our hold is "patience" and "consolation." Both of these are liberally furnished to us in the Scriptures; and it is in proportion as we are supplied with these out of the fountain filled for us by the spirit that we shall hold fast the hope.

The Apostle then adds, "Now the God of this patience and this consolation grant you to be like-minded according to Christ Jesus," i. e. even as He was who pleased not himself. Further on (ver. 13) he sums up with this prayer, "Now the God of the hope (who has given us the hope) fill you with all joy and peace in believing, in order that you may abound in the hope (have that hope overflowing you) through the power of the Holy Ghost."

These are but hints as to the meaning of this wondrous passage, the chief points of which have, I fear, by most been overlooked. It shows us the

peculiar meaning of the hope, and it shews us the special calling of the saints—possessors of the hope—who in an evil day and evil world can only hold it fast by entering into the patience and consolation contained in those very Scriptures which not a few, calling themselves Christians, set aside as obsolete and unprofitable.

HORATIUS BONAR.

2 Corinthians iii. 16.—Nevertheless, when it shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away.

Ἦνικα δ' ἀν ἐπιστρεψῇ πρὸς Κύριον, περιαιρεῖται τὸ καλυμμα.

In the received translation of this verse the subject is assumed to be *καρδία*, "the Jewish heart," and the verse becomes thus a direct prediction of Jewish conversion, whether singly or nationally, and the consequent removal of spiritual darkness.

I think that this view is a misconception, and that the real nominative is "Moses," who has already been twice mentioned in the previous verses; and that, since *ἐπιστρεψῇ* properly denotes a personal act, and Moses is the only person named immediately before, this is, in point of grammar, the natural antecedent.

A further presumption in its favour arises from the fact, that the phrase of the verse before us, and the peculiar conjunction "*ἦνικα*," are borrowed from the verse in Exodus, where Moses is expressly the subject. It runs thus in the Septuagint (Exod. xxxiv. 34): Ἦνικα δ' ἀν εἰσπορευέτω Μωϋσῃς ἐναντὶ Κυρίου λαλεῖν αὐτῷ περιγρητο τὸ καλυμμα ἕως τοῦ ἐκπορευέσθαι.

The peculiar form of introduction, "*ἦνικα δ' ἀν*," which occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, and the phrase "*περιαιρεῖται τὸ καλυμμα*," are both plainly borrowed by the Apostle from this passage in Exodus, where Moses is expressly the subject; and hence arises a clear presumption that the subject designed by the Apostle is the same.

Let us now inquire whether the whole scope of the Apostle's rendering does not become more perspicuous by accepting this view, and rendering the verse in agreement with it as follows: "But whenever he turns to the Lord, the veil is taken away."

The Apostle is here expounding the remarkable history in Exodus as a type of the contrast of the law and the Gospel, of the blindness of the unbelieving Jews, and the high privileges of true believers in Christ.

Moses, as mediator between God and the people of Israel, represented God towards the people, and the people towards God.

Moses, when he came out to speak to the people, put a veil on his face; but when he went in to speak to the Lord the veil was removed, and he

spoke with him "face to face, as a man speaketh with his friend."

The Apostle first expounds the former part of this typical history:—

We are not as Moses, who put a veil over his face, so that the children of Israel could not stedfastly look to the end of that which is being abolished. But their understandings were blinded; for until this very day the same veil upon the reading of the old covenant remaineth untaken away, because it is in Christ it is done away. But even until this day, whenever Moses is read, a veil lies upon their heart.

So far the exposition seems plain and simple. Moses, with the veil upon his face, while he speaks to the Children of Israel, fully represents God speaking to the same people in the writings of Moses, and all the Scriptures of the old covenant; and the veil which obscures the true scope of those writings, coming between the eye and the object presented, is said with equal propriety to lie upon the Old Testament which they read, and on the hearts of those who read it. The last clause gives, I think, the reason why it continues unremoved, the *οτι* being causative. The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy, and the Old Testament Scriptures "are able to make wise unto salvation, by faith which is in Christ Jesus." Hence it is in Christ only, or by faith in the promised Messiah, whether as coming, in the case of Old Testament believers, or as already come, in the case of Christians, that the veil is done away, and the writings of the Old Testament begin to fulfil their Divine purpose in the salvation and enlightenment of souls.

St. Paul now proceeds, I conceive, to unfold the other part of the type, and begins by recounting briefly the fact, which he wishes to explain in its hidden meaning: "But whenever Moses turns to the Lord, the veil is taken away." As Moses represented God to the people, and the veil on his face represented the veil on God's word in the Old Testament Scriptures, when read with no faith in the promised Saviour;—so now, when he removes the veil from his face, and turns to speak to the Lord, he represents equally the standing and privilege of true believers on Christ.

Now the Lord is the Spirit; and, where the Spirit of the Lord is, there there is liberty. But we all, with unveiled face, beholding in a mirror (or reflecting like a mirror) the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image, from glory to glory, as by the Lord the Spirit.

And here, first, the Apostle states that the Spirit, of whom he has spoken before, is that Lord in whose presence Moses stood; and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom of speech, or access to worship boldly, without a veil of bondage and darkness. And such is the privilege of all believers, especially under the present dispensation of the Spirit. We share in

the privilege represented by the conduct of Moses when he removed the veil from his face. As his countenance then became bright with the vision on which he gazed, till it became like a mirror, reflecting the Divine glory, and dazzling the eyes of the people, so is it with the believer also, in proportion as he dwells by faith upon the person of Christ, revealed through the Holy Spirit in the fulness of His grace and love. "We all, with unveiled face, reflecting like a mirror the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image, from glory to glory, even as by the Lord the Spirit."

In the next chapter he continues still the more beautiful application of the history:—

But if even our Gospel is veiled, it is veiled to them that perish, in whom the God of this world hath blinded their unbelieving minds, lest the light of the Gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them. For it is that God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, who hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.

Here the metaphor is evidently carried on still further. In some cases the Gospel itself, though a treasure of light and liberty, is veiled to those who hear it. But this arises from no defect in its own brightness, as a revelation of the glory of God in Christ, but through the subtlety and malice of "the god of this world" in interposing a thick veil of unbelief, to blot out its blessed light from carnal eyes. In its own nature that Gospel is the removal of the veil which obscured the true scope of the law and the prophets from unbelieving Israel, as when Philip said, "We have found Him of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of Joseph;" and Nathanael corrected and completed his confession in the words that follow: "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel."

On this view it seems to me the beauty and harmony of the whole passage stand out in clearer relief. The double type in the history is distinctly expounded by its double antitype. The contrast in the history of Moses becomes a parable of the contrasted character of the light and Gospel dispensations. Each part of the history is briefly rehearsed, almost in the words of Exodus, and then receives its distinct comment. The lesson is doubly applied, first to shew the privilege of all true believers, and next to disclose the right spirit for the exercise of the Christian ministry, of which the proper features are not reserve, subtlety, and dishonesty, a mask and a veil, but a clear manifestation of the truth, as in the immediate sight of God; while a further warning is given, that unbelief and hardness of heart, even under the Gospel itself, may defraud the soul of that glorious vision of the Divine grace and mercy, which would else open clearly

to our wondering view, and transform us into its own heavenly image by progressive advances in holiness and love.

T. R. B.

JACOB'S DREAM.

Genesis xxviii. 10–15.—Jacob had obtained from Isaac the blessing of Abraham by guile, and for his chastisement was now an exile; but chastisement is not desertion. His vision was, in general, a symbolic prophecy of the mode by which the blessing of Abraham should be given to all the families of the earth. In the sacred writings the paternal Godhead is never pictured, even in a vision. Jehovah, who stood above the stairs of heaven thronged with angels, was a symbol of the Godhead of our Lord. The fragment of rock on which Jacob reposed was a symbol (and for the first time in scripture) of the manhood of our Lord in union with his people; even as the twelve pillars of stone, erected by Moses and Joshua, were symbols both of the princes of Israel and their tribes (Exod. xxiv.; Josh. iv.) And the angels, going and coming, symbolised the reconciliation of heaven and earth by the mediation of our Lord. Therefore the spirit of Jehovah should be the pilgrim's companion, not only of Jacob but all the Israel of God. And the spirit of the Lord it was, in the patriarch, that on his awakening anointed and erected that rock (v. 16–19; 2 Sam. xxiii. 3.)

It was at Bethel, in the tribe of Ephraim, that Jacob erected that anointed rock; and it was doubtless on that account that Jeroboam there set up one of his idol-heifers. But there was more in that vision than ever Jeroboam thought of; and, more particularly, it foreshadowed both the first and second advent of our Lord.

His first advent; for when at Bethlehem, not far distant from Bethel, the Lord of Hosts himself descended, and all heaven emptied itself upon earth, ascending and descending upon the new born Saviour, and bringing the shepherds that message of great joy for all people; surely, that was the house of God, and that the gate of heaven. And their hymn, what was it but a voluntary, and new version of the prophecy of Isaiah (ix. 4–6; Luke i. 32.) And when those lowly shepherds came and worshipped that only great and good Shepherd, then and there in that cave was assembled the whole church of Christ as yet upon earth, and Jacob the shepherd reposing on the rock, which was after to be anointed, was now a type fulfilled.

The second advent of our Lord was also foreshadowed by the vision. This we learn from a pregnant hint given by our Lord himself to Nathaniel (John i. 47–51). This was said to confirm the faith of Nathaniel, confessing him to be the Son of God, the King of Israel. Our Lord

clearly referred to Jacob's dream; for, even at first sight of Nathaniel, "Behold," said he, "an Israelite indeed in whom is no guile;" alluding to the guile by which Jacob had stolen from Esau the blessing of Abraham. Besides, he quotes the words of the vision, and in their very order. But that addition of other words, ascending and descending "upon the son of man," was also significant. For that phrase, applied by our Lord to himself in the New Testament, always refers to the same phrase in the vision of Daniel, which foretells his second advent. Then should Nathaniel see the confirmation of his faith, and that the Son of God, the King of Israel, could come even out of Nazareth. For observe the correspondence between this vision and Jacob's dream. That ancient of days, surrounded by his angelic host, corresponds with the Jehovah who stood above the stairs of heaven thronged with angels—the godhead of our Lord (Dan. vii. 9, 10). And that son of man, coming in the clouds of heaven, corresponds with Jacob's anointed rock—the manhood of our Lord in union with his people (Dan. vii. 13, 14), presenting his church to himself (Eph. v. 27). And coming to establish his kingdom; that stone which shall become a great mountain and fill the whole earth (Dan. ii. 35).

HENRY GIRDLESTONE.

1 Kings ix. 13.—The land of Cabul.

The word "Cabul" here is evidently of some importance. It expressed its own meaning to the original reader. But what was that meaning? I think it correctly stated in the Encyc. Bib. Lit. (Kitto), art. Cabul, where it is explained as "unpleasing," on the authority of Josephus. He states that the Phœnician word means *οὐκ ἀρεσκων*. As Gesenius objects to this, and says the word is not found in the Shemitic languages, and as he is followed by Winer in supposing it to mean "as nothing," I wish to show the origin of the sense given by Josephus.

I believe that many Phœnician words may be explained by the Arabic, and that the derivation of Hebrew words from roots of similar meaning in Arabic will often give a better sense than the Rabbinical derivations of the Talmud. This word is a case in point. *Kābool* comes from the Arabic *kbl*, one sense of which is *differre debitum, recusare*. The sense *recusare* is sufficiently equivalent to the *οὐκ ἀρεσκων* of Josephus to lead us to suppose that the Arabic interprets the Phœnician.

The Septuagint has *ὁριον* in the sense of "bordering," of which Bochart and Fürst approve. The Talmud has *דלא ענין פרי*, meaning "which does not bear fruit." Some writers derive it from *קבל*, a "fetter," as in Ps. cv. 18, and cxlix. 8, and take it for a land of clay which

holds the feet like a fetter. I am inclined to reject this meaning, and to adopt the Arabic root for this word, and for many others, as giving senses different from the Rabbinical, but more likely to be the correct ones. THOS. MYERS.

Psalm lxxx. 10.—Our translators have here missed the force and idea of the original by inserting "were like." Intending to describe the luxuriousness of the Israelitish "vine," the Psalmist would say that it reached to the utmost boundaries of the land, both north and south. Accordingly he describes these boundaries by their distinctive natural features, *i. e.* "the mountains for the south," meaning the mountainous ranges of Arabia, Paran, &c. (see Habak. iii. 3, called also "the wilderness," Deut. xi. 24; Josh. i. 4; and "the wilderness of mountains," Heb.; Ps. lxxv. 6); and "the cedars" (*i. e.* the cedars of Lebanon) for the north. The verse, therefore, is to be read (as also the LXX and Vulgate render it), "The mountains were covered with its shadow, and the goodly cedars with its branches;" or, as Coverdale has it, "The hills were covered with the shadow of it, and so were the strong cedar trees with the boughs thereof." Thus (connecting verses 10 and 11 together) the Psalmist celebrates the flourishing extent of Israel's kingdom in the time of Solomon (1 Kings iv. 21–25), first north and south, and then west and east, according to the promise (Deut. xi. 24).

Bexley.

T. H.

THE DIVINITY OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST.

Mark ii. 5–12.—Though all discussion respecting the cardinal doctrines of our creed are excluded from THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR, perhaps it will not be thought out of place occasionally to notice some proofs of them which may be gathered from Scripture.

In the passage before us we have a three-fold proof of the divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ, in his power to heal sickness, power to read the heart, power to forgive sins.

The paralytic is brought before our Lord, who, instead of turning attention to his bodily sickness, announced the cure of that greater disease, of which paralysis is a fit emblem, "Son, thy sins be forgiven thee." The scribes in their hearts, not orally, murmured at this declaration: he knew their thoughts, and answered their reasoning, which, though correct in theory, was wrong in application. He knew their hearts. And it is Jehovah's especial prerogative to know the heart. "I the Lord search the heart;" "He knoweth the thoughts of man." (See Acts i. 24, *ὁ καρδιουργῶν*.) Our Lord answers their reasonings, by declaring that it is as easy to forgive sins as to cure paralysis. This the Scribes did

not gainsay, for they well knew that no mortal power could heal the man of his sickness. Our Lord, thereupon, to prove his assertion, heals the paralytic, as a proof that He has power to forgive sins.
C. E. STUART.

SAYINGS ON THE CROSS.

Luke xxiii. 34. Then said Jesus—

I.—Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do.

"He hath left us an example that we should follow His steps," and some one has remarked, that he who refuses to forgive is breaking down the bridge by which he hopes to pass from earth to heaven. I would rather say—he has reason to fear that he is not on the bridge,—for Christ is the way.

II.—To day, shalt thou be with me in Paradise (Luke xxiii. 43).

And so we are taught that the locality of the separate spirit is distinct from that of the body. "To depart is to be with Christ," to "behold His glory," as preliminary to the sharing of His glory in that day when "they live and reign with Christ."

III.—Behold thy son! Behold thy mother! (John xix. 26, 27.)

Stupendous mystery! The Son of God hath a mother, a frail, sinful mother!

IV.—My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me? (Matt. xxvii. 46.)

For a wise and sufficient reason, God hid His face even from Jesus. Should we wonder, then, when for reasons equally powerful, though of a different kind, God sees good to hide His face from the people of Jesus?

V.—I thirst (John xix. 28).

Not, we are expressly told, that His agony might be relieved, but "that the Scripture might be fulfilled." Not a link must be wanting from that chain of evidence by which we know and rejoice in Him as the Son of God.

VI.—It is finished (John xix. 30).

Types are accomplished, and prophecies fulfilled, but the types and the prophecies pointing to the First,—the humbled coming of Jesus. For the Second as well as the First Advent is announced in prophecy and prefigured in type. If Isaiah liii. 7 be fulfilled, do we not wait for the fulfilment of Isaiah lxiii. 1-4? If the "Lamb have been led to the slaughter," shedding the blood which is the price of Redemption, surely the conqueror of Edom and Bozrah hath not yet "trodden His enemies in His anger and trampled them in His fury." Then again, the ceremonial of the day of atonement has not yet been completely acted out by the High Priest of the

Church. So far "it is finished," for the victim is slain, and the High Priest hath entered with its blood into the true Holy of Holies. But thence (to complete the type) He must needs return "to bless" His people.

VII.—Father! into thy hands I commend my spirit (Luke xxiii. 46).

"Father!" Then the cloud is passed. A little ago, it was "My God!" but now, "My Father!" There was a moment when Jesus could not say "My Father!" only, "My God!" "My great, holy, and glorious God!" There are many moments when Jesus' disciples cannot get beyond the "My God!" Oh, sweet seasons, when we can say "Our Father!" But here we cannot have these seasons always. Here, they come and go. Here, the believer's life resembles a change-ful April day, frequent clouds with sunny gleams between. Oh, joyous morning of eternity, that shall show us the sun in a cloudless sky, that shall let us hear the voice, sweet and clear, "It is I, be not afraid,"—no more for ever!

M— Manse.

M. S. J.

Acts xxvi. 18.—Sanctified by faith that is in me.

It should be noted here that the Greek, by inserting a comma after *ηγιασμενους*, seems to associate the words which follow, *πιστει τυ εις εμε*, with *του λαβειν απειν*, &c. rather than with the sanctification of those who enjoy the blessings of forgiveness and inheritance.

THOMAS PRESTON.

Hebrews xi. 24. By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter.

Our existing Egyptian chronologies being all utterly erroneous, I have some thoughts of setting before your readers the correct chronology of the kings of Egypt from the time of Amenemes I. to the death of the great Sesostris. At present I confine my remarks to the reign of Pharaoh's daughter.

She ascended the throne of Egypt, B.C. 1688, A.M. 2448, and reigned twenty-two years. At the time of her accession Moses was twelve years of age. He was thirty-four at the time of her death. It was owing to the absolute authority of this queen, that Moses became versed in "all the wisdom of the Egyptians." She compelled the priests to instruct him in all their learning. The name of this illustrious sovereign was Amounist. On an obelisk still existing at Thebes, she is repeatedly styled "Pharaoh's daughter," the title exclusively given her by Moses. Having no child of her own, she would have nominated Moses as her successor. His disinclination to accept the honour was the cause of her adopting

Mæris in his stead. In the seventh year of the reign of Mæris, Moses slew an Egyptian, and was obliged to fly for his life. Moses having been preferred by Queen Amounist before Mæris, Mæris would be inclined to shew Moses no mercy.

Torquay.

F. Fysh.

Revelation xvii. 3, 4.—Plotina tells us, in his life of pope Paul II., that this pontiff outwent all his predecessors, especially in his *regno* or mitre, upon which he had laid out a great deal of money in purchasing, at vast rates, diamonds, sapphires, emeralds, chrysolites, jaspers, pearls, and all manner of precious stones, wherewith, adorned like another Aaron, he would appear abroad, somewhat more august than a man, delighting to be seen and admired by every one. But, lest he alone should seem to differ from the rest, he made a decree that none but cardinals should, under a penalty, wear red caps, to whom he had, in the first year of his popedom, given cloth of that colour to make horse-cloths and mule-cloths when they rode.

This propensity to scarlet appears to be of old standing in the papal church, for, in a list of sacred vestments appended to Plotina, there is mention made of "*pannus laneus ruber quo equorum sellam, dum pontifex equitabat, cooperiebant.*" It is called by Guicciardini "*sacra purpura.*"

Clement V. is said to have lost a carbuncle from his tiara worth 6,000 crowns.

Romish tradition reports that Constantine left to the church of Rome, amongst other articles, a golden cup, "*calicem aureum duarum librarum.*"

If the pope be not intended under the symbol of the Babylonian harlot, it is strange that he should have so studiously endued himself with all her attributes and ornaments.

Woodrising.

ARTHUR ROBERTS.

The Replicant.

Genesis ii. 24. Vol. III. 390.—With all deference to Mr. CAINE, I would submit that the words should be held as spoken by Moses under the immediate inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and hence are the words of God. It is not said that he spake these words in the beginning, but He who made them in the beginning male and female spake them. The New Testament therefore does not require us to understand them as spoken by Adam; add to this, that we have no intimation that Adam at that time knew that he and his wife would be parents, and hence that there would be fathers and mothers to leave; for it

should be noticed that till after the Fall she is always called Tshah, woman. It was not till God had pronounced the sentence of bearing children with sorrow that Adam called her Eve. Calvin and Leclerc incline to the opinion expressed above, viz. that Moses and not Adam spoke them.

C. E. STUART.

Deuteronomy xxviii. 68. Vol. IV. 12.—Dr. Gill notices, in his Commentary on this place, that two Jewish authorities, Jarchi and Aben-ezra, are favourable to the translation, "Ye shall offer yourselves for sale,—ye shall sell yourselves." Calvin, although he translates, "*vendet is (i.e. Jehova) vos inimicis vestris*" (he shall sell you to your enemies), expounds, in his Commentary, "*se vendere appetent*" (they, i.e. the Jews, should desire to sell themselves). In the version of Tremellius and Junius, the rendering is, "*Exponetis vos venales*" (you shall offer yourselves to sale). And certainly this translation conveys a more fearful idea of the misery to which the Jews would be reduced.

Bexley.

T. H.

Psalms cx. 1, &c. Vol. IV. 13.—The solution of the difficulties raised by M. S. J. will be found in the contexts of the several passages he has quoted. The first verse of the cxth. Psalm views our Lord after his humiliation, "by the right hand of God exalted" (Acts ii. 33—35) to sit at the right hand of Jehovah, until Jehovah shall set his enemies a stool for his feet (as the Hebrew literally reads). The Psalm then goes on to speak of the Lord's future work of judgment as a king over the nations, "Rule thou in the midst of thine enemies," "The Lord shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath," "He shall judge among the heathen," &c. So again in Isaiah ii. when "the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established," "The Lord shall judge among the nations and shall rebuke many people." Again, Matt. xxv, "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory then shall he sit on the throne of his glory, and before him shall be gathered the nations," &c. These passages show plainly that Christ's Millennial reign will be one of righteousness, and that a judicial character will run through it.

The great argument of the fifteenth chapter of the 1st Corinthians is deliverance from death, the wages of sin, as a consequence of the Resurrection of Christ; morally, this is accomplished when an individual believes in Christ; for "he that believeth in me shall never die;" but there is to be a final and complete end made of Death, as one of the enemies of Christ; and this will be brought to pass when as the Son of Man he shall execute judgment upon all those who shall come forth from their graves at his call (John v. 27—29),

Or, to take another passage, when the great white throne shall be set for judgment, and "death shall be cast into the lake of fire."

Viewed in the light of the scriptures just referred to, we see that 1 Corinthians xv. 26, is placed by the Spirit under the broad truth which he just before declares, namely, that Christ "must reign till he hath put all enemies beneath his feet."

In conclusion, I think that it is clear that the Lord will leave the throne where he now sits to establish the Millennial kingdom (see Rev. xix). That he will come forth in his glory to execute condign vengeance on those who will at that time be found in opposition to him. That he will then, as Solomon did after the wars of David, establish a kingdom of peace, characterised nevertheless by righteousness, and the execution of judgment against any that may rise up against him: and that that kingdom will terminate when he shall have put all enemies, including Death itself, under his own feet, and he shall deliver up the Kingdom to God, even the Father, that God may be all in all.

These considerations, I submit, give a negative to the query "Is it so?" of your Correspondent.

J. WAKEFIELD.

Isaiah liii. 6. Vol. III. 495.—The book of Isaiah is almost exclusively about the Jews, as might be expected from its preface, chap. i. 1.

The Prophet has been speaking, in chap. lii. of their future restoration at "the time of the end" (Dan. xii. 1), and in ver. 13 he suddenly introduces the Messiah, according to the manner of prophecy, in which past, present, and future are spoken of simultaneously, because God "sees the end from the beginning," and all events are present to Him. "As many were astonished at Him," "so shall He sprinkle," &c. How many in all ages have been "offended" at the humiliation of Jesus; but this should lead us to anticipate the vast results which will follow the manifestation of His glory, for, "as many were astonished," "so shall He sprinkle," or, according to Parkhurst, "so shall He cause many nations to leap," 1st. for joy and alacrity; 2dly. for desire, and inclination towards Him; 3dly. for admiration and holy astonishment; and "Kings shall shut their mouths," &c. through wonder and veneration.

The LXX render it, "so shall many nations admire at Him." In Coverdale's English Bible it runs thus, "Even so shall the multitude of the Gentiles look unto Him." The root, however, means also "to sprinkle." But before this grand consummation (Ps. lxxii.; Isa. xlix. 7; Rev. xxi. 24) in the "last days," "Who hath believed our report?" will more than ever be the sorrowful exclamation of the godly remnant amongst the Jews, who are spoken of as the Wilderness Church in

Hosea ii. 14—23; Rev. xii. 6 to the end. May we not well believe, that, though ver. 6, chap. liii. is the language of all true believers, as Mr. Brooke has shewn, yet it will be more especially that of the believing and persecuted remnant above alluded to, for they will be conformed to Christ in sufferings, and will peculiarly need the comfort contained in this precious chapter, in which a sympathising, as well as a sin-bearing, Saviour is set before us?

ש. ה. ב.

Matthew xiii. 24, &c. Vol. IV. 14.—The solution of your Correspondent's difficulty with respect to this passage can hardly be better put than in the words of Dean Trench (Parables, p. 87, ed. 3), "Nor need the term 'world' here used perplex us in the least: it (the Church) was the world, and therefore was rightly called so, till this seed was sown in it, but thenceforth was the world no longer. No narrower word would have sufficed for him, in whose prophetic eye the word of the Gospel was contemplated as going forth into all lands, and sown in every part of the great outfield of the nations." To this I would merely add, that to take the word "Church," in this parable, in any narrower sense than as being the world viewed as the whole scene of darkness, which the True Light came to enlighten—the field of this mission, of whom it is said (1 John iv. 14), "that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world (*σωτηρα του κοσμου*)," is to make the point of the parable consist in the separation which is to take place in the harvest, "the binding the tares into bundles to burn them, and gathering the wheat into God's barn;" whereas it is certainly contained in the words "Let both grow together," and the reason given for this, "lest, whilst ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them."

Brenchley. GEORGE MACKNESS (B.A. Oxon.)

Matthew xxiv. 3.—... the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the age? (*της συντελειας του αιωνος*). Vol. IV. 14.

The question taken altogether is threefold: it involves three distinct events—the destruction of Jerusalem, Christ's coming again, and the end of the present dispensation, of which the two last are synchronous. The first has long been an historical fact, and its desolation continues as a witness; about this there is no question. The two last are still future, but no less certain. The first brought in desolation, but the others will terminate it. How dissimilar in their effects!

1. As to the question regarding Christ's coming. This is to a certain extent, and especially here, a Jewish question, and to understand it aright it must first be considered in that light. The whole subject has a marked bearing upon

the Jews nationally, as well as upon the Church. In order to enter somewhat into the minds of the apostles, and into the mind of Jesus too, on this subject, let us take a brief review of a previous and most interesting transaction. Some time before (chap. xxi.), the multitude, and among them His disciples, accompanied Jesus into Jerusalem, shouting, "Hosanna to the son of David: blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord: blessed is the king of Israel: blessed be the kingdom of our father David, that cometh in the name of the Lord; Hosanna in the highest." This is a direct application of *Psa. cxviii. 26*, to Jesus, in His character of son of David and king of Israel, and heir to the kingdom of His father David. There can be no possible mistake as to what they meant, the language is plain; it is entirely a Jewish scene; all engaged in it are Jews. But some say their views were carnal and mistaken, yet Jesus charges them with nothing of the kind; on the contrary, He stamps their language and conduct with the strongest approbation. In reply to the request of the Pharisees, "Master, rebuke thy disciples," His answer is, "I tell you, that if these should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out." Now, this same prophecy, thus here rehearsed as it were, and approved, is yet to have a future fulfilment in His reception, not merely by a few Jewish disciples, but by the whole Jewish nation. Jesus thus points to it: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets . . . Behold, your house is left unto you desolate; for I say unto you, ye shall not see me henceforth till ye shall say (or, Luke, until the time come when ye shall say), Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." This is addressed to them in their national character; and it is here plainly declared that the time shall come when the Jews shall welcome Jesus at His return with "Blessed is He that cometh, &c." These were the last words He uttered on His departure from the temple, and shortly before the question of the apostles. This, therefore, no doubt is the coming alluded to by them,—His second coming as son of David, king of Israel, not, as at first, to weep over, but to rejoice in Jerusalem and joy in His people" (*Isa. lxxv. 18—24*). Of course there is much more involved in this; but so far regarding "the kingdom of our father David," as a key to the whole subject.

2. As to the question regarding "the end of the age." Our Lord has left us in no doubt of the meaning of the term, by telling us what shall then take place: "The harvest is the end of the age (*συντελευταία του αἰῶνος*), and the reapers are the angels: as, therefore, the tares are gathered together and burned in the fire, so shall it be at the end of this age." (*Matt. xiii.*) The same in the parable of the net. When Jesus asked His

disciples if they understood these things, they said, "Yea, Lord." Its meaning is plain here; we all understand it, as well as the apostles, and there is no valid reason for supposing that it means anything different in the question before us. This, then, is what the apostles had in mind, and not *Dan. ix.* The end of the age, therefore, does not mean the destruction of Jerusalem and the close of the Jewish dispensation, but the time of the Second Advent of Christ from heaven.

Jerusalem is to remain desolate and trodden down "until," Israel as a nation cannot see Jesus again "until," blindness in part is happened unto Israel "until," but no longer. The word "until" puts a limit to Jerusalem's desolation and Israel's darkness, by the coming of Christ and "the end of the age."

Bootle.

J. WORTHINGTON.

Luke ii. 40. χάρις Θεου. (Vol. III. 406).—The *χάρις* is thus used by Thucydides (i. 42), *ἡ γὰρ τελευταία χάρις καιρὸν ἔχουσα, καὶ ἐλασσὼν ἢ, δύναται μείζον ἐγκλημα λυσαι*: thus translated by Hobbes, "For the last good turn (*χάρις*) done in season, though but small, is able to cancel an accusation of much greater moment." Favour is evinced in action by bestowing benefits, sought or unsought, not by exchanging them. The Hebrew word for *χάρις* is *חַנּוּן*, from the root *חָנַן*, merciful, gracious, commiserating, favouring; and in *Genesis (xxxiii. 5, 11)*, "graciously given" and "graciously dealt with." Another form of this root, *חָנָה*, signifies inclination, propensity, love. The Hebrew New Testament has *חַנּוּן* for *χάρις*, "grace." (*Rom. xvi. 20, 24, &c.*) In Syriac it is also translated by *chenono*, from the same Shemitic root, as well as by *taibuthe*, from the root *בָּרַךְ*, "good," meaning favour shown by acts of beneficence, or, as Aristotle explains *χάρις* (*Rhet. ii. 7*), "a benefit without looking for a return." The Hebrew word from the same root *חֲנֻנִי*, "gratis," as the last word is commonly used in business, will furnish a correct notion of the evangelical meaning of the term "grace." Every divine gift is a grace, and therefore the influence of the Holy Spirit witnessing with our spirit is a grace permeating the inward man. But it is desired by the Querist that notice should be taken of the meaning of this term in the language of the schoolmen to which Leibnitz, Dugald Stewart, and Wilson refer. This may be best learned from Thomas Aquinas himself. (*I. xxiv. 3.*) *Quicumque enim gratiam habet, ex hoc ipso dignus est vita æterna. Et hæc ordinatio deficit interdum: quia aliqui ordinati sunt ex gratia habita, ad habendum vitam æternam, a qua tamen deficiunt per peccatum mortale. Then he distinguishes those ordained to eternal life by predestination from those by grace alone, the condition of the latter being, dicuntur esse scripti in libro vite, non simpliciter,*

sed secundum quid, i.e. they have eternal life not in itself but in its cause. (Hampton's Bampton Lectures, p. 498.) However erroneous and unauthorised in doctrine Aquinas may be, he leaves no doubt as to his meaning, which cannot be predicated of Leibnitz, still less of Dugald Stewart.

The Romish church teaches (Trent. Council, vii. 5) that grace is given to all who receive a sacrament; hence perhaps "the drop of grace," "gutta gratiæ;" whilst "a spark of grace" can only be allowable as a rhetorical equivalent for "a very small instance of God's favour." Let me add, that grace must be something perfectly intelligible to the poor and ignorant to whom the Gospel is preached, from which any recondite meaning as to essentials, intelligible only to the rich and learned, must be entirely alien.

Lichfield.

T. J. BUCKTON.

Luke v. 36—39. No man putteth a piece of a new garment upon an old, &c. Vol. III. 422.

The general idea of this parable would seem to be, that the capacity and attainments of believers are to be regarded in the exercises to which they are called, and the work that may be given them to do. The 39th verse seems to be especially intended to meet an objection, or to remove a stumbling-block. All inexperienced persons might think that, if all Christ's followers are to be called to high and self-denying exercises in due time, then it is a hard thing to belong to Christ. But Christ saith that, when the time cometh that they shall engage in these exercises (such as fasting, and other acts of mortification and self-denial), they shall relish them as much above their former exercises as men relish old wine above new: so that they shall no more wish to return to those exercises which were suitable to the time of their inexperience and childhood in the faith, than men who have drank old wine will straightway desire new. When they become men, they will of their own accord put away childish things: and as their days, so their strength shall be.

Morayshire.

W. D.

Acts ii. 27. Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell.—Vol. III. 481.

I think Mr. Palmer must be under some mistake, when he says that Hades in the above passage signifies the place of torment, if he means the place of torment exclusively, and that it was to that place that Christ went. No doubt Hades includes both Paradise, or Abraham's bosom, and γέννα, the place of torment (See Matt. v. 22, 29, 30, &c.) The passages referred to by Mr. Palmer do not show that Hades is a place of torment exclusively. Matt. xi. 23, and Luke x. 15, simply denote its relative position (See Job xi. 7—9). Matt. xvi. 18, is a periphrasis for death, the

Church shall ever live. When Hezekiah said, "I shall go to the gates of the grave (Sept. πύλαι αἰδου, gates of Hades), Isa. xxxviii. 10, he did not anticipate that he was going to a place of torment. Luke (xvi. 22, 23) includes Abraham's bosom and a place of torment. Revelation i. 18, Christ is here represented as having the insignia of authority over the invisible state. Howe says upon this passage, "Upon the whole, it being most evident that hell is but a small and mean part of what is signified by Hades, it will be very unreasonable to represent or conceive of the power here ascribed to our Lord according to that narrow notion of it; and would be a like incongruity as if, to magnify the person of highest dignity in the court of a mighty prince, one should say, 'He is the keeper of the dungeon.'" 1 Cor. xv. 55; Rev. vi. 8, and xx. 13, 14, have reference to the unseen world, or invisible state. We certainly have no Scripture warrant for believing that Christ went to a place of torment. I quite agree with Mr. Palmer's concluding remark: "The more ancient Church believed that our Lord first went to the place of torment, which belief does not seem to be supported by one single passage of Scripture, when rightly interpreted."

Burslem.

JOHN HARRISON.

2 Corinthians v. 21. Justification. Vol. III. p. 495, 464, &c. We will assume as a point which is not disputed that the words δικαιουν and δικαιουνθαι are used in a forensic sense, i. e. that they mean either a declaration of acquittal or one of righteousness, or both. Let us take two passages which illustrate each of these meanings. (I.) Exod. xxiii. 7, "I will not justify the wicked." (II.) Deut. xxv. 1, "(the judges) shall justify the righteous." Now in both these passages the judgment is, as a matter of course, represented as being according to truth. The wicked person is not acquitted because he really is wicked. The righteous is justified, pronounced righteous, because he really is so. This is an important point,—let us bear it in mind. It will, I suppose, be readily granted that whatever, in these particulars, is the peculiar meaning of the word δικαιουνθαι, as applied to the law, the same must be the meaning of the word as applied to the gospel. Now St. Paul, in speaking of a legal justification, not only uses the expression δικαιουνθαι ἐξ ἔργων νομου, but δικαιοσυνη ἢ ἐκ του νομου, ἐν νομῳ, and (which is an expression to be remarked) ἰδία δικαιοσυνη. It is manifest then that whether or no the justification of the law belongs to the first category, it does at all events belong to the second, and denotes a declaration of righteousness, because of righteousness—that righteousness being attained by obedience. Cf. Deut. vi. 25. The expression δικαιουνθαι ἐξ ἔργ.

νομ. did therefore clearly imply more than a mere acquittal. And this will be made more manifest still by a reference to Rom. x. 5; Levit. xviii. 5; Deut. iv. 1 (and indeed the Book of Deut. *passim*). Rom. iv. 4, where the righteousness and justification of the law are connected with blessings and rewards. Such being the case, both precedent and common sense lead us to the conclusion that the judgment of God in the justification of the Gospel must, equally with the other, be according to truth, i. e. a declaration of righteousness because of righteousness. What then is this righteousness? Not ἡ δικαιοσύνη, not an inherent righteousness; but δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ (genitive of the source) ἡ ἐκ Θεοῦ δικαιοσύνη ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει, that righteousness which δια πίστεως I. X.; (πεθανερωται) εἰς πάντες καὶ εἰς πάντες τοὺς πιστευόντας. And in 1 Cor. i. 30; 2 Cor. v. 21, this righteousness is shown to belong to Christ, while in the latter passage it is stated in the plainest words that it is made to occupy the same position with regard to the believer, as the sin of man (ἀμαρτία, which, by the way, never does, and never can mean "offering for sin") did with regard to Christ. The Lord laid on Christ the iniquity of us all—the righteousness which belongs to Christ and is given by God is "revealed upon (ἐπὶ) all who believe." It is then, I think, manifest that a gospel justification, being the declaration of righteousness because of righteousness, does not mean merely pardon of sin. But further, the law had its Ebal as well as its Gerizim. Assume that in any one isolated act the worker attained righteousness, there would still hang over his head the awful sentence, "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." So that every isolated (assumed) righteous act would be nullified as to its permanent consequences by a subsequent failure in obedience. Cf. Ezek. xviii. 24. And so in fact the justification of the law in its only true and perfect form, could only belong, not to isolated acts, but to an obedience in all points persevered in until death, life being the term of service to the law (Rom. vii. 1.) As the curse belonged to a failure in, (Deut. xxviii. 1.) so the blessing belonged to an attainment to, a continual obedience in all points. (Ib. v. 15.) Now Christ did not come καταλῦσαι τὸν νόμον, ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι. He was not only born mortal man for the express purpose that He might die (Heb. ii. 14), but he was born under the law, for the express purpose of being obedient μέχρι θανάτου, until death, thus attaining in the law a true and complete justification. It was an absolute necessity, and a consequence of his assumption in birth of a Jewish nation, that the blessings of Gerizim and the curses of Ebal should hang over his head. They did so, and He escaped from the curse and attained the

blessing; and that head is the one given by God to his Church (Eph. i. 22). If then He possesses now in life a complete righteousness, so does his body. Faith, uniting the believer to Christ, gives him his righteousness in all its completeness. Thus then the believer is pronounced righteous because in Christ the head he really is so, and he attains in Him the reward of righteousness, eternal life, and the inheritance which fadeeth not away.

HENRY T. J. BAGGE.

Ephesians iii. 15. Vol. III. 378, 466.—Whether *πασα πατρια*, as Mr. GIFFS maintains, mean every family, or the whole family, it makes no difference with respect to the fact that they are all children of God in Jesus Christ, as T. H. has sufficiently proved from this passage. I rejoice to see that this great truth has found a vindicator in the pages of THE ANNOTATOR. Mr. GIFFS asks for scriptural proof that "the Church" includes any that were before Pentecost. Stephen, I reply, tells us that Moses was "with the Church in the wilderness." There was a Church in the wilderness; and, though there were many who believed not, yet not all were unbelievers that came out of Egypt. The Word of God had taken effect. Some believed. The unbelievers were a Church only in name, as dead as the boards and skins of their own tabernacle; but there were others, of whom those types were true figures. How is it that Paul compares the election of grace out of the Jews in his day (Rom. xi. 1—3) with the 7,000 in the day of Elijah, if they were not members of one body? How is it that, while (Rom. ix.) he excludes all the Jews that believed not (from the days of Abraham), he includes all the elect (as Isaac and Jacob), and sums them up together with elect Gentiles (ver. 23) as vessels of mercy before prepared unto glory, if they were not partakers of the same grace? The word *ἐκκλησία*, "Church," is constantly used in the Psalms; and if they that believed not were not of the true Church, but of the typical one only, they that believed were. Is this our mercy to the Jews, whose mercy we have obtained, that we should take to ourselves the kernel, and hand them over their own beggarly elements only? But Mr. GIFFS would (in effect) hand them over to perdition. He speaks of their being under the law, and the Church under the ministration of the Spirit (2 Cor. iii.). No doubt as a nation they were under the law, which, as the Apostle (2 Cor. iii.) goes on to state, was the ministration of death and condemnation; and they that were under that law, separate from grace, are a *πατρια* neither in heaven nor on earth. But the elected among them, were they under the law? Are they perished? No; they were under the ministration of the Spirit—epistles of Christ, written with the finger of the living God, born of the

Spirit, as Isaac (Gal. iv. 29). The ministration of the Spirit is not the Pentecostal gift, but that of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, dating from the days of Abel, whose blood was to be required of the generation which put Jesus to death, because I presume he was of the family of Jesus.

Mr. GIFFS argues that baptism of the Holy Ghost is necessary to constitute men a Church, or one body in Christ. A very different view appears in Acts xi. 15—18, compared with xv. 8. God which knoweth the hearts bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as He did unto us. It appears that that gift was the baptism of the Holy Ghost: that it was given as God's witness of approval, and given to them as a people whose hearts He knew, as of a people to whom He had granted repentance unto life. The Pentecostal office of the Holy Ghost to the believer is not to unite with Christ, but to bear witness of that union. He is the Spirit of Adoption, not to make them sons, but because (Gal. iv. 6) they are sons, sent forth into their hearts, to cry, "Abba, Father," whereby they know that they are sons. I would remark, in conclusion, that "confusion of things" lies with those who confound experimental knowledge of God with enlightened understanding: being in the way of life, and understanding its mysteries; being sons, and enjoying consciously its comfortable privileges; living in Christ, waiting for the consolation of Israel, manifested in these last days, and living in the light and enjoyment of such manifestation.

JOHN M. TAYLOR.

Colossians i. 18.—Head of the body, the Church.

VOL. IV. 9.

Your Correspondent Mr. BROOKS, at the close of his interesting note on this passage, puts the question, "What evidence does Scripture afford of a change having taken place at Christ's resurrection and ascension to glory in the position of the Old Testament saints?" &c. Lest any should hastily answer "No evidence at all," I would ask attention for Matt. xxvii. 52. The thought I have had is that these "saints" were such as had companied with, and heard and believed on, the Saviour in measure as he had offered himself for faith in the three years of his walk among men; and that they were thus raised that they might hear, and be joined to him by faith in, his accomplished work and glory as risen Head of the Church.

Matthew alone records this event, and I think it may deserve attention in the inquiry raised.

D. WALTHER.

1 Timothy v. 24, 25. — Some men's sins are open beforehand," &c.

VOL. III. 438.

Is not verse 23 of this chapter introduced by way of parenthesis from the Apostle's anxious

desire that Timothy should not, by ill-judged abstemiousness, impair his delicate constitution, and render himself unfit for discharging the onerous duties of his calling? Are not verses 24 and 25 assigned as a reason for ver. 22, that Timothy should be particularly careful to "lay hands suddenly on no man?" Does not the Apostle suggest that ministers should not be hastily ordained, because, while the sins of some are transparent, and would anticipate the decision formed, the sins of others are not so easily discoverable, and only follow after a considerable time for observation, *ερακλονουσιον*. So also the good qualities and fitness of some for the ministry is immediately apparent, while the usefulness and suitableness of others for the sacred office will not be soon "found out."

AXMINSTER.

Z. J. EDWARDS.

Son of God and Son of Man. Vol. III. 391, 453.

—It seems evident that there is some mistake here, and that Mr. READS must have intended his first definition to apply to the title "Son of Man," the second to "Son of God." Still a fuller statement seems desirable.

1. The title "Son of God" is predicated of the Lord Jesus Christ in three different applications.

1. In the sense of his being born in time. This Ps. ii. sets forth: "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee"—in connection with His kingship in Zion, presented to Israel's responsibility at His first advent, but postponed till His second, because of their then and present unbelief. So Is. ix. 6: "Unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given." Compare Luke i. 32: "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of his father David." And further, ver. 35: "Therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God."

2. "Son of God" as risen from the dead. Rom. i. 4; Acts xiii. 33, 34, shows Jesus in these two positions; 33, as raised upon earth ("again" should be omitted here, as it is in ch. iii. 22, 26, the meaning both there and here being the Messiah born in this world); 34, as raised up from the dead. See also Col. i. where ver. 15 seems to refer to His birth into the world, where he necessarily was the first-born or chief of every creature, as being the Creator; and ver. 18, to His place of pre-eminence as risen, "who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead." Heb. i. 5, 6: ver. 5 speaks of Him in the first of these two positions; ver. 6, probably in the second, especially if the marginal rendering (which is most likely the correct one) be taken, which would connect His introduction into the habitable world with His second coming. Rev. i. 5, may confirm this.

3. Heb. i. 1, 2, 3, evidently speaks of our Lord as Son in the highest and divine sense. So almost everywhere in the Gospel and Epistles of St. John. "The only begotten of the Father" does not refer to His place as born on earth or risen from the dead, but expresses his eternal relationship as a divine person.

II. John v. as it shows us the Son quickening whom he will in virtue of his divine glory, so it declares that all judgment is committed to Him as Son of Man. This title refers to his assumption of that nature in which he is first rejected and secondly exalted as universal Lord and Judge. See Ps. viii. compared with Heb. ii.; Dan. vii.; the Gospels *passim*. Hence also he is seen as "the Son of Man" in connection with the judgment of the seven churches in Rev. i.

G. W. GIRRS.

Bengel's Gnomon. Vol. IV. 14.—I subscribe to the English translation, announced by Messrs. Clark, and on inquiry, about a month ago, when any portion of it would be published, was informed that two volumes (out of four) would be published in April next.

The practical part of the commentary exists in English in the Rev. John Wesley's Notes on the New Testament.

Wavertree.

JOSEPH HILES.

Greek Testaments. Vol. IV. 15.—As Mr. COOMBE desires further information on a matter of such great moment to the Christian student, allow me to contribute a further mite. Much depends on the condition of, those for whose use the work is intended. For instance, "the head master" spoken of has found Webster and Wilkinson's book "suitable to the higher classes of a school and the ordinary run of undergraduates." Now every person of fair acquirements knows that this, however well adapted for the mass of youths at a university, is saying very little for the wants of such as desire to search more deeply. Indeed the same individual owns the absence of what is of interest and value to "the more advanced student." Again, as to exposition, I may observe that, though Messrs. Webster and Wilkinson may rarely say as to fundamental orthodoxy what is wrong or injurious, there is a total blank, if not worse, as regards the proper hope of the Christian and the Church, and consequently the views are erroneous on almost every question of prophetic and dispensational truth, *i.e.* on a very considerable part of the New Testament, not to speak of its connections with the Old Testament. Moreover, even as to the gospel of God's grace, (*i.e.* essential saving truth,) there is that meagreness which falls in with common popular Arminianism—the reverse of that "boldness" which the Holy Ghost loves and blesses. Never-

theless, though the text is merely a reprint of the Text. Rec. with few allusions to various readings in the notes, it is at least a comfort to find a new book of the kind free from the poisonous German influences which pervade most of the critical Greek Testaments that are issuing from the press. Mr. ALFORD's, for instance, is a far more clever and brilliant performance, in spite of Professor TISCHENDORF's too depreciatory criticism (in 1850) that it was hardly fit for schoolboys. I do agree with this remark, if applied morally; because, in my opinion, Mr. ALFORD's system, laid down in his *Prolegomena* and carried out in many of his notes, undermines the proper claim of the New Testament to inspiration. He distinctly teaches that the occurrence of demonstrable historical mistakes "does not in any way affect the inspiration or the veracity of the evangelists!" (Vol. i. p. 17, London, 1849.) Now, to talk thus is simply to deceive oneself if not the reader. Evidently he cannot believe that inspiration means God speaking or writing by man, so as to convey His mind perfectly, though in human language and in the style of the individual employed. For, according to Mr. ALFORD, inspiration is quite compatible with human mistake, whether of Matthew, or Luke, or whomsoever. What misleads the unwary, is, that Mr. ALFORD sets forth much truth as well as error in his book, and persists in using the word "inspiration" when he has really forsaken the true and sound idea conveyed by it: just as a still bolder and far more unguided man, Mr. F. D. MAURICE, continues to speak of the atonement, resurrection, eternal punishment, &c. though in fact he has long abandoned their proper meaning. I have read Mr. ALFORD's letter to the "Christian Examiner" for this month (Jan. 1857), but it has in no way relieved my mind, while his *Prolegomena* and notes remain unretracted.

I have also examined the recent publication of Dr. Christopher Wordsworth containing the four Gospels in Greek, with notes. His text is on the whole creditably drawn up, but he has not given such an apparatus criticus as to satisfy a careful scholar. The notes are derived chiefly from the early Fathers and from the theological literature of the Church of England—of course so far as the latter chimes in with the Editor's strong ecclesiastical views and his decided sacramentalism. A sample of the last will show how far Dr. Wordsworth's exposition can be trusted. On Matt. xxii. he treats Augustine's view of the wedding garment as inadequate, contending that the parable represents the visible Church, and that therefore this garment must mean outward profession of the Christian faith, particularly in the sacrament of baptism as the germ. Hence he argues, (with a gravity which would be ludicrous, if it were not distressing, considering the

subject,) that the question "Friend, how camest thou in hither, not having a wedding garment?" may be understood as specially addressed to those who, bearing the Christian name, &c. yet reject the sacraments! "And considering the title the Quakers have taken for themselves, that of 'Friends,' may we not be allowed to say that this question has a solemn and awful sense in reference to them?" May I not be allowed, in my turn, to regret that Dr. Wordsworth should have undertaken the task of scriptural interpretation, for which he is clearly incompetent?

Guernsey.

WILLIAM KELLY.

P.S.—Why does not Dr. Wordsworth proceed a little further, and press Matt. xi. 16, and above all Matt. xxvi. 50, into his service? What a crushing blow to the "Society" to find themselves identified with the traitor Judas? "Friend, wherefore art thou come." The same word *εταίρος* occurs in all three passages, a mere inspection of which is enough to expose this absurd misapplication. It is perhaps needless to add that I have as little sympathy as Dr. Wordsworth with the Quakers as such, and with their sad and ignorant neglect of baptism and the Lord's Supper.

The Querist.

Deuteronomy xxvii. 2-4.—It shall be on the day when ye shall pass over Jordan unto the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, that thou shalt set thee up great stones, and plaister them with plaister: And thou shalt write upon them all the words of this law, when thou art passed over Therefore it shall be when ye be gone over Jordan, that ye shall set up these stones, which I command you this day, in mount Ebal, and thou shalt plaister them with plaister.

In Joshua viii. 30-32, we find that this commandment was obeyed. Are we to suppose that all the law, including the Ten Commandments, and the regulations respecting the rites and ceremonies, was written on these stones set up in Mount Ebal? Is mention made anywhere of what became of these stones? In Deut. xxvii. 4, the Samaritan Pentateuch reads "Mount Gerizim," instead of "Mount Ebal;" but this is evidently an intentional alteration to suit the wishes of the Samaritans.

Manchester.

W. CAINE.

Matthew xvi. 18.—I think the explanation of Dr. Hales (Analysis iii. 131) the right one. . . . "alluding to his surname, Peter (*πέτρος*), as belonging to the Rock, (*τῇ πέτρῃ*), promised that on 'this Rock' (pointing, we may presume, to Himself) He would build His Church;" and in a note Dr. Hales adds, "Peter could not be the Rock meant, from the difference of the Greek

terms which our Lord probably used, *πετρος* and *πέτρα*. Nor his confession of faith. (The) Christ Himself is the Rock, or main foundation both of the Jewish and Christian Church, Deut. xxxii. 15; Ps. xviii. 31; Is. xxviii. 16; 1 Cor. x. 4; 1 Cor. iii. 11. The Prophets and the Apostles were the architects, or master-builders, Eph. ii. 20; 1 Cor. iii. 10. See Lightfoot on Matt. xvi. 18."

R. BETA BETA.

Mark iv. 31, 32. It is like a grain of mustard seed, which when it is sown in the earth is less than all the seeds that be in the earth: but when it is sown it groweth up, and becometh greater than all herbs, &c.

A Constant Reader would be glad for an explanation of the above passage. Can it be applied to the simple, humble, and self-denying gospel delivered to men without pomp and power? As the mustard-seed raised itself above the limits of its kind, so the visible Church oversteps its boundary in doctrine and practice. Note, there is no mention of fruit in the parable; so how can it be applied, as most commentators say, to the gradual increase of true religion?

HIGHFIELD.

Ephesians iv. 19.—Who being past feeling.

What is to be understood by this? Does it import anything more than the natural condition of all men as "dead in trespasses and sins?" and yet there does appear to me a difference. Is the "being past feeling" connected with judicial hardening in the case of those who wilfully reject the Gospel testimony, while "being dead in sins" is the natural condition of all men? "THE."

Colossians i. 13.—Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son.

This change is spoken of as already past. At what time in the inward history of the Christians referred to was it perfectly effected?

Was it when they repented, or when they intellectually believed the essential truths of the Gospel, or when, in consequence of such belief of the truth, they took God at his word, and fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before them. This may include some of the questions already considered, but I think the great importance of the subject justifies further consideration.

There are several classes of texts which bear upon the subject, with regard to which I should like to see the remarks of your Correspondents.

1st. Texts, in which the term made use of to express that instrumentality by which the change is effected seems to include more than intellectual belief of the truth; such as Acts xi. 18, "repentance unto life."

2nd. Texts in which "faith" seems to include trust, as well as intellectual belief; such as Matt. vi. 30, "O ye of little faith;" Matt. xv. 28, "O

woman, great is thy faith," which seems to include trust in our Saviour, even in opposition to the apparent meaning of his words. James i. 6, compared with 1 John v. 14, and other passages in the Gospels descriptive of faith in prayer.

3rd. Those texts which seem to assert that there may be head knowledge without saving faith, such as Rom. i. 18, "men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness." 2 Peter, ii. 20, 21, Luke viii. 13, "which, for a while, believe," illustrated by the case of Simon (Acts viii. 13), who "believed also."

4th. Those texts which seem to assert that intellectual belief must manifest itself in act before it saves; in other words, that we must take God at his word, and act upon it, before it can be said to save us; as in the case of the Israelites, who were healed, not by believing that if they looked at the brazen serpent they would be healed, but by actually looking at it—who were safe, not when they believed in the existence of cities of refuge, but when they took refuge in them; such as (John vi. 53) "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you" (Luke xiv. 26, 27), which surely asserts that the most earnest acting upon our intellectual belief is essential to our becoming a disciple at all.

Upon the answer to this question depends much with regard to assurance. There are two methods by which a Christian may obtain peace. The one is directly, in the very act of trust. This seems most adapted to the case of those who "are in darkness and have no light" (Isa. i. 10). The other is by a syllogistic process of reasoning. Is not this more adapted to the spiritually healthful and vigorous? If Christian faith and hope are simply intellectual belief in the truth of present and future spiritual realities, the full assurance of faith and hope can have no reference to any individual case. But if that faith and hope include trust in God, then the full assurance of faith and hope takes God at his word in the clearest and most unequivocal manner, accepts and appropriates the present spiritual blessings, which God offers to all, and looks forward with joyful certainty to an individual participation in those spiritual blessings which are yet future, and only promised. An intellectual belief in our own spiritual condition, whatever that may be, is evidently no part of Christian faith. It can only be an intellectual belief of the word of God. But it is quite another question whether Christian faith in the person of God, particularly as revealed in Christ, does not include trust in him. If it does, the full assurance of faith would include that trustful rest and repose—that unquestioning confidence which a little child has in its parent.

Carlisle.

WILLIAM BROWNE.

Revelation viii. 13.—And I beheld, and heard an angel flying through the midst of heaven, &c.

Dr. TREGELLES, in his most useful version of "the Revelation," reads "eagle," instead of "angel," in the above passage; and Mr. ELLIOTT admits that "the external evidence of MSS. is decidedly in favour of that reading," retaining, however, without hesitation, for reasons assigned, the reading *αγγελου*.—Hor. Apoc. 1st ed. Vol. I. 225, Note; and see also p. 234, n. 1.

Now it has occurred to me as probable (and I should wish to submit the opinion as a query to the readers of THE ANNOTATOR), that, on the analogy of the rule referred to in the observations on Acts ix. 7, and xxii. 9, in Vol. I. at pp. 133 and 267, the meaning of the passage here might be, that the Apostle heard a sound which resembled that of the rushing flight of an eagle—the word being *αετου*—the Gen. He did not actually know it to be an eagle that he heard, which, if he had positively known, the word governed by the verb *ηκουσα* would have been in the accusative case, *scil. αετου*. On this supposition it might still have been an angel which made the rushing, eagle-like noise, and then Mr. ELLIOTT's just objections to the word *αετου* would be obviated, and that reading, so strongly authenticated, be confirmed.

Stillorgon, Dublin.

J. R. ECHLIN.

Revelation xiii. 1—3.—And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads the name of blasphemy. And the beast which I saw was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion: and the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority. And I saw one of his heads, as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed: and all the world wondered after the beast.

Assuming the remarks of Sir Isaac Newton, and the inference thence, to be correct (vol. III. p. 421), a revolution so extraordinary must be preceded by events preparatory to it; and we may hope to trace these by the light of prophecy, step by step, backward from the ultimate terminus to our present time. Query then whether this prophecy (Rev. xiii. 1—3) be not the first step in that direction, being a repetition of that in Dan. ii., with some additional particulars?

This prophecy had been preceded by that in Dan. vii.; in which the fourth beast of prey had one ten-horned head, the Roman; the third beast had four heads, the Grecian; the first and second had each one head, the Babylonian and Persian: in all seven heads. Now, as in Dan. ii., we have a symbol of the four great empires, combined in one human figure; so in Rev. xiii. 1—3, we have a symbol of the same four empires combined in

one bestial figure: and in both cases alike they perish altogether, or at once, immediately before the kingdom of heaven is established upon earth (Dan. ii. 35; Rev. xix. 20).

Again, as the body of this bestial figure was like a leopard, namely, the leopard with four heads, this body must symbolise the Grecian empire in its fourfold division, after the battle at Ipsus; when Cassander reigned over Macedonia, Greece, and Epirus; Lysimachus over Thrace and Bithynia; Ptolemy over Egypt, Lybia, Arabia, Cælo-Syria, and Palestine; and Seleuchus over Syria; or (according to Sir Isaac Newton's remarks) it must symbolise the nations which at present occupy the territory of those four kingdoms. See Sir Isaac Newton on Daniel, pp. 30, 117, edition 1733.

Now, since the starting point of the vision (Rev. xiii. 1—3) seems to be just when one of the seven heads shall recover of a deadly wound, and the whole beast shall immediately, to the world's wonder, rise into power: since also the lawless King of the North, in Dan. xi. 36, is generally allowed to be a King of Syria; query then whether the wounded head of this compound leopard-beast be not the Syrian head?

Whether or not Syria at present be a vulnerable point, the lawless King of Syria at last will bring on that dread catastrophe which is the burden of all prophecy, and which the Church may not avert: she may, however, prepare to meet it, by cultivating a heavenly-minded fortitude. "But, if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?"

H. GIRDLESTONE.

Revelation xxi. 8. Vol. I. 272; II. 59.—Who are the *δελτοι*? Mr. CALLOW's reply does not remove the difficulty. Six commentators whom I have consulted do not agree with each other as to the meaning. Matthew Henry says:

The fearful lead the van in this black list; they durst not encounter the difficulties of religion, and their slavish fear proceeded from their unbelief; but those who were so dastardly as not to dare to take up the cross of Christ, and discharge their duty to him, were yet so desperate as to run into all manner of wickedness—murder, &c.

Henry evidently makes the *δελτοι* the same as the *απιστοι* and the *φονεις*, and he says the fear arises from unbelief. Archbishop Cranmer and Bishop Jewel were for a time *δελτοι*, but their fear did not arise from unbelief, but from mere human weakness and dread of death. The same may be said of the *traditores* in the time of Diocletian's persecution. Doddridge says:—

The fearful and the unbelieving are those who dare not face the difficulties which a courageous profession of Christ's religion requires.

He supposes the *δελτοι* and the *απιστοι* to be the same persons. Whitby says:—

The cowardly and distrustful, who either had not faith in God's promises, or courage to persevere on the encouragement of his promises.

Bloomfield, quoting Bp. Taylor, says the *δελτοι* are "those who fear men more than God; who will do any thing, but suffer nothing; that fall away in persecution." Scott does not make the *δελτοι* and *απιστοι* the same persons, like Henry and Doddridge, and Whitby, but distinguishes between them thus: "the fearful are the cowardly soldiers, who fear the enemy more than their captains, and who turn back in the day of battle;" the *απιστοι* "are not the weak in faith, but those who have no faith." Hardy thus comments on the word *δελτοι*.

Qui incommodum metu Christianam professionem deserunt; aut evangelii causâ periculis se opponere timent. *Δελτοις* A. Pastor in Lexico hic pro malis sive improbis, non pro timidis accipiendum voluit.

W. CAINE.

Temple of Janus. Vol. III. 423, 452; IV. 12.—I should feel greatly obliged to Mr. GIRDLESTONE if he would give the passage from the treatise he names, or any other work, to enable me to obtain an answer to the question I have before asked as to the exact date when the Temple of Janus was opened by Augustus, after the third time that it had been closed by him. For he will perceive that in Mr. BUCKTON's quotation from Eschenburg (p. 452), owing to an imperfect copy, he particularly mentions his inability to supply the information I am anxious to obtain.

B. W. SAVILE.

Notices to Correspondents.

The Editor will communicate with Mr. Hogarth as soon as he is able.

Errata in our next.

All Correspondents writing for the "ANNOTATOR" or "REPLICANT" must send us their real names; not necessarily for publication, but for our own information and safeguard. *Papers not thus authenticated will be invariably laid aside.* We allow more latitude in the "QUESTER" department.

Every paper should commence with the text or subject commented upon, written distinctly at the head of the article. Reference should then be made to the page or pages where the subject has been before noticed, and to which the reply, if it be one, is sent. Queries should have the text prefixed from the Authorised Version, or else should have such a heading as the Replicants can with ease refer to.

Every separate article should be written on a separate piece of paper, to allow of our arranging them in Scripture sequence. We cannot return manuscripts sent to us for publication.

No. 93 will be published (D.V.) on Saturday the 14th of February.

Just Published, Vol. III. well bound in cloth. Price 9s.

Vols. I., II., and III. Price 26s. 6d.

Quarterly Part, No. 12, in a neat wrapper. Price 2s.

All Communications to be addressed to The Editors of THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR, care of Messrs. NISBET and Co. 21, Berners Street, Oxford Street.

All communications respecting the supply of the ANNOTATOR, as well as all Post-office Orders, or enclosures of Stamps, to be addressed to the publishers, Messrs. NISBET and Co. 21, Berners Street, Oxford Street.

On the 2d of February, price Sixpence,

OUR CHRISTIAN CLASSICS: READINGS from the BEST DIVINES.

No. II.

CONTENTS.

ELIZABETHAN ERA.

THEOLOGICALS.

BISHOP JEWEL.

The Challenge at Paul's Cross.

ARCHBISHOP SANDYS.

Be Sober.

The Cloak and the Veil.

Foxes.

BERNARD GILPIN: The Apostle of the North.

His Latter Will.

HENRY SMITH.

The Trumpet of the Soul Sounding to Judgment.

STERNHOLD and HOPKINS.

Psalm cxxiv.

Psalm xviii.

Old Hundredth.

FRANCIS DAVIDSON.

Psalm cxxx.

Psalm cxxxiii.

Psalm xxiii.

WILLIAM HUNNIS.

The Complaint of Old Age.

London: JAMES NISBET and Co. 21, Berners Street.

This day is published, price 3s. 6d.
THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN
EVANGELICAL REVIEW. No. XIX.
February 1857.

CONTENTS.

- I. Ranalli's Italian History.
- II. Itinerating Libraries and their Founder.
- III. Sydney Smith as a Minister of Religion.
- IV. The Church—its Perpetuity.
- V. The Matter of Preaching.
- VI. Eli Smith's Arabic Bible.
- VII. Dove's Logic of the Christian Faith.
- VIII. Theodore Agrippa D'Aubigné, Warrior, Statesman, and Historian.
- IX. Macdonald's Creation and the Fall.
- X. Critical Notices.

London: JAMES NISBET and Co. Berners Street. Edinburgh. OLIVER and BOYD.
Glasgow: DAVID BRYCE. Dublin: JOHN ROBERTSON.

This day, price 6d.

A CONSPICUOUS of the various EVIDENCES confirming the DIVINE AUTHORITY of the GOSPEL. Being an attempt to assign their true places to the Inquirer and the Inquiring.

JAMES NISBET and Co. 21, Berners Street.

Fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d. cloth,

PRAYER ANSWERED in ONE HUNDRED and FIFTEEN CASES, recorded in the Old Testament.

JAMES NISBET and Co. 21, Berners Street.

Fcap. 8vo. 2s. 6d. cloth,

THE PASTOR'S PRAYER for the PEOPLE'S WEAL. A practical Exposition of St. Paul's Prayer for the Ephesians (iii. 14-21). By JAMES SPENCE, D.D.

JAMES NISBET and Co. 21, Berners Street.

THOMAS CARTWRIGHT.

Man's Right to Read the Word of God.

RICHARD HOOKER.

Church Music.

Preservation and Perseverance.

JOHN FOXE.

The Burning of Dr. Rowland Taylor.

Thomas Tomkins: Weaver and Martyr.

SACRED POETS.

ROBERT SOUTHWELL.

Mary Magdalene.

Content and Rich.

GEFFREY WHITNEY.

The Lame and the Blind.

Self-punished.

EDMUND SPENSER.

Man the Care of Angels.

The Seven Good Beadmen.

This day is published, price 8d.

THE APPLE OF DISCORD. Is the Christian Sabbath an Ecclesiastical or a Divine Appointment? being the Arguments (for and against) of the most celebrated Controversialists on the Subject, condensed by an M.A. of Cambridge.
JAMES NISBET and Co. 21, Berners Street.

Fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d. cloth,
AN EXPOSITION, Critical, Explanatory, and Practical, of Hebrews vi. 4-8. By ROBERT BROWN.
JAMES NISBET and Co. 21, Berners Street.

Small crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. cloth.
SKETCHES of a TOUR in EGYPT and PALESTINE, during the Spring of 1856.
JAMES NISBET and Co. 21, Berners Street.

In one vol. royal 32mo. price 1s. 6d.
MORNING WATCHES AND EVENING INCENSE. By the Author of "The Faithful Promiser."
JAMES NISBET and Co. 21, Berners Street.

Second Edition, folscape, 3s. 6d. cloth.
THE VISITOR'S BOOK of TEXTS. By the Rev. A. A. BONAR.
JAMES NISBET and Co. 21, Berners Street.

18mo. 1s. 6d. cloth,
THOUGHTS and APHORISMS on the CHRISTIAN LIFE. Edited by the Rev. J. BAILLIE.
JAMES NISBET and Co. 21, Berners Street.

18mo. 2s. cloth,
OSHIELLE; or, Village Life in the Yöruba Country. From the Journals and Letters of a Catechist there. By M. A. S. BARBER.
JAMES NISBET and Co. 21, Berners Street.

This day is published, price 1s. 6d. a new and cheap Edition of
MEMORIALS of CAPTAIN HEDLEY VICARS, 97th Regiment.
JAMES NISBET and Co. 21, Berners Street.

Just Published, demy 8vo. in a neat cover, Price 3s.

SKETCH of a COPTIC GRAMMAR, adapted for Self-Tuition. By W. B. MACDONALD, of Rammerscales. Edinburgh: W. H. LIZARS. London: GEORGE PHILIP & Son, 32, Fleet Street: and all Booksellers.

Just published, in crown 8vo. price 5s. cloth,
GOTTHOLD'S EMBLEMS; or, Invisible Things understood by Things that are made. By CHRISTIAN SCHUBER, Minister of Magdeburg in 1671. Translated from the Twenty-eighth German Edition, by the Rev. ROBERT MENZIES.

"To many these 'Emblems' will be as balm to a wound, as a strain of simple music after the noise and worry of the world."—*English Churchman*.

"A peculiarly fascinating volume. It is rich in happy and beautiful thoughts, which grow on the root of genuine piety; it is a noble product of German piety of a former age."—*Witness*.

"An effort, and an eminently successful one, to give a tongue to nature and art, whereby they may articulately proclaim the glory of the Creator."—*Warder*.

Edinburgh: T. and T. CLARK.
London: HAMILTON, ADAMS, and Co.

In post 8vo. price 7s. 6d. Second Edition,
THE SUFFERING SAVIOUR; or, Meditations on the Last Days of the Sufferings of our Lord. By F. W. KNAUM-MACH, D.D. Author of "Elijah the Tishbite."

"Truth and tenderness have seldom been so successfully combined; a book of the heart—to that it appeals in every page, with a force difficult to resist."—*Christian Witness*.

"The work bears throughout the stamp of an enlightened intellect, under the teaching of the Holy Spirit, and of a profound study of the Word of God."—*Record*.

"The author has chosen a suitable theme, and it comes to us bathed in his own warm, fervent spirit."—*Christian Witness*.

Edinburgh: T. and T. CLARK.
London: HAMILTON, ADAMS, and Co.

ROYAL ASYLUM of ST. ANN'S SOCIETY.

LAST APPLICATION. URGENT CASE.

PROXIES are earnestly solicited on behalf of M. E. JACKSON, No. 42 on the list. Her mother died of cholera, her father, a surgeon, of consumption, leaving three children utterly destitute, except for the care of an uncle, a clergyman in delicate health, who has a wife, six children, and an invalid sister, dependent on the slender income derived from a district church. The case is strongly recommended by the Lord Bishop of Lichfield; Sir H. Oglander, Bart. Parnham; and S. Cox, Esq. Benminster.

Proxies will be thankfully received, and all inquiries answered, by Miss Evans, Benminster, Dorset; Miss Marryat, Charmouth, Dorset; and Messrs. Hatchard, 187, Piccadilly.

THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR; OR, NOTES AND QUERIES ON SCRIPTURAL SUBJECTS.

[PUBLISHED ON ALTERNATE SATURDAYS.]

VOL. IV.—No. 93.]

FEBRUARY 14, 1857.

[Price Threepence.
Stamped Edition, 4d.

THE ANNOTATOR:—

- Gen. xxi. 10-13, by R. Dell—Jowett on the Scriptures, by Rev. J. Baylee, D.D.—Canon of Interpretation for the Book of Psalms, with special reference to Psalm xvi., by Rev. W. M'Ilwaine . 33, 34
Power of Hebrew Tenses—Dan. iii. 22—Matt. xxiv. 15, by W. Weekes . 35, 36
Testimony of Jesus (John v. 32-47), by Rev. Z. J. Edwards—Rom. v. 12-21, by W. Kelly—Rom. vii. and viii., by Rev. A. Roberts—Rev. xxii. 3, by John Dawson—Calvin and Servetus, by Rev. A. Roberts . 37-40

THE REPLICANT:—

- Psalms xvii. 14—cx. 1, by J. C. Reichart—Psalms cxxxv. 15, by J. E. Wakefield—Prov. xiv. 24, by Rev. F. Fysh . 40, 41

- Matt. xlii., by Rev. E. Ryley—Luke xviii. 13, by Rev. F. F. Tracy—Acts ii. 27—xxvi. 18, by Rev. R. W. Dibdin—Rom. v. 15-17, by R. Johnston . 42-44
2 Thess. ii. 2, by R. M. Norman—James i. 17, by R. Johnston—Son of God and Son of Man—The Lord's Supper, by C. Ellis . 45, 46

THE QUERIST:—

- Exod. xii. 40—John viii. 51, 52, and xi. 26—1 Tim. i. 13, by the Rev. J. F. Beddy—The Restoration of the Jews, by the Rev. B. W. Savile—Hone the Bookseller, by the Rev. J. F. Beddy—The Church of God—The Difference between John's and Christ's Baptism—The Tabernacle and its Removals . 46, 47

NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS

48

The Annotator.

Genesis xxii. 10-13.—Abraham stretched forth his hand, and took the knife to slay his son. And behold, a ram caught in a thicket by his horns. And Abraham went and took the ram, and offered him up for a burnt offering in the stead of his son.

How beautifully is here brought out in type the substitution of the Lord Jesus for the sinner. Isaac is bound, ready to be slain. The Lord calls to the destroyer to hold his hand, "Deliver him; I have found a ransom" (Job xxxiii. 24). The substitute is near; the ram suffers in Isaac's stead. So the sinner stands guilty and condemned. A burnt offering is required for his acceptance, a sin offering for his atonement. Jesus is both; "an offering, and a sacrifice, for a sweet smelling savour" (Eph. v. 2, with Lev. i. 9, and iv. 3, 10). He suffers, and the child of promise (Gal. iv. 28) escapes; yea rather, is raised to be a coheir with the Saviour, once suffering, now risen and exalted to glory. R. DELL.

JOWETT ON THE EPISTLES.

DEAR SIR,

Occupied as my time is, I have great difficulty in finding moments for additional work, and yet I could not refuse your appeal for aid in the self-No. 93.

denying effort which you are making to diffuse sound scriptural criticism, and so promote the spread of Divine truth by means of THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR. If the Lord enable me, I propose to do this in two ways: one by calling attention to the errors scattered through works whose aim is to give currency to a theology which departs widely from the ancient landmarks of evangelical truth; the other is to answer some at least of the numerous questions proposed by your Correspondents.

In doing so I trust I shall be entirely preserved from the bitterness of controversy, and enabled to manifest to the consciences and hearts of those who differ from us that I aim only at truth.

With your entire concurrence, I commence with Professor Jowett's work on the Epistles. His position in Oxford gives him a weight which must engage attention to whatever he writes. I propose to go over his two volumes very much in the order in which he himself has treated the subject, so as to make the observations which I shall venture to make more easily compared with the volumes themselves.

I shall commence with the General Introduction, which treats of the Greek text.

In this Mr. Jowett's observations on Lachmann's text are suggestive. He says, "Like

other great editors, he either could not or would not fully explain his method of procedure;" and again, "These rules are not equally observed by Lachmann in both editions. In the smaller one he professed to follow the Eastern, that is, the Alexandrian, authorities wherever they agreed; and only where they disagreed to balance them by the consent of the West. Somewhat more weight is given to the latter element in the larger edition, which contains his more matured judgment; but the increased value is not such as to make any considerable difference in the selection of readings." Mr. Jowett adds that Lachmann has not referred to the Oriental versions.

How much does all this show us the danger of altering the Textus Receptus! Had Lachmann died before his "more matured judgment," his name would have so far stereotyped the immature alterations in the very foundation of our knowledge of the Christian revelation. How much more suitable were the Ketib and the Keri of the Jewish critics!

In the last century Griesbach, at present Lachmann, are thus permitted to obscure the evidence of what is really the text of the Inspired Word. Even where there is an obvious error in the text, all that is really necessary would be gained by a marginal reading and annotation. We have an example in point in Isa. ix. 3, "Thou hast not increased the joy" is, by the marginal reading, "Thou hast to him increased the joy." The translators have thus preserved their reverence for the received text, and yet directed the attention of the reader to what they justly think is a better reading.

By the present practice we have the serious inconvenience of the danger of not knowing what is the real text of Scripture. When we get a Greek Testament, how often we miss some portion upon which we had delighted to dwell! We take up another, and find it there. We are thus compelled to be critics where we desire to be devotional. The same results affect in a still greater degree New Testaments for schools.

If critical recension had attained to anything like exact science, and were its results generally, I had almost said universally, admitted, there would be little reason to complain; but, in the present condition of textual criticism, there is a loud call to return to the old ways, to discourage every attempt at doing more with the Textus Receptus than adding footnotes of various readings, with critical reasons for any proposed change.

St. Aidan's.

JOSEPH BAYLEE.

CANON OF INTERPRETATION FOR THE BOOK OF PSALMS, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO PSALM XVI.

Although the interpretation of Psalm xvi. has

been already largely discussed, and portions of it with ability and learning, in the pages of THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR (see Vol. II. 303, 374, 393; Vol. III. 126, 148, 172), I beg permission again to call attention to this most important portion of the prophetic word; not only because, as it seems to me, some of the contributors above referred to have missed its direct and specific meaning and application, but also, in order to adduce what appears to be a safe and very useful canon of interpretation, not alone in the case of this particular Psalm, but of several others. I shall proceed, in the first instance, to indicate what has been just referred to, the canon of interpretation, and then apply the same to Psalm xvi., in illustration of its value as applied to others, if it be admitted.

Most of the readers of THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR are, possibly, aware of the various theories which exist, as regards the application of the Psalms, prophetically, to the Lord Jesus Christ. Some have been found to claim for the entire book, and each Psalm, such an application. The difficulty attending such an use of the Book of Psalms may, perhaps, be best illustrated by a glance at one of the most recent attempts of this sort by the Rev. J. RYLAND. Others would limit such an application to those Psalms which are the acknowledged composition of David. The difficulty of such a mode of interpretation will be best appreciated by any one who has examined the vast variety and opposition of opinion among interpreters, and those of acknowledged ability, on this very head. It occurs to me, however, to observe, that perhaps a more simple and satisfactory guide may be found as follows. Several of the Psalms are not only quoted by the inspired authors of the books of the New Testament (that is, by the Spirit of God himself), but there directly applied to Christ.

The Rev. J. H. HOBNE ("Introduction to Study of the Scriptures, Vol. II. p. 263, part 1) enumerates fourteen Psalms, among other portions of the Old Testament, as thus quoted in the New. I have examined these, and find that in every instance we have a reference, more or less direct, to our blessed Lord: a list of these Psalms is subjoined.* Now, without meaning to assert that no others of these inspired compositions were designed by the Holy Spirit to apply, prophetically, to the Messiah, the rule which I would venture to suggest is this:—that each of these Psalms, and *all parts of them*, are direct predictions of Christ.† The *italicised* words may

* Psalm ii., viii., xvi., xxi., xxii., xli., xlv., lxxviii., lix., xc., cii., cx., cxviii., cxxxii.

† Or more generally thus—that whenever any Psalm is quoted in the New Testament, with a special application to the Lord Jesus Christ, the *entire* of that inspired composition ought to be considered as prophetic of Him.

contain a suggestion new to some, yet I am disposed to believe, that if the rule be fairly applied to all the Psalms thus specified, it will be found to hold good.

Let this be done, for example, in the case of Psalm xvi. To do so as fully as the importance of the subject demands would exceed the limits of a brief paper, as the present ought to be; and yet, to answer the purpose mentioned at its outset, one or two passages, at least, must be thus tested.

Whether the Authorised Version of ver. 2 be retained, or the proposed reading of the Rev. C. D. GINSBURG (*CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR*, Vol. II. 393), the words present a most consistent meaning if retained in their application to Christ, and only thus. They contain an expression of *trust in the Father*, by the Son (ver. 1.), exercised by Him as not only the head and redeemer of His church, but as the perfect exemplar of His people.

In this view the language used by Him (ver. 2) is strictly appropriate, nor need a more recondite meaning be sought for the word טוֹבָה than that given in our English Version. "My goodness," the Redeemer says to His Eternal Father, "my righteousness" *extendeth* not to thee, but it does extend to the saints, to all my people who believe on me, and are thereby justified. These are the "excellent" of the earth, "and in them is my delight."

Let the reader view *all* the verses of the Psalm in this light, and he will find, perhaps, a novelty and fulness of meaning in the whole not generally appreciated. Thus (ver. 4), Christ speaks, as the intercessor, and utters an awful, yet just word of warning to those who look to any other, as such, than Himself. He will "*not take up their names into His lips*." Thus, also (ver. 5, 6), Jehovah is His "portion." He is His "goodly heritage:" thus the great lesson of *faith* is, by Christ's example, taught to His people, and the whole ends with the glorious resurrection—hope of the Church, through Him, its living head.

This I believe to be the true meaning of the Psalm, fully brought out by the application of the canon of interpretation above referred to.

Belfast.

WILLIAM M'ILWAINE.

POWER OF HEBREW TENSES.

Psalm xxv. 6, 7.—Remember thy tender mercies.
Remember not the sins of my youth.

The former "remember" is the imperative; the latter is the future or imperfect tense; and the distinction is this: when God's own attribute is appealed to, the strongest form of expression is used, a species of command; confidence is manifested; *q. d.* "Thou art love, compassionate, &c.,

therefore, act accordingly, as one mindful of thy own blessed attribute, for thou canst not do otherwise." But when the Psalmist thinks of his own sins, he becomes the humble suitor; deprecation is employed; a lower tone is used, *q. d.* "I beseech thee, be not thou mindful; let it please thee, not to act as if thou didst remember," &c. This nice distinction of sense is very striking and emphatic. May we ever have, in pleading with God through Christ, boldness in appealing to his own attribute of mercy, and humble earnestness in appealing, from the sense of our own sinfulness.

Bexley.

T. H.

Daniel iii. 22. Therefore because the king's commandment was urgent, and the furnace exceeding hot, the flame of the fire slew those men that took up Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego.

The following fact, as an illustration of the above, may not be without interest. In the Record of Jan. 12 there is a paragraph about the Great Eastern steamship, in which, after describing the size of the iron plates which are now manufactured for it, we have the following: "After the iron has been heated to a white heat, it is withdrawn from the furnace, and carried to the rolls, and rolled into plates. The heat given off is so great as to prevent the workmen approaching within one or two yards without their clothes being set on fire, and the skin burnt off their hands and faces."

C. E. STUART.

Matthew xxiv. 15.—This passage is usually treated as being parallel with Luke xxi. 20—32, and it may be well to look at this before I enter upon the former.

Luke xxi. 20 is fully sufficient to account for the flight of the Christians to Pella before Titus compassed Jerusalem, the command being, "When ye shall see Jerusalem (*κυκλουμένην**) being compassed—the action begun, but not completed. And so it was, the Roman army came to Jerusalem and retired, again advanced and retired, advanced again and sat down before her, and then † the Christians fled to Pella.

In Matt. xxiv. the flight commanded is to be in consequence of the setting up of "the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel." Those who look for the pre-millennial advent can readily conceive that after he who "shall come in his own name," ‡ *i. e.* the Antichrist, shall have

* Acc. sing. fem. part. pres. pass. of *κυκλω*.

† It would perhaps be more correct to say they fled some time between the first and third advance of the Roman army. The only authority I have access to is Adam Clarke.

‡ John v. 23.

been received by the Jews, he will break the covenant he will make with them for one *heptud* (week),* and set up "the abomination" in the holy place, the which will stand "until the consummation and that determined shall be poured upon the desolator" (margin).† This is not applicable to Titus, for he, the desolator, was not destroyed. The first act of the Lord Jesus when He comes to reign will be to destroy the desolator.

It is affirmed, from various circumstances, that the Roman army, or its standards, or some act of Titus, was the setting up of the abomination of desolation. Was this so? Setting aside the fact that Titus the desolator was not destroyed,‡ I will state the circumstances which have been supposed sufficient to fulfil the prediction, and reply shortly to them. It is said—

1st. Of the Roman army being in any part of Judea.

2nd. Of it when encamped round Jerusalem.

To these I reply that, if it were so, as the abomination had been standing some years before our Lord delivered the prophecy, He merely uttered a meaningless warning. Besides, the definite article could not have been used; it would not have been called *the* abomination, but *an* abomination.

3d. Of the lines of circumvallation formed by Titus.

4th. Of the eagle nailed by Titus to the door or gate of the Temple.

5th. Of the sacrifice offered to the Roman standards within the inclosure of the Temple.

6th. When Titus entered the Holy of Holies, there is, it is said, no doubt but that an ensign was then, if not before, carried in, and therefore the abomination was then set up.

To these I reply, after the lines of circumvallation were formed, no egress from the city was permitted; therefore the Christians could not have fled; and consequently neither of these could have been the abomination, and they did not fly from that cause: we have seen in Luke xxi. 20 a cause fully sufficient.

It is, however, well to examine verse 15 more closely.

The emphatic word of ὅταν οὖν ἰδῇτε is the conj. οὖν, and it would, if rendered "Therefore,

* Dan. ix. 17.

† It appears to me strange that a participle should in any language speak of the thing acted upon—not of the cause, but of the effect. If not against rule, the Editor will perhaps permit the readers of THE ANNOTATOR to discuss the point on the Hebrew word here used.

‡ This is fully sufficient to prove the passage under consideration does not refer to the Romans under Titus, without the participle ἐπὶ, as rendered in the text "desolate," be insisted on.

when ye shall see," be more emphatic: surely, their thoughts were directed to something which they did not then see, and not to that which was present. Apply this to 1 and 2.

Το βεβλῆμα της ἐρημωσεως. The same expression is used in 1 Mac. i. 57, ed. Montan. 54 Eng. of that which Antiochus set up upon the altar in the Temple. In Dan. ix. 27, β. των ε.; xii. το β. ε.; or, according to a various reading, β. της ε.

The word rendered by "stand" is εστος,* "it has been standing." The sign must have been fixed for some time before the flight. No ideal standing can satisfy the expression; but, as regards that in Luke xxi. 20, the action is begun, it is not completed. No imaginary standing can fulfil the former, nor did the flight take place at the first (or second) advance of the Roman army, but, when assured by the state of affairs that the city was doomed, they fled.

The expression εν τοπω ἁγιω settles, it appears to me, very decidedly the place where the abomination of desolation will be set up. By comparing this expression, which is used by the LXX in Lev. x. 13, 17, 18; xiv. 13; xvi. 34; and το ἅγιον (used of the Holy of Holies), x. 18 (where both are found); xvi. 2, 3, 16, 17, 20, 23, 27, with το ἅγιον του ἁγίου (verse 33), "the holy sanctuary," I find it alludes to that part of the tabernacle in which the altar of burnt offering was placed; and, as in the New Testament ναος, when speaking of the temple, is limited to the Holy of Holies, but ιερον includes even the outside walls, I consider I do not strain a point in saying το ιερον, Dan. ix. 27 (Theod. I have no access to the true LXX) is the same place as τοπω ἁγιω, Matt. xxiv. 15, more particularly as the abomination was set up by Antiochus in the same division of the temple, viz. on the altar of burnt offering (see above). Surely these independent evidences settle the meaning of the term τοπω ἁγιω, "holy place." Apply this to each of the supposed fulfilments, or to anything the Romans did, and it will be seen Matt. xxiv. 15, was not fulfilled by them. Perhaps some of the Correspondents of THE ANNOTATOR will look more particularly into this use of τοπω ἁγιω by the LXX.

The expression, ἡ γενεα αὐτη (verse 34), must, it is confidently affirmed, be limited to the generation of men then living when the prophecy was delivered, and therefore the fig-tree must have budded, and all contained in ver. 15—34 have been fulfilled in the destruction of Jerusalem, or at all events in a few years after that event, and this limits the setting up of the abomination to the time when Titus destroyed the city. I reply, Luke xxi. 22, fully and completely settles the

* Acc. sing. neut. part. perf. of ἵστημι.

meaning of *ἡ γενεα αὐτῆς* to be "this race of people." It says the Jewish race shall not pass away—cease to be a distinct people—separate from the rest of mankind—until* (after) Jerusalem shall (cease to) be trodden down of the Gentiles (verse 24). This has now been for nearly 1800 years, and so I find God to be His own interpreter; and that the meaning generally placed on this expression has been marked by Him to be in direct opposition to what the Holy Spirit has recorded here.† The fig-tree must have budded, Christ's elect must have been gathered, the Son of Man must have come, the Kingdom of God—of Heaven—of Christ, as it is indifferently called, must have been set up (after the things predicted in ver. 25—28 have come to pass, for, when they are seen, it—the Kingdom—is nigh at hand), before the Jewish race can pass away, for thus saith the good news of that kingdom in Luke xxi. 20—35. And the last verse says that day—the day in which that kingdom shall be set up (verse 31)—will come as a snare on all them that dwell (*καθημενωσ*, "who are seated") on the face of the whole earth—on all who make this world their resting-place.

I have shewn, and I think clearly, that the Roman army, &c. was not the abomination of desolation; that "the holy place" is that division of the temple in which the altar of burnt offerings was placed; that *ἡ γενεα αὐτῆς* may be—and must, in the passage under consideration, be applied to the Jews as a race of people: it follows, therefore, as a consequence, Matt. xxiv. 15, has not been fulfilled; its fulfilment must therefore be future. If this be so, verses 37—39 will allow no place for the millennium before Christ's return.

WM. WEEKES.

TESTIMONY OF JESUS.

John v. 32—47.—What varying evidences does not our Lord here adduce, all exactly applying

* *αχρι* "continually until," or if the reading *αχρις ου* be preferred, "until when (or, following Lid. and Scott. *αχρι π.*, "to the time when") the times of the Gentiles, *πληρωθωσ*, should have been (equivalent to "shall be") fulfilled. I have put it as in the text, as being more explicit while conveying the same meaning.

† In Luke xvi. 8, whatever value may be placed on *αιωνος*, "age;" which is rendered by "world," the same must be given to *γενεαν*; and the whole of the Epistle to the Philippians requires that *γενεας*, rendered by "nation" (ii. 15), be taken to include a time yet future, and so cannot be limited to men then living. Homer, vi. 146, applies *γενεα* to the leaves of trees and to mankind: *οιηπερ φυλλων γενει τοιδε και ανδρων*, rendered by Pope, "Like leaves on (of) trees the race of man is found." *γενεα* is here applied either to all mankind, or limited to the ancestors of Glaucus: either sense supports the meaning I have placed on it.

to himself, as a right key does to the wards of a most complicate and intricate lock. He first commences with the holy Baptist, "the burning and shining light," as preparing the minds of men for the greater light "that lighteth every man that cometh into the world," ver. 32—35. Next the miracles of Christ bear witness, for it was foretold by the evangelical prophet that the "eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped: then shall the lame man leap as a hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing," ver. 36 (compare Isa. xxxv. 5 and 6). The father's voice from heaven, too, attests Messiah's coming. "This is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased," ver. 37 and 38; comp. Matt. iii. 17. The Scriptures also, from the first promise in Genesis to the last in Malachi, from the Virgin's seed that bruised the serpent's head, Gen. iii. 15, to the "Sun of Righteousness that arose with healing in his wings," Mal. iii. 2, clearly foretell the Holy One and the Just, ver. 39—44. Lastly, the bigoted and prejudiced Jew has no excuse, for Moses wrote of him, ver. 45—47. Whichever law of Moses is appealed to, ceremonial, civil, moral, each has reference to Christ. The blood of sprinkling, the pascal lamb, scape goat, daily, monthly, yearly, sacrifice—all have their fulfilment in the Great High Priest. Jesus is the true Son of David, the great Jewish King and Lawgiver. He hath become obedient unto the law for us, and this is "the name whereby he shall be called, the Lord our Righteousness, Jer. xxiii. 6.

AXMINSTER.

Z. J. EDWARDS.

ROMANS v. 12—21. Though I cannot but dissent from those who consider this a difficult passage, it is plain that it is often misunderstood, as it is certainly momentous in its bearings.

First, I am of opinion that the parenthesis is rightly marked so as to help the sense, 13—17 inclusively being one of those full and instructive digressions so characteristic of St. Paul.

Next, be it observed, that the Apostle traces sin up to its source, beyond the Jew or the law. "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." Sin was theirs through one; besides, all had sinned. It was not the law of which the Jews boasted which brought in sin; for it existed anterior to the Sinai covenant. And, though sin was not put to account, or imputed to man, in God's government of the world before the law, still death reigned, the proof and wages of sin, even over those who had not transgressed a known commandment like Adam (or like the Jews after the law was given). That is, while in the nature of things there might not be transgression between the two points of Adam

and Moses, there was sin,* and God marked His sense of it, for death reigned. Now, if Adam were confessedly typical of the Messiah who was to come, should not the free gift be as the offence? For if by the offence of the one the many (the mass connected with him, who in this case were all mankind,) have died, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man Jesus Christ, has abounded unto the many. And shall not, as by one that sinned, be the gift? For the judgment was of one [thing] to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences to justification. For if by the offence of the one, death reigned by the one, much more shall those who receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness, reign in life by the one, Jesus Christ. This closes the parenthesis, nor could reasoning be more compressed in itself, or more conclusive to a Jew. For he, of all men, could not deny the sorrowful facts of Genesis, or the universal ruin entailed by Adam's sin. The principle then is conceded. From the beginning God had recognised something more than mere individualism. If the first and earthy man had sent down to all his family sin and death, why should not the second man, the Lord from heaven, transmit to His family righteousness and life? Verse 15 compares the persons or heads; verse 16 contrasts the things, or the judgment grounded on a single act with the state of accomplished righteousness (*δικαιωμα*) in spite of many offences; and verse 17 presents the crowning result, the evident propriety that, if by the offence of one death reigned, how much rather should the last Adam's family reign in life through their glorious head.

Then, we have the general thread resumed with light and force derived from the parenthesis, and this in the most abstract way possible. "Therefore, then (in allusion to the intervening verses, but in direct reference to verse 12), as [it was] by one offence unto all men to condemnation; so also [is it] by one accomplished righteousness unto all to justification of life. For as by the disobedience of the one man the many have been constituted sinners, so also by the obedience of the one shall the many be constituted righteous." That is, verse 18 gives us the pure and simple tendency of Adam's offence on the one hand, and of Christ's righteousness on the other. The direction of the one, as of the other, was towards all men. But verse 19 adds the very im-

portant information that, whatever might be the scope of action in either case, the actual and definitive effect was a different matter. All men were not left in their ruin, nor were all, in result, delivered through Christ. Hence the change from *παντες* to *οι πολλοι*, for it is mere ignorance to take them as equipollent. In certain circumstances they may mean the same persons, but the terms are invariably distinct in themselves. Thus, in verse 18, where "all" occurs, we have the universal aspect of the act, whether of Adam or of Christ; but in verse 19, where the positive application is treated of, we get "the many" who are in fact affected thereby.

But law did come: why it entered, and as it were, by the way, the Apostle answers in verse 20. It was that (not sin, but) "the offence might abound." God forbid that anything God gave should be said to create evil! Sin being already there, the law came to bring out its real character as directly violating God's command when he gives one. "But where sin abounded, grace has superabounded, in order that, as sin has reigned in death, so also might grace reign, through righteousness, to eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord."

May I just say in closing, that the Authorised Version is clearly wrong in twice rendering *ες παντας ανθρωπους* "upon all men." In such a sentence it ought to be, "unto or towards all men." The distinction of *ες* and *επι* strikingly appears in Rom. iii. 22; where we have, first, the universal tendency of God's righteousness, by faith of Jesus Christ, and then, the actual application of it to all those who believe. This is accurately given in our Bible, "unto all," the first and general presentation, putting all under responsibility; and then, "upon all them that believe," the special portion of all such as believe. To any who desire to understand the Epistle to the Romans, I would strongly recommend a version published by Gregg, and the admirable exposition of it, which is the opening article of the "Present Testimony," part xxxv., just issued by Groombridge.

Guernsey.

WILLIAM KELLY.

Romans vii. and viii.—Peter Martyr has an interesting and comfortable observation on the change of person which St. Paul adopts, when he turns from the subject of the first of these two chapters to the subject of the second.

In the 7th chapter, where he was writing of the indwelling sin and inward warfare of believers, he uses the first person singular, "that we might understand that no man is so holy as to be exempted from that sin as long as he lives here. But afterwards, when he treats of the assistance of the Spirit of Christ, he introduces the person

* In 1 John, iii. 4, the true force beyond a doubt is, "sin is lawlessness," and not merely "transgression of the law," which is a different phrase and idea. Man was corrupt and violent before the law. Under the law he despised and rebelled against the authority of God. Transgression is always sin, but sin is much more than transgression.

of others, lest any might be led to think that it is not every Christian who enjoys this present help, but only the chief and choicest, such as the apostles."

Woodrising.

ARTHUR ROBERTS.

Revelations xxi. 3. And there shall be no more curse, for the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be in it, and his servants shall serve him.

This verse clearly indicates the condition of the redeemed in the New Jerusalem; it will not be one of luxurious indolence, but of active duty, "his servants shall serve him." This is declared in other portions of God's Word. In the Lord's Prayer we are taught to ask, "Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven," shewing us that in heaven there is a divine will which commands and obtains implicit obedience; and in Rev. vii. 14, 15, we are told that they who had "washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb," are "before the throne of God, and serve him day and night in his temple." With respect to the nature of the service and duties in which the redeemed will be engaged, little is said in Scripture, and with this we are not at present concerned. What we are now proving is, that the saints in glory, so far from spending an eternity according to the popular idea in "sitting on a cloud and singing Hallelujah," are actively engaged, each performing his appointed duty, and serving God in his appointed sphere. But it may be objected, are not labour and service inconsistent with a state of perfect happiness? Certainly not. Look at the condition of our first parents previous to the Fall—they were perfectly happy, and yet they had to dress and keep the Garden of Eden. Look at the angels—their bliss is complete, and yet their occupations are unceasing. Labour and sorrow are by no means necessarily connected; it is sin, and sin alone, that has linked them together, and when we are removed to a habitation where sin is unknown the unhappy connection will be eternally dissolved. In heaven "there shall be no more curse," labour shall be restored to its primitive purity and dignity, and thus it is perfectly consistent on the one hand to affirm that they who die in the Lord shall "rest from their labours," and to maintain on the other that "his servants shall serve him." The practical use of this doctrine is plain; the work which God appoints for us in this world is preparing us for our work in the world to come. Let us then be diligent, and, as it is God who appoints our sphere, let us be contented and thankful.

Ewell.

JOHN DAWSON.

CALVIN AND SERVETUS.

I am continually hearing invectives against Calvin for the part which he took against Ser-

vetus. Gibbon affects to be "more deeply scandalised at the single execution of Servetus than at the hecatombs which have blazed in the *auto da fés* of Spain and Portugal," and many who are no sharers with Gibbon in his infidelity yet fully accord with him in this opinion. They can speak lightly and gently of the Marian martyrdoms, and of the Bartholomew massacre, and of all the horrors of the Inquisition; but at the almost solitary case of Servetus "frigidus horror membra quatit." Servetus is looked upon with pity, and with sympathy, and Calvin execrated. Now, you will allow me, perhaps, to suggest two mitigating circumstances in this wholly indefensible transaction.

1. That Servetus was no common heretic, but an awful and horrible blasphemer, who compared the mysterious doctrine of the ever-blessed Trinity to the fable of Cerberus, and broached such vile and awful statements in his writings, that a printer at Frankfort refused to proceed with a work of his which he had begun to print. "Filiis hypostasim existentem et Patri coessentialem et coequallem, diabolicam ideam et fabulosam quandam chimæram convitari non veritus est." Calvin tells the pastors of Frankfort that he wishes they would form their own judgment of Servetus by a perusal of his book, and assures them they would find in almost every page what would strike them with horror.

2. That not Calvin only, but almost all his contemporary divines, were persuaded in their consciences, however erroneously, that blasphemers, and even gross heretics, should suffer death at the hands of the magistrate. He admits that one of the syndics of Geneva, at his instigation (*me auctore*), had cast Servetus into prison.

For I acknowledge (says he) that I considered it a matter of duty to restrain, as far as in me lay, a man worse than obstinate, and irreclaimable, lest the contagion should spread further. We see how licentiously impiety stalks everywhere abroad, so that fresh errors continually spring forth—such is their supineness whom God hath armed with the sword to vindicate the glory of His name. Whereas the Papists are such hot and zealous vindicators of their own superstitions as fiercely and furiously to shed the blood of innocence, let it shame Christian magistrates to be so altogether spiritless in maintaining certain truth. I confess, indeed, that nothing less becomes us than to imitate their furious intemperance; but there must be some bounds to moderation, so as not to let the impious utter with impunity whatever blasphemies they please, whilst we have the means of checking it.

It is well known, I believe, that all the Swiss Protestant cantons were consulted, and indeed German divines also, as to the punishment which ought to be inflicted, and that all with one consent, the Zurichers especially, declared "Monstrum esse non ferendum," and urged the magistrates to the step which they adopted.

Calvin begged that a different kind of death might be determined on, but ineffectually, "*Genus mortis conati sumus mutare sed frustra*"—a proof that this reformer was not then the supreme orderer of matters at Geneva. Indeed, D'Aubigny asserts that Calvin and the Council of Geneva were then on very bad terms. "Calvin," he says, "had excommunicated some of them, and, very far from complying with his wishes, the Council opposed him all they could." The execution of Servetus, strange as it may seem, was cordially approved by mild Melancthon. He says, in a letter to Bullinger,

Judico Senatum Genevensem recte fecisse quod hominem pertinacem et non omisurum blasphemias sustulit. Ad miratus sum esse qui severitatem illam improbant.

Our own divines of that and the succeeding generation equally approved it. Thus Bishop Jewel says,

As for David George and Servetus the Arian, and such other the like, they were yours, Mr. Harding, they were not ours. You brought them up, the one in Spain, the other in Flanders. We detected their heresies, and not you. We arraigned them. We condemned them. We put them to the execution of the laws. It seemeth very much to call them our brothers (as Harding had done), because we burnt them.—Bishop Jewel's Defence of Ap. III. 188. (P.S.E.)

So, again, Dr. Field, the Dean of Gloucester, in James the First's days—

How little approbation he (Servetus) found amongst us, the just and honourable proceeding at Geneva will witness to all posterity.—Field on the Church, lib. iii. c. 27.

In short, I know of no great divines of the sixteenth century, except it be Martin Luther and John Foxe the martyrologist, who held our principles of toleration. I may add, indeed, Castellio (a not very sound theologian in other respects), who ventured to write, under the feigned name of Martinus Bellius, a book in which he questioned the advantage of punishing heretics. Good Bishop Hall, as well, I believe, as all his contemporaries, held the intolerant opinion. We must blame rather the times than the men, make allowances for the prejudices of education, and be thankful that we live in days when the capital punishment of blasphemy and heresy is adjourned, by Protestants at least, to God's tribunal.

Woodrising Rectory. ARTHUR ROBERTS.

The Replicant.

Psalm xvii. 14. Vol. IV. 12.—The interpreting "Thy hid treasure," to mean wealth, seems more consistent (1) with the analogy of the Hebrew (see Job xx. 26; Psalm lxxxiii. 3; Prov. xiii.

22, in all which passages the idea of riches is most appropriate): and (2) with the design of the context, which is, to set forth the prosperity of the ungodly, as a plea with God to vindicate His servant. "Deliver me, Lord, from the men whose tyranny has prevailed too long, and whom thou hast too long suffered to settle down in the lees of their prosperity."—Calvin.

Bexley.

T. H.

Psalm cx. 1. Sit thou at my right hand until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool. Vol. IV. 13.

This passage M. S. J. compares with 1 Cor. xv. 26, and Rev. xx. 14, and, understanding it to mean that Christ will sit at the right hand of God, until all his enemies, including death, are either destroyed or subdued, he proposes the question respecting our Saviour's abode or position during the millennium. The difficulty arises from the interpretation or application of the expression footstool, which is generally understood as a term of victory over a conquered foe, or as synonymous with trampling the enemy under the feet; but it seems to be employed in Scripture only as a term of honour, and as a resting place, especially when connected with Deity. Thus the earth is called God's footstool in Psa. lxvi. 1. "The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool;" and again, the temple at Jerusalem was called the Lord's footstool, Psa. xc. 5; and cxxx. 7, "We will worship at his footstool." When David was about to build that temple, he said (1 Chr. xxviii. 2), "As for me, I had in mine heart to build an house of rest for the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and for the footstool of our God;" and when that temple, that habitation of Deity, was destroyed, and with it the glory had departed from Israel, the prophet Jeremiah exclaimed in his Lamen. ii. 1, "How hath the Lord covered the daughter of Zion with a cloud in his anger, and cast down from heaven unto the earth the beauty of Israel, and remembered not his footstool in the day of his anger." If footstool then conveys the idea of a resting-place, and a place of honour, it is very significant in the cxth Psalm, and refers us especially to that glorious event when the Lord Jesus, after effecting the conversion and restoration of his people Israel, shall make them his resting-place by dwelling in the midst of them. When at his first advent he came unto his own, his own received him not, not even after his glorious resurrection, and hence, when he had announced the terrible judgments (Matt. xxiii. 38, 39), "Behold, your house is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, ye shall not see me henceforth till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord," he was raised to sit on his Father's throne, where, endued with all power in heaven and in earth, He prepares his people and his work, until all is

ready for his return in glory at the second advent, and when, especially his people Israel, hitherto his enemies, shall be prepared to receive him as their Lord and Saviour, and become his footstool or resting-place, according to the promise. Zech. ii. 11, "And I will dwell in the midst of thee, and thou shalt know that the Lord of hosts hath sent me unto thee." Then will also be fulfilled what follows (Psa. cx. 2, 3), "The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies. Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power," i. e. in the day of Christ's second advent his people Israel shall present themselves to him as a free-will offering. J. C. REICHAET.

Psalm cxxxv. 15. Vol. IV. 13. — In Osburn's "Ancient Egypt; Her Testimony to the Truth," the drowning of Pharaoh in the Red Sea is stated as a fact, based, I suppose, on the testimony of the hieroglyphic records, although the evidence is not given. It is stated in that work (page 10) that "the exodus took place under the last monarch of the eighteenth dynasty, and that Egypt never recovered the blow which this terrible event inflicted upon her posterity, for her next monumental epoch is the era of decline: the exodus being followed almost immediately by an invasion of the Shepherds, whereby the rulers of Egypt, with their infant monarch, the son of Pharaoh who perished in the Red Sea, were once more expatriated, and were compelled to take refuge in Ethiopia."

There is also some negative proof at page 14, where the title and description of the last king of the eighteenth dynasty are thus given: "Pharaoh, the Light of the Sun, Sesostri (Si-Ptah Menephtha) — the last monarch of the eighteenth dynasty, the Pharaoh that perished in the Red Sea. He was never interred in his tomb. Reign began B.C. 1479."

Perhaps the larger works of Osburn and Lepsius give details.

J. E. WAKEFIELD.

Proverbs xiv. 24. — Riches are a diadem of the wise; but the (gross) opulence of fools is failure. Vol. IV. 3.

In reply to Mr. ROBERTS I send the above, which I believe to be the correct, translation of the verse in question. In order to express fully the paronomasia of the original, it is necessary that we eliminate the word "folly" out of the passage altogether. "Folly" is a secondary meaning of חֲסִידָה. Its primary meaning is "deficiency," "falling short," &c. In rendering the word into English, the primary idea is to be attended to. If, however, we derive חֲסִידָה from חָסֵד, instead of from חָסֵד, the idea will be that of

"grossness," "opulence," &c. The paronomasia of this passage is occasioned by this double derivation of חֲסִידָה.

Torquay.

F. Fysh.

Matthew xiii. Vol. IV. 14. — The following remarks are a few notes gathered in reading on the subject of the above useful inquiry proposed by your Correspondent — "the connection, aspects, &c. of the several parables in Matt. xiii."

The parables are seven, the greatest number comprised in any chapter: the first four are addressed to the "multitude" from the ship, the last three privately spoken to the disciples.

(1.) The parable of the Sower is the fundamental one (Mark iv. 13) in which the Word of God is represented as the principal agent in the regeneration of man — the seed considered by or in itself; while in the parable of the

(2.) Tares it is considered after it has been received into the heart, and incorporated into the man, which is now so vitally united with him that they cannot be viewed asunder. The parable of the

(3.) Mustard Seed is concerning the kingdom that displays itself "openly, and cannot be hid," and the power of truth to develop itself from within itself; while that of the

(4.) Leaven is concerning the kingdom of God, "which cometh not with observation," or the power and action of the truth on the world brought into contact with it.

Both the latter describe the small beginnings, the gradual progress, and the final marvellous increase of the Church. Chrysostom thus traces the connection between the parable of the Mustard Seed and those before: — "In that of the Sower the disciples had heard that three-parts of the seed sown perished, and only a fourth part prospered. Again, they had heard in that of the Tares of the further hinderances which beset even this part that survived; and now, lest they should be tempted quite to lose heart, and to despair, these two parables are spoken for their encouragement."

(5.) So far, to the multitude especially, there is now a personal appropriation required, and the following parables are addressed to the disciples apart. To quote Dr. Hammond: "The Gospel, being by some not looked for, is yet sometimes met with by them, and becomes matter of infinite joy and desire to them; and so is likened to treasure casually found and hidden again or concealed, and which they count no price too dear to obtain (just as the Gentiles did)."

(6.) Others there are who have followed the study of wisdom, and thirsted after some instruction; and then the Gospel of Christ comes as a rich prize doth to a merchant who is in pursuit of rich merchandise, and, meeting with a jewel for

his turn, lays out all his estate on it (Nathaniel, Simeon, and Anna are instances)."

7. The parable of the Draw-Net is similar to that of the Tares, with this difference—the latter shows the "present" intermixture of good and bad, and that men are not to effect the separation. The former states the "future" separation, and by God himself. In the latter the kingdom of God is to be identical with the world; in the former, with its present imperfect form, the less contained in the greater.

Bengel and others look upon these seven parables as a complete whole, and to be viewed in a prophetic spirit as a history of the rise, progress, and consummation of the Church. Rather than dogmatise according to his seven different epochs, we might safely say that the parables constitute a picture of the failures and successes, and their several causes, and the warnings and encouragements, that attend the promulgation and progress of the Gospel of the Word of God.

E. RYLEY.

Luke xviii. 13. The Sinner and his Pardon.

Ὁ θεός, ἰλασθητί μοι τῇ ἁμαρτωλίᾳ.—Vol. III. 3.

No doubt many of us who are ministers of Christ have observed the readiness, or rather glibness, with which in conversation some will admit they are "sinners," and add the expression of their hope, that "God will be merciful" to them, whilst alas! the hollowness and ignorance of this confession it requires but little acumen to detect. But how striking and significant is the word selected to embody the spirit of the "Publican's prayer," ἰλασθητί μοι, "be propitiated towards me," or, "be merciful to me for the sake of an atonement." Would not the error above alluded to be, through grace, successfully combated by a full and pointed exposition of this word, ἰλασθητί; implying, as it does, a lively and intelligent humility in combination with a fixed and accurate perception of the true ground upon which God is mercifully pleased to pardon and justify the penitent sinner (Heb. ii. 17; 1 John ii. 2).

Icklesham.

F. F. TRACY.

Acts ii. 27. Vol. III. p. 257, 481.—Mr. PALMER is correct in stating that εγκαταλείπειν more properly means "to abandon, cast off," than "to leave;" it is worthy of note that in our version—in Matt. xxvii. 46; Mark xv. 34; 2 Cor. iv. 9; 2 Tim. iv. 10—16; Heb. x. 25; xiii. 5; it is translated by "forsake;" in Rom. ix. 29, by "leave."

The third article of the 42 published in Edward the Sixth's reign, contains our present third article, but with this addition, "For the body lay in the sepulchre until the resurrection: but his ghost departing from him was with the ghosts in

prison or in hell, and did preach to the same, as the place of St. Peter doth testify."

The article, "Descendit ad inferos" of the Popish creed, is thus explained:

Ejus igitur priori parte hoc nobis credendum proponitur; Christo jam mortuo, ejus animam ad inferos descendisse, ibique tamdiu mansisse, quamdiu ejusdem corpus in sepulchro fuit. Verum inferorum nomen addita illa receptacula significat, in quibus animæ detinentur, quæ coelestem beatitudinem non sunt consecutæ. Horum igitur piorum animas, qui in sinu Abraham Salvatorem expectabant, Christus Dominus ad inferos descendens liberavit.*

Andradius, however, Defens. Trident. Concil. lib. ii. says, this doctrine cannot be proved at all from Scripture, and even Bellarmine admits it can be gathered only with much difficulty.

Before the "place of St. Peter" can be brought to prove anything, it must first be settled and shewn that the soul of Christ which is supposed to have descended into hell (εν φυλακῇ) is identical with the quickening spirit there spoken of.†

Some few of the Reformers appear to have been unable to get rid of this "rag of popery." Bishop Latimer conceived that Christ descended and suffered in soul in hell. Becon, who was chaplain to Archbishop Cranmer, in his "Sick man's salve,"‡ held that "Christ, after the death of his body, went down in His soul to hell to break the pride of Satan," &c. Cranmer himself most probably held the same doctrine. In the third article, "De duabus Christi naturis," of a book containing divers articles, most probably drawn up for the agreement of the English and German divines, who held their conference in London, A.D. 1538, and printed in Archbishop Cranmer's Remains and Letters (p. 473) we find it "crucifixus, mortuus et sepultus, . . . item descendit ad inferos."

But if we carefully examine into matters, the doctrine appears to obtain no great countenance from either Scripture or antiquity. In interpreting the former it is well to bear in mind Hooker's saying, "I hold it for an infallible rule in the interpretation of Holy Scripture, that, where a literal construction will stand, the farthest from the letter is commonly the worst."§

If we turn to the original passage in Ps. xvi. 10, we there find the word for "soul," is ψῆψ; for "hell," is ᾠλῆ; and for "corruption," τῆψ; Now ψῆψ literally means the vital breath,

* Catechismus Concil. Trident. Pars I. cap. vi. § 1, 2, 3.

† ὁ ζωοποιηθεὶς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, ἐν ᾧ καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασι πορευθεὶς ἐκηρυξεν. 1 Pet. iii. 18, 19.

‡ P. 189, P. S. edition.

§ Eccles. Polity, lib. v. cap. 59, § 2.

anima, anhelitus, and so anything that breathes, an animal, a person; in Lev. xvii. 11, 14, it is rendered by "life;" in Gen. xvi. 15, 18, 22, 25, 26, 27; Lev. iv. 2; v. 1, 2, 4, 15, 17; xvii. 10, 11, 12, 15; by "soul," in the sense of persona (similar to the use of *ψυχη*, in the New Testament, Acts ii. 41; vii. 14; 1 Peter iii. 20). In Num. v. 2; Lev. xxi. 1, it is translated by "the dead;" in Num. ix. 6, 7, 10, by "dead body;" in Lev. xxi. 11, by "body,"* and yet in every case the Sept. has *ψυχη*.

ῥήνη again, literally means "a grave," and hence the state of death. It can only be used figuratively for "hell." In our version it frequently occurs, and is rendered by "the grave" or "hell," by the Sept. *ἀδης*, and sometimes, if I recollect rightly, by *θανατος*.

ῥήνη, properly signifies "a pit," hence "the grave," and so "corruption," or as the LXX have it, *διαφθοραν*.

It will thus be seen that the passage in the Psalms, if literally translated, points rather to Christ's burial and resurrection. The latter part of the verse speaks of "corruption," which cannot be understood to be but in the grave.

Calvin, *in loc.* says,

As to the point that Peter (Acts ii. 30) and Paul (xiii. 33) contend that this prophecy was fulfilled in the person of Christ alone, the sense in which we must understand them is this, that He was wholly and perfectly exempted from the corruption of the grave; . . . both the Greek and Latin fathers have strained these words to a meaning wholly different, referring them to the bringing back of the soul of Christ from hell: but it is better to adhere to the natural simplicity of the interpretation which I have given, that we may not make ourselves objects of ridicule to the Jews; and farther that one subtilty, by engendering many others, may not involve us in a labyrinth. In the second clause mention is without doubt made of the body; and we know it to be a mode of speaking common with David, intentionally to repeat the same thing twice, making a slight variation as to the words.

I can hardly agree with Calvin's conclusion here, that David says the same thing twice, since it is quite possible for a body not to be left any length of time in the grave, and yet see corruption, especially in a warm climate. The prophecy appears to me to relate to the two facts, that Christ's body should not be left in the grave, nor should it see corruption, which may almost be said to begin when life is extinct.

The doctrine of the "descent into hell," appears to me plainly contrary to Luke xxiii. 43, 46, where our Lord promised the penitent thief an entrance into Paradise (or the "third heaven,"

2 Cor. xii. 2, 4,) assuring him of His own presence there that very same day, which ended only three hours after our Lord's cry of "Eloi, Eloi" (Matt. xxvii. 46).

Nor can we allow the evidence of antiquity to be much in its favour, for I find it in no creed of the first three centuries. Ignatius (Ep. ad Trall. § 9) does not give it in his short confession beginning *κατωθῶτε οὖν*. It is not in the creed of Irenæus (Lib. III. c. 4), beginning "Credo in unum Deum;" nor in the confessions of faith met with in Tertullian, beginning "Regula est autem fides," &c. (De Præscrip. Hæret. 13) "nos vero et semper," &c. (Adv. Prax. c. 2), and "Regula quidem fides," &c. (De virg. velan. § 1); nor is it in the Creed of Origen (in Procem. Lib. de Principiis), and beginning "Unus Deus est," &c.; nor in that of Gregory Thaumaturgus, commencing *εἰς θεὸς πατὴρ*; nor in the Apost. Constitutions (Lib. VII. c. 41); nor in the Creed of Jerusalem, nor in that of Cæsarea, given by Eusebius, and beginning *πιστευομεν εἰς ἑνα θεόν*; nor in that of Antioch; nor in the Roman, or, as it is more commonly called, the Apostles' Creed; nor in the Nicene Creed, as first published by the council, A.D. 325; nor as revised and enlarged by the second Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381; nor is it in the confession of faith of the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451.

It is found first of all in the creed of Aquileia, given by Rufinus, a presbyter of that church, who was the friend, but afterwards the opponent, of Jerome; it is there, "descendit ad inferna," which Rufinus expressly says is to be understood of Christ's burial. His words are, "In Ecclesiæ Romanæ symbolo non habetur additus, descendit ad inferna; sed neque in Orientis Ecclesiis habetur hic sermo. Vis tamen verbi eadem videtur esse in eo quod sepultus dicitur." It is also in the creed of the Council of Ariminum, A.D. 359, where the word used is *καταθῶν*, and it there refers to Christ's burial. It is found in the creed bearing the name of Athanasius, where, as in our third article, it is "descendit ad inferos;"* and it appears, according to Bishop Pearson, to have been added to the Apostles' Creed somewhere about A.D. 600.

I find in Cyprian (Lib. ii. Testim. adv. Judæos) the following two headings of chapters: "Capitula xxiv. Quod a morte non vinceretur nec apud inferos remansurus esset," and "Capit. xxv. Quod ab inferis tertio die resurgeret," so that he evidently means only Christ's resurrection from the grave.

* Augustine, on Num. xvi. 33 (Quest. super Num. lib. iv. c. 29), says, "Et descenderunt ipsi et omnia quæcumque sunt eis viventes ad inferos. Notandum secundum locum terrenum dictos esse inferos," &c. Inferos is in the Heb. *ῥήνη*.

* καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ψυχῇ τετελευτηκυῖα. Lev. xxi. 1. Sept.

Clemens Alexandrinus (Strom. lib. vi. cap. vi. sec. 44, 45) maintains that Christ and His apostles descended, in order to preach to the souls of the heathen, that they might not be condemned for not believing a gospel they had never heard. But, as has been said, this writer is "rather a well-meaning philosopher, than a plain Christian teacher."

I know not whether mention of the subject be made in any other of the Ante-Nicene Fathers.

A LAYMAN.

Acts xxvi. 18. Inheritance among them which are sanctified (or the sanctified). Vol. IV. 21.

I do not think it a mistake to associate "faith" with the words "forgiveness of sins and inheritance;" and consequently that the Greek is right, as well as many editions of our English Bible, to indicate that meaning by a comma.

Whether it can be clearly made out that sinners ever are "sanctified by faith" is itself a disputed question among able divines. But no one among them will deny that sinners "by faith receive forgiveness of sins and inheritance among the sanctified," and this, I doubt not, was the meaning of the Holy Ghost here.

R. W. DIBDIN.

Romans v. 15-17. Vol. III. 483.—Your Correspondent *Αχρηστος*, in his answer to the inquiry, "How far the saving benefit of Christ's work extends?" maintains that Adam is the natural, but not the federal, head of his posterity. May I be permitted then to make a few remarks, to prove that he is a federal head?

The addresses of God to Adam, recorded in Genesis i. 28-30, and iii. 17-19, were spoken to him, as experience proves, not as a private but public person. Why then should not these words, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," be also understood as having been addressed to him in his representative capacity.

The language of the Apostle in this chapter cannot be consistently explained on any other principle than that Adam and Christ are both federal heads. The phraseology employed in the 12th verse is worthy of notice. It contains three verbs, viz. *εισηλθε* (entered), *διηλθεν* (passed through), and *ημαρτον* (sinned), all in the same tense, viz. the aorist, which denotes a single definite action, which took place at a certain past time, and was then finished. I conclude then that the acts indicated by the several verbs were simultaneous, and consequently that *ημαρτον* (sinned) refers to the identical sin which "by one man entered into the world," and which is called in the 18th verse "one offence." See Vol. II. 364. Had the Apostle meant to convey the idea that all men die in consequence of their own personal sins, he would have employed the present tense, and said, "death passes upon all

men, because all men sin;" but instead of that he says, "death (*i. e.* the sentence of death) passed upon all men, because all men sinned (*i. e.* committed a particular act of sin)." But infants, who are included among all men, are liable as well as adults to suffering and death, although they do not sin personally. How is this to be accounted for? It will not do to say that these evils are inflicted upon them because they derive a corrupt nature from their original progenitor, for innate depravity itself is a penal evil, and pre-supposes guilt. If so, the guilt can be none other than the imputed guilt of Adam, their surety and representative. The same great fundamental principle is distinctly brought out in the 18th and 19th verses. In the former the Apostle says, "Therefore, as by the offence of one (*ὁ ἑνὸς παραπτώματος*), judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." It is here declared that the sentence of condemnation came upon all men "by the offence of one," or, as it might be more correctly rendered, "by one offence." This "one offence" of Adam, however, must not be confounded with the corruption of his moral nature, for they are different things, and stand to one another in the relation of cause and effect. But the effect, whether experienced by Adam or his posterity, cannot be separated from its cause; and, consequently, if they inherit his depravity, they must be held as having been identified with him in the commission of the "one offence," otherwise it has come to pass in the providence of God, that an effect has been produced without a cause, which is impossible. Those who deny the doctrine of imputation, however, maintain that the only ground of condemnation is personal transgression, which proceeds of course from innate depravity as its fountain; but if the first clause of this verse were interpreted according to this principle, the second, which stands in an antithetical relation to it, would mean that all the children of the second Adam derive a holy nature from Him, in consequence of which they do good works, and are therefore justified. Such an interpretation, however, contradicts the testimony of Scripture, which uniformly and unequivocally declares that we are justified, not by our own works, but by the righteousness of another, even the Lord Jesus Christ.

Though the phrase (*εις παντας ανθρωπους*) "to all men," means all mankind in the first clause, yet in the second its signification is of necessity limited, not only by the words which immediately follow, but by the facts of the case (for it is not true that all men shall obtain "justification even unto life"); and therefore it can mean nothing else than all those whom Christ represents.

R. JOHNSTON.

2 Thessalonians ii. 2. Vol. III. 360, 402.—It appears to be admitted in the pages of your journal that the word *εφεισθηκεν* should be rendered "is present" or "is actually come," so that the error of the Thessalonian Christians consisted, not so much in neglecting their daily business whilst expecting the near approach of the Lord, as in the being induced to believe that the day of the Lord was actually then come, and that the persecutions and tribulations they were then enduring were consequent upon that time of vengeance called the Day of the Lord, previous to which the Apostle had told them that the Lord would come and catch them up to meet him in the air. It seems from chap. i. 4, that the Thessalonians were undergoing an unusual amount of persecution from their Gentile countrymen, and it was a natural mistake, perhaps, that they should fall into, that the day of the Lord was actually come, and that Paul's prediction of their being previously caught up had failed: and so in the first part of this epistle, after commending their patient endurance of their trials, he anew sets the promised hope before them, and then, in chap. ii. 1, by reason of this hope and their gathering together unto Him, warns them against letting their minds be shaken, either by forged letter or false teacher, that that day was come, and that consequently his prediction had failed.

In taking this view of the subject of course I understand the day of Christ, or, as some versions read it, day of the Lord, to be that period during which judgments will be poured upon the earth, and especially the Jews, which is variously denominated in Scripture—day of the Lord, days of vengeance, time of Jacob's trouble—and also previous to the commencement of that time, the Lord will descend from his present place of abode, and coming, not necessarily immediately on the earth, but as it seems intimated in 1 Thess. iv. 17, into the region of the earth, will gather up his saints, living and dead, close this dispensation, and yield that vengeance preparatory to his coming on the earth, when his feet shall again stand on the Mount of Olives. In this view I shall run counter to the opinions of some of your readers, but it is one which is, I think, becoming increasingly common among students of prophecy, and also seems to afford the best clue to the interpretation of the remaining part of the prediction in this chapter.

ROBERT M. NORMAN.

James i. 17. Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no *(παραλλαγή η τροπής αποσκίασμα)* variableness, neither shadow of turning.

Vol. III. 438.

I beg to give the following extract from the

late Rev. Greville Ewing's Greek Lexicon on this interesting text:—

Bishop Jebb's translation is, "with whom is no parallax, neither tropical shadow;" the meaning of which he explains when remarking the gradation of thought which the clause contains. "The sun's parallax, or the difference between his place as viewed from the centre and surface of the earth, is a mere trifle compared with his tropical shadow; when, for example, in our winter he has declined to the southern tropic, a declination by which our days are considerably shortened, and we suffer a great diminution of light and heat." *Sacr. Lit.* p. 316.

The bishop's translation is certainly very beautiful and ingenious, but to many it may appear perhaps somewhat fanciful. I should therefore feel much obliged if some of your learned Correspondents would give us their opinion of it.

R. JOHNSTON.

Son of God and Son of Man. Vol. III. 391, 453; IV. 27.—It may be observed that both these are titles of the person of Christ, just as a man's name applies to both body and soul. Hence some things are said of the Son of Man which could only be true of God the Son, as in John iii. 13, where Christ, speaking of the Son of Man, says, He "is in Heaven," though he was speaking the words on earth. Some things, again, are said of the Son of God which could only be true of the man Christ Jesus, as in Luke i. 35, where the Son of God is said to be born of a woman.

An imperfect illustration of this may be gathered from the name of Abraham, which at one time is used in reference to his body, when it is said, "Abraham is dead" (John viii. 52), and elsewhere is used of his soul, when Jesus says, "He is not the God of the dead" (Matt. xxii. 32), and yet affirms that He is the God of Abraham.

BIBLICUS.

The Lord's Supper. Vol. IV. 15.—Surely none but a (loving) Christian ought to go, although there are that go with confidence who have "neither part nor lot in the matter," in misapprehension of what fitness is, beguiled by Satan into a fatal security (hypocrisy and self-deceit). Do they rest on John vi. 53—55? This spiritual feast must be known before one can break bread and drink wine in "remembrance" of the master, for till then there is "no life in them," and the dead cannot be strengthened or comforted or sustained with the food of the living. Many forbear long after it is their proper place and bounden duty, unable to give utterance to the language of the heart and the motions of the spirit—it is enough that they have tasted that "the Lord is gracious," as the Eleven had when they could (yet) forsake Him and flee (Matt. xxvi. 56; Mark xiv. 50), and could say, "We trusted that it had been He which should have

redeemed Israel" (Luke xxiv. 21), "believing not" (Mark xvi. 11, 13, 14), "doubting" (Matt. xxviii. 17), so that Jesus "upbraided" them with their unbelief.

The Lord had judged them worthy to receive from His own hands the bread and wine when as yet they had not received the Holy Ghost, and in apprehension of His death could say, "Be it far from Thee."

It is enough that the lips murmur, "Lord, I believe, help Thou mine unbelief."

That strong faith coupled with deep humility which must be in the soul, as expressed by GAMMA in the words, "I know my acceptance"—I have not "any doubt,"—is known to comparatively few of the contemporary members even of the little band. Of late there has been much said of the "sin" of not having this confidence, of which opinion Satan has probably taken advantage; yet a firm and meek reliance on a crucified and risen Saviour must be the desire of every child of God. Trembling is not to be confounded with an unholy dread; it may be a timid joy: it is not the place for mourning. "The Spirit witnesseth with our spirit" long before the tongue is loosed to cry, "My beloved is mine, and I am his." Jesus draws many thither, it may be, to confirm their faith till "perfect love casteth out fear."

"Preparation" cannot render fit (of itself). The life a Christian lives is fitness. To have "life" is to have a full title, and absence is plain disobedience.

Twickenham.

C. ELLIS.

The Querist.

Exodus xli. 40.—Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years.

There is a difficulty sometimes felt about this period of 430 years, as though it meant that the Israelites sojourned in Egypt for that period, while we know they sojourned there only for 210 years.

If this be the only passage to favour the difficulty (as in Gen xv. 13, the expression is, "a land that is not theirs"—not necessarily Egypt), does it not merely assert that the sojourning of the children of Israel, in all their wanderings from Haran till they left Egypt, was 430 years? It is not said "the sojourning in Egypt," but "the sojourning of the children of Israel who dwelt in Egypt (at this time)."

Dundalk.

J. G. R.

John viii. 51, 52, and xi. 26.—Eternal Death.

It is remarkable that, though the expression "eternal or everlasting" is often applied in our English Version to "life, fire, punishment, de-

struction," &c. it is never applied to "death," but it is, I think, in the original Greek, and I throw it out for the opinion of better scholars.

In John viii. 51, 52, the order of the important words, *εἰς τὴν αἰῶνα*, is changed in the latter verse, where the Lord seems to explain to the incredulous Jews what He meant in ver. 51, viz. "If a man keep my saying, he shall not taste death for ever" (*θανάτου εἰς τὴν αἰῶνα*, not as in the previous verse, where "for ever," *εἰς τὴν αἰῶνα*, follows the verb "see"), i.e. "eternal death."

A similar passage to this is John xi. 26, "Who-soever believeth in me shall never die," literally, "shall not die for ever," i.e. eternally; and so our Prayer Book, in service for the dead, uses the expression, apparently a translation of this passage, "shall not die eternally."

Comp. also John x. 28 (in Greek).

Believers do die, but not eternally.

Dundalk.

J. G. R.

1 Timothy, i. 13.—Who was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious: but I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief.

May we read those words, "but I obtained mercy," parenthetically? May we suppose that they are thrown in abruptly by the Apostle before he had finished his sentence, in order to acknowledge the lovingkindness of the Lord, who had showed him mercy? The Apostle speaks again of His amazing mercy in the 18th verse.

Am I correct in supposing that the third clause of the verse is to be connected with the first, and not with the second?

I would read the verse thus,—“Who was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious (but I obtained mercy); because I did it ignorantly in unbelief.”

Monmouth.

J. FAWCETT BEDDY.

The Restoration of the Jews.—Can any of your Correspondents say what help the European powers, who were engaged in the late war against Russia, have publicly given toward the restoration of the Jews to their fatherland? For if my memory does not fail me, I think that excellent nobleman, Lord Shaftesbury, made a statement at one of our religious societies' meetings, about the time of the commencement of that war, when he said, upon the authority of Lord Clarendon, that when peace was made, the claims of the Jews would be taken into consideration, or words to that effect.

Can any of your readers say if anything, and what, has been done to redeem this promise?

B. W. SAVILE.

Hone, the Bookseller.—Hone, the bookseller, who was convicted for writing a parody on the liturgy, and who, like Saul of Tarsus, obtained mercy, wrote and published some striking verses on the

value of the Bible. Will you kindly present them to your readers in the pages of THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR? J. FAWCETT BEDDY.

The Church of God.—To whom does the title "Church of God" apply? I find the following statement on this subject in some "Plain Papers on Prophetic and other Subjects," published by Partridge and Oakey (page 423). The Church of God consists not, as is popularly supposed, of all saved persons from the beginning to the end of time. The expression is never so used in Scripture . . . there it denotes the assembly of true believers from the day of Pentecost, when that assembly was formed, to the descent of the Lord Jesus into the air to receive it to himself in heaven The saints who thus compose "the Church" have, of course, many things in common with Old Testament saints, with the disciples during our Lord's lifetime upon earth, with the Jewish remnant in the coming crisis, and with the saints who shall inhabit the millennial earth . . . but to "the Church" belongs the wondrous distinction of being Christ's body—his bride—inhabited by the Holy Ghost.

Does not the promise (1 Thes. iv. 16), that "the dead in Christ shall rise to meet the Lord in the air," appear to embrace the saints under the Old Testament dispensation, as well as those who shall have been gathered in since the day of Pentecost? HY. M.

The Difference between John's and Christ's Baptism.—A Correspondent, at p. 291, vol. III. touches on the subject of the difference between John's baptism and the baptism of our Lord. It strikes me that there is an inaccuracy of idea, which is very general, as to what is implied by the very expression itself, "The difference," &c. It seems often to be considered that there was some marked difference in the outward form of, or in the intention, or in the effects of, the baptising with water as used by John, and the baptising with water as used by the disciples of our Lord himself, as commanded by Him. I would suggest that the difference consists, not as regards the baptising with water, but as regards the teaching of John, and the teaching of our Lord and His disciples. It is in the sense of "teaching" that our Lord asked the question, "The baptism of John," &c. (Matt. xxi. 25; Mark xi. 30; Luke xx. 4). I would next ask your Correspondents whether this difference in the teaching was not this: that John's teaching was a teaching of the need of repentance—the setting before men their sins, and the requirements of the law; and that he pointed to Jesus as the Lamb of God, and told the people they should believe on Him which should come after him; but that Jesus's teaching was a far more full and clear Gospel teaching, "That whosoever believed

in Him should have everlasting life?" (John iii. 15, 16, 36.) F. L. W.

The Tabernacle and its Removals.—I request to know if there is any Jewish tradition or other information respecting the removal of the tabernacle of the congregation from Shiloh to Gibeon. On entering the promised land it was first set up at Shiloh, Jos. xviii. 1. We must of course suppose that it contained the ark of the covenant, and that the court was around it, in which was placed the brazen altar for the burnt offerings, &c. The ark of the covenant was taken away from Shiloh in the time of Eli, 1 Sam. iv. 4; and was never taken back there. After being some short time in the hands of the Philistines, it was taken to Kirjath-jearim, to the house of Abinadab in the hill, where it is said to have been twenty years, 1 Sam. vii. 1, 2. It must however have been much more than twenty years before David fetched it away from the house of Abinadab in Gibeah (or the hill), 2 Sam. vi. 3; after remaining a short time in the house of Obededom it was placed in the city of David. In the mean time, during Saul's life, it would seem that the table on which the shew-bread was placed, and which ought to have been in the outer part of the tabernacle, was at Nob, 1 Sam. 21; Matt. xii. 3, 4. Is Nob and Shiloh the same place?

In the beginning of the reign of Solomon the tabernacle and the brazen altar were at the high place at Gibeon, 2 Chron. i. 3—6, 13, and must therefore have been at some previous time removed from Shiloh. Was this before or after the removal of the ark from Kirjath-jearim to the hill by David? Kirjath-jearim and Gibeon seem to have been two different cities, though probably at no great distance, Josh. ix. 17. F. L. W.

ERRATA IN VOL. III.

Page	Col.	Line	
483	1	8	For "interest" read "instinct."
"	1	39	For "In man" read "In fine."
"	1	44	For "or" read "and."
499	1	17	For "The father's kingdom of the Son of Man" read "The father's kingdom—not that of the Son of Man."

ERRATA IN VOL. IV.

Page	Col.	Line	
11	2	41	For "riddle" read "middle."
12	1	10	After "Authorised Version" insert "of the New Testament."
"	1	27	For "such a term" read "such a turn."
26	1	17	For "πιδανγραυι" read "πιδανγραυι."
"	1	17	(bis) for "αυαντι" read "αυαντι."
"	1	57	For "nation" read "nature."

Book Wanted.

Hades; or, the Place of Departed Spirits, by R. Govett. Pub. by the Edinburgh Prophetic Association. Address E. M. A., Mr. Lake's, Surrey Corner, Norwich.

Notices to Correspondents.

In consequence of the protracted illness of the Editor, several letters have remained unanswered, which would otherwise have received immediate attention. The Editor takes this opportunity of thanking those of his Correspondents who have so kindly remembered him at the Throne of Grace during his indisposition.

All Correspondents writing for the "ANNOTATOR" or "REPLICANT" must send us their real names; not necessarily for publication, but for our own information and safeguard. *Papers not thus authenticated will be invariably laid aside.* We allow more latitude in the "QUEST" department.

Every paper should commence with the text or subject commented upon, written distinctly at the head of the article.

Reference should then be made to the page or pages where the subject has been before noticed, and to which the reply, if it be one, is sent. Queries should have the text prefixed from the Authorised Version, or else should have such a heading as the Replicants can with ease refer to.

Every separate article should be written on a separate piece of paper, to allow of our arranging them in Scripture sequence.

We cannot return manuscripts sent to us for publication.

No. 94 will be published (D.V.) on Saturday the 28th of February.

Just Published, Vol. III. well bound in cloth. Price 9s.

Vols. I., II., and III. Price 26s. 6d.

Quarterly Part, No. 12, in a neat wrapper. Price 2s.

All Communications to be addressed to THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR, care of Messrs. NISBET and Co. 21, Berners Street, Oxford Street.

All communications respecting the supply of the ANNOTATOR, as well as all Post-office Orders, or enclosures of Stamps, to be addressed to the publishers, Messrs. NISBET and Co. 21, Berners Street, Oxford Street.

By the Author of "The Faithful Promiser."

MEMORIES of BETHANY.
Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. cloth.

FOOTSTEPS of ST. PAUL.
Crown 8vo. 5s. cloth.

ALTAR STONES. 6d. sewed, 8d. cloth.

EVENING INCENSE. Royal 32mo. 8d. sewed, 1s. cloth.

THE WORDS of JESUS. Fifty-fifth Thousand. 8d. sewed, 1s. cloth.

THE MIND of JESUS. Being a Sequel to "The Words of Jesus." Royal 32mo. 8d. sewed, 1s. cloth.

THE MIND and WORDS of JESUS. In one Volume. 1s. 6d.

THE FIRST BEREAVEMENT; or, Words addressed to a Mourner on the occasion of a First Trial. 4d. sewed, 8d. cloth.

THE NIGHT WATCHES. Sixty-fifth Thousand. 8d. sewed, 1s. cloth.

THE MORNING WATCHES. Sixtieth Thousand. 8d. sewed, 1s. cloth.

THE MORNING and NIGHT WATCHES. In one Volume. 1s. 6d. cloth; also in large type, crown 8vo, 3s. 6d. cloth.

THE WOODCUTTER of LEBANON. Second Edition. Fcap. 2s. 6d. cloth.

A VOLUME of FAMILY PRAYERS. Third Edition. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. cloth.

WELLS of BACA; or, Solaces of the Christian Mourner, and other Thoughts on Bereavement. Fifth Edition. 18mo. 1s. cloth.

THE CHILD'S BOOK of DIVINITY; or, Grandmamma's Stories about Bible Doctrines. New Edition. 18mo. 1s. cloth.

THE EXILES of LUCERNA; or, The Sufferings of the Waldenses during the Persecution of 1686. Second Edition. Fcap. 2s. 6d. cloth.

JAMES NISBET and Co. 21, Berners Street.

This day is published, price 3s. 6d.
THE BRITISH and FOREIGN EVANGELICAL REVIEW. No. XLX. February, 1857.

CONTENTS.
I. Ranalli's Italian History.
II. Itinerating Libraries and their Founder.
III. Sydney Smith as a Minister of Religion.
IV. The Church—its Perpetuity.
V. The Matter of Preaching.
VI. Eli Smith's Arabic Bible.
VII. Dove's Logic of the Christian Faith.
VIII. Theodore Agrippa D'Aubigné, Warrior, Statesman, and Historian.
IX. Macdonald's Creation and the Fall.
X. Critical Notices.

London: JAMES NISBET and Co. Berners Street. Edinburgh: OLIVER and BOYD. Glasgow: DAVID BRYCE. Dublin: JOHN ROBERTSON.

This day is published, crown 8vo. 5s. cloth.
A MEMOIR of the LATE CAPT. ALLEN GARDINER, R.N. By the Rev. J. W. MARSH, Vicar of Bleasby, Notts. Crown 8vo.

JAMES NISBET and Co. 21, Berners Street.

Just published, in demy 8vo. 10s. 6d. cloth.
ECLECTIC NOTES; or, Notes of Discussions on Religious Topics at the Meetings of the Eclectic Society, London, during the years 1798—1814. Edited by JOHN H. PRATT, M.A. Archdeacon of Calcutta.
JAMES NISBET and Co. 21, Berners Street.

This day is published, price Eighteenpence, a Cheap Edition of
MEMORIALS of CAPT. HEDLEY VICARS, of the 97th Regiment.

JAMES NISBET and Co. and all Booksellers.

This day is published, price Sixpence,
A CONSPECTUS of the VARIOUS EVIDENCE confirming the DIVINE AUTHORITY of the GOSPEL; with an attempt to assign the true places to the Enquirer and the Enquiry. By D. WALTHER.

JAMES NISBET and Co. 21, Berners Street.

This day is published, price Eightpence,
THE APPLE of DISCORD. Is the Christian Sabbath an Ecclesiastical or Divine Record? Being the Arguments (put against) of the most celebrated Controversialists on the subject. Condensed by an M.A. of Cambridge.

JAMES NISBET and Co. 21, Berners Street.

In the Press, in crown 8vo.
FOUNDATIONS: being a Series of Essays, Argumentative and Didactic, on Fundamental Truths. By the Rev. WILLIAM POLLOCK, M.A. late Incumbent of St. Mark's Liverpool. Vicar of Bowden, Cheshire.

Contents:—
I. One Faith.
II. The Word of God.
III. The Incarnation.
IV. Satisfaction for Sin.
V. The Resurrection.
VI. The Wrath to Come.
VII. The Devil and his Angels.
VIII. The Church.
IX. Baptism.
X. The Lord's Supper.
XI. The Living Preacher of a Living Christ.
JAMES NISBET and Co. 21, Berners Street.

Just Published, demy 8vo. in a neat cover, Price 3s.

SKETCH of a COPTIC GRAMMAR, adapted for Self-Tuition. By W. B. MACDONALD, of Rammerscales. Edinburgh: W. H. LIZARS. London: GEORGE PHILIP & SON, 32, Fleet Street: and all Booksellers.

THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR;

OR,

NOTES AND QUERIES ON SCRIPTURAL SUBJECTS.

PUBLISHED ON ALTERNATE SATURDAYS.

VOL. IV.—No. 94.]

FEBRUARY 28, 1857.

[Price Threepence.
Stamped Edition, 4d.

THE ANNOTATOR :—

The Storm, the Demoniac, and the Herd of Swine,
by the Rev. H. Girdlestone—Gen. xii. 10, by the
Rev. F. Fysh—xxviii. 3, by the Rev. G. Studdert . 49, 50
Exod. v. 9—Psalm lxviii. 9, 10—Rom. iii. 30, by J.
N. Miller—Rev. xii. 17, to xiii. 6, by Rev. A.
Roberts—Lookings—Imputation, by Rev. H. T.
Bagge—Veracity of Scripture . 51—53

THE REPLICANT :—

Ps. cx. 1, with 1 Cor. xv. 26, and Rev. xx. 14, by A.
Hall—Prov. xiv. 24, by Rev. J. Baylec, D.D.—Isa.
liii. 6—Matt. xvi. 18, by Rev. J. Harrison—Mark
i. 24, by Rev. C. G. Coombe—iv. 31, 32, by J.
Worthington . 53—55
Rom. viii. 29, 30, with Matt. xx. 16—Rom. ix. and
Gal. iv.—2 Cor. iii. 16, by the Rev. H. T. J. Bagge—

Col. i. 13, by Rev. J. M. Taylor—Heb. xlii. 2, by
C. E. Stuart—Greek Testaments, by Rev. W. F.
Wilkinson . 56, 57
The Difference between John's and Christ's Baptism,
by Rev. T. Preston—The Pharaoh of the Exode, by
Rev. B. W. Savile—The Church, by W. Kelly . 58, 59
The Cross, by T. J. Buckton—Fasting—The Literal
Interpretation of Unfulfilled Prophecy, by Rev. C.
G. Coombe . 60, 61

THE QUERIST :—

1 Chron. v. 2, and Is. x. 27, by W. Caine—Zech. xiii.
8, 9—Matt. xi. 13, by G. Mackness—Matt. xxiv. 34
—Acts xxi. 4—Rom. vi. 3, 4—1 Cor. xv. 55—Phil.
iii. 13—Rev. xvi. 12, by W. Caine—Early Mis-
sionary Movements—Swedenborgianism, by R.
Cornall—"Kai" . 62, 63

NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS

64

The Annotator.

THE STORM, THE DEMONIC, AND THE HERD OF SWINE.

Matthew viii. 23—34.—It is plainly foretold by our Lord, that before His second advent, and yet not long before, nature itself shall be convulsed, and therewithal the hearts of men, with no vain fears that the day of judgment in very deed is come at last; such signs of it there shall be both in heaven and earth (Luke xxi. 25—28). Now, seeing that Sennacherib and Hezekiah were types of some modern Assyrian yet to come, and of that King of Kings who shall at the last defend his own Jerusalem, possibly that sign in heaven of old which caused the shadow on the dial to retrograde may also be typical of those last signs in heaven which our Lord himself foretold (Isaiah xxx. 17—22; xxxviii. 5—8). Certain it is, that the days of Noah were typical of the day of the Lord, and of its signs on earth (Matt. xxv. 37). But when everything else perished the ark rode out the deluge, and the rainbow became the token of a new covenant with heaven and earth; and when our Lord, the true "Rest," slept in the stern of that poor fisher-boat, how could those patriarchs of a new world possibly perish? But
No. 94.

what if this evening-voyage (Mark iv. 35) should turn out at last to be no less than a rehearsal of the last act in the great drama of redemption, and this the first scene—the voyage of faith, and the safety of the Church even in that last hurricane which shall affright the world? We are to know "who stilleth the noise of the seas, the noise of their waves, and the tumult of the people."

Again, the idea, first, I believe, conceived by Mede, that the conversion of the Apostle of the Gentiles might be not only a pattern to the Gentiles, but also a type of the conversion of the Jews, seems to be borne out by prophecy; for therein they are found hostile indeed almost to the last, yet all on a sudden mourning for him whom they had pierced, and battling on the Lord's side in the end. (1 Tim. i. 16; Zec. xii.—xiv.; Mede, fol. 766, 891.) Now, as when Paul, who had been "exceedingly mad" against the Church, heard that voice, and saw that form in light insufferable—yet to his companions, fallen to the earth and speechless, all this was lost in lightning and in storm; so when on earth, distress of nations with perplexity shall shake men's hearts, because the powers of heaven itself shall be shaken, possibly that may be the critical moment when the tribes in the land may see Him
D

(and as yet none else)—see Him and suddenly be converted and mourn. And if that be possible, consider whether this demoniac, now raving mad in the storm, and now again sitting at the feet of Jesus, clothed and in his right mind, may not also be a symbol of that same event, and to a second scene in this great drama.

Once more; two only of our Lord's many miracles hurt any living thing; the fig-tree, and the herd of swine. But the fig-tree was an acknowledged symbol of the judgment upon Judah; and the herd of swine, of whose judgment may that be a symbol? Of some swinish multitude, no doubt. The very land about that neighbourhood was itself a parable, for thereabout were two places known over all the ancient world; there, the royal gardens of Jericho, famed for the balsam tree, at that time known of nowhere else, and hard by was the Dead Salt Sea of infamous Sodom. The bloated carcasses of that great herd could not float down the Jordan, out of the fair sea of Galilee, but the paradise of Jericho must have been left behind, while they were consigned to that lake of fire, which, when I saw it (says Brochard, a writer of the twelfth century), always smoking as it was, and dark with black vapours, appeared like the very entrance of hell itself. Now in the Apocalypse we are forewarned of a great multitude, mad as that herd, infuriated as wild beasts, who, in the last days, shall rage and perish in the lake of fire, at that very time when Satan himself shall be cast into the abyss (Rev. xix., xx). And have we here indeed another symbol of that sad catastrophe? Is that so potent monosyllabic command to "go," no other in effect than the last most dreadful sentence of Divine justice? "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels" (Matt. xxv. 41).

Certainly, when the mighty Angel of the Covenant, coming to judgment, is portrayed in the Apocalypse—arrayed in a cloud, and the rainbow upon his head, his face as the sun, and his feet as pillars of fire; and he set his right foot on the sea and his left on the earth (Rev. x.); this may, indeed, portray more gloriously the maker and the master of them both; but nothing could more really display his absolute authority and power over all elements and evil spirits whatsoever than did our Lord's most glorious acts that day, whether his sacred feet stood on the bark or on the beach.

H. GIRDLESTONE.

Genesis xii. 10.—And Abram went down into Egypt to sojourn there.

I have just succeeded in ascertaining the correct date of the foundation of the Egyptian monarchy. It is B.C. 2368, A.M. 1768. Omitting

for the present contemporaneous dynasties, the following is the true chronology of the Pharaohs as they succeeded one another from the foundation of the monarchy to the time of Abram's sojourn in Egypt:—

First Dynasty of the lists.

	B.C.	A.M.
1. MENES	2368	1768
This was ten years after the birth of Peleg.		
2. PSEMEMPSES	2308	1828

Third Dynasty.

3. ACHES	2290	1846
4. SEPHURIS	2248	1888

Fourth Dynasty.

5. SORIS	2218	1918
6. SUPHIS	2189	1947
7. NU-SUPHIS, jointly with Suphis	2160	1976
NU-SUPHIS alone	2133	2003
8. NEPHERCHERES	2123	2013
9. SESOCHRIS	—	—

According to the Canon of Eratosthenes the reigns of these two last Pharaohs must have occupied twenty-six years.

Eleventh Dynasty.

10. SENUCHERES	2097	2039
11. MENTHESUPHIS	—	—
12. NUBCHERES	—	—
13. USERCHERES II.	—	—
14. NESTERES	—	—
15. ACHTHOES	—	—

These six Pharaohs reigned forty-three years.

16. AMENEMES	2054	2082
------------------------	------	------

Abram went down into Egypt in the third year of the reign of this Pharaoh, *i.e.* in B.C. 2052, A.M. 2084. The Pharaoh, however, with whom Abram had dealings was a Sebennyte Pharaoh, probably IMEPHTHIS.

Torquay.

F. Fysh.

Genesis xxviii. 3. A multitude of people (or, as the margin renders the original, assembly of people).

The word here used is not the ordinary one of מִן, but קָהָל, a word applied more especially to the nation of Israel, which, though "a multitude of people," *i.e.* composed of twelve different tribes, yet formed but one congregation or assembly, and is therefore frequently termed κατ'ἐξοχήν, "the assembly," "the congregation of the Lord." And this perhaps is what is meant by that expression in Gen. xxxv. 11, "A nation and a company (קָהָל) of nations shall be of Thee." In one sense "a nation" commonly so called—

yet because made up of many tribes, "a company of nations;" but, nevertheless, this "company," not merely a mixed "multitude of people" composed of various nations and divers languages, but an assembly—a congregation united for the purpose of religious worship, and all speaking the same tongue. This we know was the case at one period of Israel's history. May not the passage also point to future times when Israel and Judah shall be again "one nation," having "one king," "one shepherd" over them, and when as Ezekiel continues to say (xxxvii.) God's sanctuary and tabernacle shall be in the midst of them for evermore. This, too, seems confirmed by Gen. xlviii. 4, where Jacob repeating the words of the blessing conferred on him, does so in these terms, "I will make of Thee a multitude (קהל) of people, and will give this land to thy seed after Thee for an everlasting possession." So Ezekiel tells us, "I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel"—more distinctly "They shall dwell in the land that I have given unto Jacob my servant, wherein your fathers have dwelt."

Drumcar.

GEO. STUDDERT.

Exodus v. 9. Let them not regard vain words.

Here *שׁוּעָה*, a verb of seeing (have an eye to, look towards), is joined with its object by the preposition *בְּ*, and in such constructions the pregnant idea is conveyed of being riveted to the object so as to be affected in spirit or conduct by it. Thus, Psalm l. 22, "I will shew him" (See Heb.) means, "I will fill him with joy by means of my salvation, which he shall see." Again, Gen. xxi. 16, "Let me not see the death of the child" (See Heb.) means, "Let me not be afflicted with the sight of," &c. Accordingly, Pharaoh here says, "Let them not give attention to (*i. e.* look at, have respect to, with the mind) vain words, so as to be moved to disobedience, negligence, or rebellion." And so Psalm cxix. 117, means, "Sustain me, that I may be saved, and that I may have respect to thy statutes (*i. e.* take pleasure and find delight in them) continually, so as to be quickened to obey them."

Bexley.

T. H.

Psalm lxxviii. 9, 10.—A rain of free-will gifts (1) thou shakest to and fro (2), O God; (as to) thine inheritance (3), even when it was wearied, thou (4) hast established it. Thy host (5) have dwelt in it (6); thou providest (7) a dwelling-place, in thy goodness, for the distressed (8), O God.

(1). This expression describes the various miraculous supplies of water, manna, quails, &c. which God sent to the Israelites in their travelling through the wilderness (compare Exod. xvi.

4; Psa. lxxviii. 24, 27). *שׁוּעָה* is, in its special sense, a copious, great rain (1 Kings xviii. 45; Job xxxvii. 6; Zech. x. 1). *נִדְבוֹת* are offerings, or gifts, of free-will, as opposed to what is prescribed or vowed (Levit. xxii. 23; Exod. xxxv. 29; Ezek. xli. 1—15). Plentifulness and grace, therefore, are here ascribed to these bounties of God towards Israel; copious, as heavy showers; and of free grace, and contrary to Israel's deserts.

(2). Margin of Authorised Version, thou didst "shake out." The idea of this word is, to move to and fro, to wave backwards and forwards, as in a sieve (Isa. xxx. 28), or with the hand (Isa. xiii. 2; Zech. ii. 13). It is specially used of the wave-offerings (Exod. xxix. 24—27), which were waved from side to side; while the heave-offerings were moved up and down. The meaning of the Psalmist, therefore, is, that God sent the manna and quails on all sides, and in all parts, of the camp of Israel—"round about their habitations" (Psa. lxxviii. 28).

(3). *i. e.* thy people (Deut. iv. 20; ix. 26).

(4). Thou, Heb. *אַתָּה*, for the sake of emphasis: *i. e.* "Thou, who only hast power to do it, whose prerogative it is, even, when thy inheritance was most disheartened, borne down, &c. didst establish it again." The exhaustion referred to is rather spiritual (worn-out patience, faith, &c.), and therefore the establishing is of a similar kind, *i. e.* the reviving and confirming of faith, hope, patience, &c. (see *לָאָה* in the Lexicons).

(5). The word *חַיִּית*, in 2 Sam. xxiii. 13 ("the troop," Authorised Version) is replaced in 1 Chron. xi. 15, by *מַחֲנֶה*, "the host."

(6). *i. e.* in the land of Canaan. This emphatic ellipse is not uncommon (ver. 14; Isa. viii. 21); it is supposed that all would understand what place was meant.

(7). A dwelling place, or house, is understood from the sense and context (ver. 6).

(8). Israel is so described in contrast with the powerful nations which were in occupation of Canaan (see Num. xiii. 28, 31—33).

The Psalmist here celebrates God's care over Israel (1) in their journeyings, and (2) in their settlement in Canaan, as a type of His abiding care for His Church (ver. 35), especially as manifested in Christ (ver. 18).

Bexley.

T. H.

Romans iii. 30. Seeing it is one God who shall justify the circumcision by faith and the uncircumcision through faith (*περιτομην εκ πιστεως και ακροβυστιαν διu πιστεως*.)

The expression *δικαιουντα τον εκ πιστεως* in verse 26 furnishes what appears to be the key to solve the difficulty in this confessedly perplexing passage. *Εκ πιστεως* cannot in that expression

qualify *δικαιουντα*; for, on that supposition, the clause would not make sense, as it would require to be rendered "justifying by faith the"—"the" what? or "the justifier by faith of the"—"the" what? The verse suggests no answer. But if *εκ πιστεως* does not here qualify *δικαιουντα*, it must qualify *τον*. Viewing it then in this light, the expression *τον εκ πιστεως* is (as our English version justly renders it) of the same force as *τον πιστευοντα* or *τον πιστον*, and is therefore equivalent to "the (man) of faith," or "the believer," or "him that believeth." In this verse then *εκ πιστεως* is descriptive of the main distinguishing characteristic of the justified person—the characteristic of faith, or believing; or the phrase characterises a person—the justified person. Now, if in verse 26 this phrase describes a characteristic of a person, may it not be similarly employed in verse 30? May it not there also be characteristic of persons? This seems to be the case. *Περιτομη* and *ακροβυστια* in that verse are obviously comprehensive expressions denoting—the one "circumcised persons"—the other "uncircumcised persons." And according to the view that *εκ πιστεως* here denotes the characteristic of faith in those who are justified, the phrase *περιτομη εκ πιστεως* must be equivalent to the expressions "circumcision of faith," or "believing circumcised persons," or "believing circumcision." If this opinion be correct, the clause *δικαιωσει περιτομην εκ πιστεως* may be rendered "who shall justify the circumcision of faith," or "who shall justify believing circumcised persons." The subjoined clause *και ακροβυστιαν δια της πιστεως* seems elliptical. *Εκ πιστεως* ought to be supplied immediately after *ακροβυστιαν*, in order to express the sense fully. Viewing it thus, *ακροβυστιαν* in its connection here must denote "uncircumcised persons (of faith)," or "(believing) uncircumcised persons." On the whole then, *εκ πιστεως* seems to qualify, not *δικαιωσει*, but rather *περιτομην*; and *δια της πιστεως* to qualify, not *ακροβυστιαν*, but *δικαιωσει*. The verse would therefore be correctly rendered if it ran thus:—"Who shall justify the believing circumcision, and the (believing) uncircumcision through faith?" or, "Who shall justify believing circumcised and (believing) uncircumcised persons through faith?" This rendering is corroborated by the circumstance that the Apostle could scarcely with propriety have styled believing circumcised persons as *περιτομην την πιστευουσιν*, or as *περιτομην τον πιστευοντα*: it being contrary to grammatical usage to express a class of persons embracing both sexes by a feminine participle, as in the former of these expressions; and it being also barely admissible to connect a masculine participle, as in the latter, with a feminine substantive, if any other mode of expression be possible. Such a mode was possible in this case,

as is evident from the phrase *τον εκ πιστεως* in verse 26; and therefore it was adopted in verse 30.

Liverpool.

JAMES N. MILLER.

Revelation xii. 17, to xiii. 6.—Allow me to direct the attention of your readers to a singular passage in a speech ascribed by Eusebius to the Emperor Constantine, which appears to have conveyed an almost prophetic warning to the Church of the advent of the seven-headed beast.

Seeing that the fathers of the Nicene Council were disposed to quarrel, he puts them thus upon their guard. *Μηδε της τυραννων θεομαχιας εκ ποδων αρθεισης, ιτερως ο φιλοπονηρος δαιμων τον θειον νομον βλασφημιας περιβαλλετω*. "The Theomacy of the tyrants having been brought to an end, let not the demon who delights in mischief in some other way beset the religion of God with blasphemies." This singularly tallies with the explanation given by Mede, Newton, Elliott, &c. of the Apocalyptic symbols in the 12th and 13th chapters. The passage is taken from Euseb. de Vit. Const. lib. iii. c. 12.

Woodrising Rectory.

ARTHUR ROBERTS.

LOOKINGS.

Allow me to add to M. S. J.'s very profitable "words" on this subject, Vol. IV. p. 4:—

I. A word for all those who are awakened to a sense of their danger:

Isaiah xlv. 22—"Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth."

II. A word for self-application and examination:

Genesis xvi. 13.—"And she called the name of the Lord that spake unto her, Thou God seest me; for she said, Have I also here looked after Him that seeth me?"

III. A word to inspire us with courage and strength in the path of God's commandments, and the leadings of his Providence:

Judges vi. 4.—"And the Lord looked upon him, and said, Go in this thy might . . . have not I sent thee?" and a prayer for the same gracious encouraging look.

Psalms cxix. 132.—"Look thou upon me, and be merciful unto me, as thou usest to do unto those that love thy name."

See also Psalm cxxiii. 1, 2.

IV. Words for the suffering, or tempted:

Hebrews xii. 27.—"He endured, as seeing Him who is invisible."

Psalms xxxiv. 5.—"They looked unto Him, and were lightened; and their faces were not ashamed."

John xiv. 19.—"Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more; but ye see me: because I live, ye shall live also."

V. Words especially for these latter days :

2 Peter iii. 11, 12, 13, 14.—“ Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness? looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat. Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. Wherefore, beloved, seeing that ye look for such things, be diligent that ye may be found of Him in peace, without spot, and blameless.” E. T.

IMPUTATION.

It is desirable to bear constantly in mind that the justifying righteousness of Christ is the title-deed to a possession, attained by Him through a life-long obedience. Before the individual act of faith, it is possessed by Christ for the believer. After faith, it is possessed by the believer, in Christ. When, then, we say, that in Christ, the Head, the believer is really righteous, we mean that, with a special reference to justification and life, he possesses a righteousness which entitles him to both. But however close may be the union between Christ and the believer, and however truly the latter may say, “ this justifying righteousness is mine,” since that which merits life was neither obtained nor is primarily possessed by him, it must always be his by imputation. And if, reasoning upon human similitudes, we find it difficult to explain how that which is really mine is also mine by imputation, we must remember that the difficulty arises out of, and is inseparably connected with, the great mystery of the union between Christ and his Church. And I believe it to be of the greatest importance that we should keep in due prominence this, the imputative character of justifying righteousness, because we thus preserve a clear line of demarcation between the perfect righteousness which justifies, and the imperfect righteousness which is the manifestation of the life wherein we possess justification.

HENRY T. J. BAGGE.

VERACITY OF SCRIPTURE.

I should much like that you called attention to the veracity of Scripture in the case of Old Testament miracles. I say this, because in a standard work of the day (Dr. Robinson's *Biblical Researches*) the passage of the Red Sea is explained by the hypothesis of an ebb-tide, the east wind, and the shoals. True, Dr. Robinson still calls it a miracle; but he does so after having stripped it of all that is miraculous, and reduced it to a form in which it is accepted by the Rationalists of Germany. As Dr. Robinson's work is

the fullest and ablest of its kind, as it is the work of a man who in other respects venerates Scripture, there is the more need that your readers be warned against some of its statements. His authority is already quoted by some in support of the Neologian view; and, if no words of caution be given forth, it will be considered that he has settled the question. The miracle in question is one of the mightiest which Scripture records; and, if Dr. Robinson's interpretation is to be accepted, then there is not one record of a miracle in Scripture which may not equally be evaded. That miracle is a stronghold; if it be given up, inspiration must be abandoned, and the veracity of Scripture called in question. I trust that no feelings of personal respect for the able professor, nor of deference to his learned work, will hinder a Christian man from protesting against such invasions of the simplicity of inspired history. His views on the above miracle have already earned the eulogies of German Rationalism. Let not Christian men keep silence. **VIGILANS.**

The Replicant.

Psalms cx. 1, with 1 Corinthians xv. 26, and Revelation xx. 14. Vol. IV. 13.—The first passage from the Psalms does not state that all enemies are to be destroyed, but that they shall all be put in subjection to Jesus at his second advent. Other passages show that all his opponents among men will be cut off at that period, but neither death nor hell (the grave) are included in this destruction. The Apostle Paul (1 Cor. xv. 25) says, “ Christ must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet.” Now, as Christ is nowhere in Scripture said to reign till He comes to take possession of his kingdom, at the commencement of the Millennium, the time of his reign not only includes the thousand years, but also the little season when Satan shall be loosed and go out to deceive the nations (Rev. xx. 3, 8, 10).

Sitting represents Christ resting till the time arrives for Him to be publicly invested in heaven, “ with dominion, and glory, and the kingdom,” as described Dan. vii. 9—14.

Pimlico.

ARTHUR HALL.

That Christ is to come before the Millennium, seems clear from the following passages, which appear to me to prove that there can be no Millennium before Christ's reign begins, because the second advent is to find men given up to wickedness, and the delusions of Satan, in a way they never yet have been (Dan. vii. 21, 22; Matt. xxiv.; 1 Thess. v. 2, 3; 2 Thess. ii. 3—12; Jude 14, 15; Rev. xix. 11, to the end). M. S. J. seems quite right in supposing that Christ is “ to sit on the right hand of the Father,” until the destruc-

tion of His enemies; but does it not follow that those enemies and death are destroyed when He comes, and not 1000 years afterwards, and that the kingdom which He resigns is his present co-ordinate kingdom with the Father, called elsewhere "sitting at God's right hand?" Christ's own kingdom as "Son of David" is to have "no end" (Luke i. 32, 33; Isa. ix. 6, 7; Ps. lxxxix. 34—37).

I would suggest that 1 Cor. xv. 24—28, should be understood differently from the usual way of interpreting it. Those who are Christ's are to rise at His coming (ver. 23), "then the end," &c. (verse 24); "cometh" being inserted by the translators, and the kingdom which he resigns being His present reign at God's right hand.

And does not 2 Tim. iv. 1, prove that the judgment of quick and dead is to be at Christ's appearing? John v. 29. The particulars of the judgment of the living wicked are given in Rev. xix. 11 to the end; and those of the judgment of the dead in Rev. xx. 11, 12. At first sight Rev. xx. appears to contradict this view; but this may be explained by supposing that Rev. xix. and xx. do not represent events which are to follow each other, but rather that John was shown several visions to represent events which are to happen at the same time, each new vision beginning with "And I saw." (Compare Dan. vii. 9, 10; Matt. xxv. 31, to the end.) This is made clear by reading Rev. xx. 5, as a parenthesis, except the last clause, "This is the first resurrection;" and also verses 7—10, which refer to a period 1000 years after Christ's reign begins, and allude to a judgment altogether distinct and different from that in verses 11—15.

כ. ה. ז.

Proverbs xiv. 24. The foolishness of fools is folly.
Vol. IV. 3.

Mr. ARTHUR ROBERTS inquires whether Parkhurst and Schultens are authorised in giving אֹלֶת the sense of "opulence" in Prov. xiv. 24.

They have the support of Gesenius, who renders it "pre-eminence," or "great honours," observing that the writer appears to have played on the double signification of the word אֹלֶת. A reference to the Concordance will, however, throw considerable doubt on the other signification. I think our public version preferable. It is not a tautology: it is an emphasis: "The foolishness of fools is indeed folly."

St. Aidan's.

JOSEPH BAYLEE.

Isaiah liii. 6. Vol. III. 495.—In the Rev. H. E. Brooke's question upon this verse, does he not overlook the body to whom the whole chapter directly and primarily refers, even that people

with whom the prophet identifies himself in the use of the pronoun "we?"

While I rejoice in the belief that this glorious chapter is fully applicable to the case of each individual believer in his relation to Christ, yet, considering its position in the prophetic page, I think the inspired writer there speaks in the name of his people, the nation of Israel, and declares, concerning them, that in their eyes the coming Messiah would have no form nor comeliness; and that when they should see Him there would be no beauty that they should desire Him. They did fulfil this and other Scriptures, in despising and rejecting Him in the days of His humiliation; and to this day their descendants hide their faces from Him, and esteem Him not. Yet was He wounded for their transgressions; and, when the remnant of the house of Israel "shall look on Him whom they have pierced, and mourn," with what peculiar fitness will they take up the words of this verse, "All we like sheep have gone astray: and the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all."

The Gentile Church has indeed an undoubted interest in this and in many other passages of the Old Testament which were written concerning the nation of the Jews: St. Paul plainly declares the title of believers to all their spiritual promises, Gal. iii. 29. Only let us not forget, while partaking of the root and fatness of the olive tree, that we are but a graft thereon, not the parent stem.

F. T. C.

Matthew xvi. 18. Upon this rock. Vol. IV. 29.

R. BETA BETA will find, by referring to the Index of texts in the first volume of the ANNOTATOR, that this subject has already been discussed.

The interpretation as given by C. W. B. at p. 99, Vol. I., I regard as quite satisfactory, and as the only tenable one. If it be still urged that if Christ had meant Peter, St. Matthew would have used *πῆτρον*, the masculine, and not *πέτρα*, the feminine gender, the answer is, that in the Syriac version, made in the language our Saviour spoke, there is no such difference in gender, and the words are identically the same, "Thou art *כִּבְנָא* (Peter), and upon this *כִּבְנָא* (rock)," &c. The Syriac literally translated is, "Thou art a rock, or stone (see John i. 42), and upon this rock (or stone)," &c. The same version in Matt. xxvii. 60, and elsewhere, has *כִּבְנָא* both for rock and stone.

If it be still further urged, that if Christ in the language in which he spoke had used words that were identical in form and meaning, St. Matthew would have done the same in Greek, the answer is, that this is not by any means certain. St. Matthew (xxvii. 46,) gives *Eli*, which in all probability was the word that Christ uttered; but St.

Mark (xv. 34), for some good reason, gives Eloi, a different word, but identical in meaning. (See Vol. II. 68.)

Perhaps it is only fair to add, that Eusebius, Augustine, and Epiphanius, took the same view of the passage as Dr. Hales.

Burslem.

JOHN HARRISON.

Mark i. 24. Vol. IV. 14.—Query. "Is this the language of the devil or the man?" Answer. Of the unclean spirit, through the medium of the man whom he possessed. He spoke as the representative of his fellows: "What is there between us and Thee?" &c.

Query. "Why?" Answer. Why not? The onus of defending and establishing an impossible suggestion lies upon him who makes it.

J. C. I. has doubtless an object in putting this Query, which can hardly be charged with being superficial.

Crookes Parsonage.

C. G. COOMBE.

Mark iv. 31, 32. Vol. IV. 29.—When the entire parable is carefully considered, it is no wonder the Querist should ask, "How can it be applied to the gradual increase of true religion?" as interpreted by commentators. The kingdom of heaven, meaning here the professing Church of the present dispensation, as will be seen, was at the first small, like the mustard-seed, and like it, and like the "vine" brought out of Egypt (Psa. lxxx.), has spread out its "branches" far and wide; but its extent is no evidence at all of its purity, however sound at the first.

Let the parable be examined a little, at least so far as is justifiable by scriptural precedent. It is stated that the seed grew, and "waxed a great tree," so that the "fowls of the air" lodged in its "branches" and under its "shadow." Now, there surely must be some reason for the "fowls of the air" being introduced here, as well as in a previous parable, that of the Sower, where their depredations are stated, and their meaning clearly explained. The sower sows the seed, and the "fowls of the air" come and devour it. Interpretation: "The sower soweth the word, then cometh the devil, Satan, the wicked one (*ὁ διάβολος ὁ σατανᾶς, ὁ πονηρὸς*), and taketh away the word sown in their hearts." As these fowls of the air, and their rapacity, are here thus so distinctly explained, and for a special purpose of instruction, there is therefore the strongest reason for believing that their meaning and purpose must be the same in the parable in question; there could be no necessity for a second explanation; their character and object were clear. If the growth of the mustard-seed meant simply the spread of true religion, what, I ask, could "Satan, the devil, the wicked one," have to do nestling in the midst of it? He is in the midst of the tree, secure in its "branches," and lodged

under its "shadow." Commentators, in having overlooked the character and object of these occupants of the mustard-tree, have entirely misapplied the parable, and misrepresented the character of the present dispensation.

The three parables of the "Sower," the "Leaven," and the "Mustard-Seed" are designed to teach the same truth in different ways. It is not at all the individual and his growth in grace that is meant, as many suppose; but the aggregate of professors, and increase of corruption that is indicated in them all. The professing Church has its "branches," so called; and there can be no difficulty in telling the real origin of the superstition, worldliness, false doctrine, and "damnable heresies" which pervade the greater portion, if we look at the mustard-tree.

Bootle.

J. WORTHINGTON.

The parable of the grain of mustard seed appears to me to be set in manifest contrast with the parable of "the seed cast into the ground" (ver. 26—29). The first of the two parables presents to us the result at the time of harvest of that which had been growing for the most part secretly and imperceptibly in the world. It is in fact God's own work, which He is carrying on surely but noiselessly in the world. The good work which He begins in quickening a soul here, unheeded by the world, will be finished in the day of the Lord Jesus Christ, and be known as a work worthy of God, "when mortality shall be swallowed up of life." The children of God are not now known by the world in their lofty dignity as his children, but the day of their "manifestation" draweth nigh, and then shall they "shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father."

One great hindrance now to the recognition of the sons of God by the world is, that the world has before its eyes a present palpable result in wide-spread Christianity, in other words in actual Christendom, "the grain of mustard seed become greater than all herbs." In this the world glories, and thus men have become "lovers of their own selves, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God, having the form, but denying the power of godliness." Wherever the true doctrine of the cross is received "in the power and demonstration of the Spirit," there the world, though it assume the name of Christ as its outward badge, is known to be the same world which rejected and crucified the Lord of Glory (1 John v. 19).

The first of these parables shews us the work of God in the midst of the world, the second that man has so corrupted the doctrine of Christ (which in its power sets self aside and only exalts Christ) as to make the very name of Christ subserve his own selfishness, and help on his own self-exaltation.

PRESBUTES.

Romans viii. 29, 30; Matthew xx. 16. Vol. III. pp. 149, 176, 254, 494.—Your Correspondent W. D. D. misunderstands, and consequently misrepresents, my meaning in the passage he has quoted. I do not assert, as he would make me do, that grace poises a man in *equilibrio*. An action may have a hundred arguments to dissuade us from it, and only one to recommend it, and yet we may choose to do it. Without at all estimating the relative power of the Holy Spirit's influences and Satan's temptations over man's heart, which will vary in each individual according to the measure of grace vouchsafed, and vary in the same individual at different times, it cannot be denied that holy men have sinned, and do sin. Surely they did so of their own free will, being overcome by temptation! May not a man possess free will as well as any other talent committed to him, without making an idol of it? In every case of doubt, or of temptation, do we not choose at last one of two or more courses? Are we not, in so doing, free agents? To deny this would be to destroy responsibility, and establish the doctrine of a blind fatalism.

In the first text produced "I will cause them to walk in my statutes," "to be the cause of" and "to compel by an irresistible force," are two very different modes of proceeding.

In the second, "sin shall not . . . grace," let us examine the context. The Apostle says, "Let not sin reign . . . neither yield your members . . . but yield your members . . ." And be not afraid that these your efforts to serve God shall be abortive, "for," in doing thus, "sin shall not have the dominion over you for . . . grace:" the help from on high is sure and strong to those who seek it.

How shall we, without admitting man's free will, explain this text (2 Cor. vi. 1), "We then, as workers together with Him, beseech you also that ye receive not the grace of God in vain"? Or Gal. v. 4?

It would take up too much space to discuss the other two texts, the former of which is quite beside the question.

In the struggle between the flesh and the spirit (Gal. v. 17), man's own will, assisted, set free, persuaded, but not compelled, or made infallible, must decide. Deny this, and how many of the exhortations of God's Word become vague and imperfect!

Faith overcomes the world. Through faith we are saved. Faith is the gift of God, but it must be used by man, and may be neglected. D. J. P.

Romans ix. and Galatians iv. Vol. IV. 15.—Many promises are given to the Jews nationally as God's chosen people (Gen. xiii. 15—17; Amos iii. 2), and are not meant for the Gentiles according to the election of grace,

Romans ix. 25, 26, alluded to by F. P. do not mean the calling of the Gentiles. These verses are quotations from Hosea i. and ii. in which God promises reconciliation to his chosen people; and that they are intended literally for the Jews is beyond doubt from the whole tenor of the 1st and 2nd Hosea.

This is confirmed by Rom. ix. 26, where the apostle, quoting Hosea i. 10, repeats the prophecy that the accomplishment of the promise "shall take place where it was said unto them, Ye are my people," obviously restricting the promise to the Jews in Judea.

Rom. ix. 27, 28, 29 are verses quoted from Isaiah x. 22, 23; i. 9, and clearly refer to the Jewish remnant who are to be saved at the time of the end, when God will make short work on the earth.

Galatians iv. 27 seems to be accommodated, as F. P. says, by the apostle to the elect Gentiles. The passage is taken from Isa. liv. 1, where the Jewish Church is represented as a divorced wife (Isa. l. 1), and is comforted with the promise that when restored, her children shall be so increased that the land originally possessed by them will be insufficient to contain them (Isa. xlix. 19, 20). The only place where the Gentiles are alluded to in the whole chapter is the third verse, where it is said of the Jews, "Thy seed shall inherit the Gentiles." These words are remarkable, as proving that it could not be to the Gentiles the prophet was speaking, and also as inferring the future supremacy of the Jews.

The Jews inherit the promises directly from Abraham, but the Gentiles spiritually through faith in Christ and therefore grafted into the Jewish Church. Many of the promises can be fulfilled literally to the Jews only, but there are others which the Gentiles according to the election of grace are warranted by the example of Paul to apply also to themselves. Of these Gal. iv. 27 is an example.

The following texts if carefully considered together seem to afford the explanation wished for by F. P.

Isa. x. 22, 23,	with Rom. ix. 27, 28.
Joel ii. 32	" x. 13.
Isa. lii. 7	" x. 15.
Isa. liii. 1	" x. 16.
Deut. xxxii. 21 . .	" x. 19.
Isa. lxxv. 2	" x. 21.
Isa. xix. 20, and lix. 20	" xi. 25, 26.

R. L.

2 Corinthians iii. 16. Vol. IV. 18.—T. R. B., making the subject here Moses, says that the apostle "recounts briefly the fact which he wishes to explain in its hidden meaning, 'But whenever Moses turns to the Lord the veil is taken away.'" I fear that this interpretation is

open to the serious grammatical objection that the conjunctive (which expresses future probability) "is used after temporal relative adverbs, when what is said is not considered as an actual fact, but only as something imagined or thought of."—Jelf, Gr. Gr. 841, 1. Thus, in the clause, *ἵνα δ' αὖ πιστεύῃς πρὸς Κύριον*, the mood points to a future event, the tense to the momentary completion of the action at that future time, while *αὖ*, belonging to the time of the action, shows that it is indefinite and uncertain—"whensoever it shall turn to the Lord."

HENRY T. J. BAGGE.

Colossians i. 13.—Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son.

In answer to Mr. BROWNE's question, I would suggest in brief that there is no intermediate condition between death in sin, and life in Christ. In Eph. ii. 5, we read, that "when we were dead in sin He quickened us together with Christ." Comparison of this verse with the three preceding ones will shew that by this mighty act of God, the sinner (before dead, or under the power of darkness), being quickened together with Christ, is translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son.

This act of translation must be a past act in every one in whom spiritual life is found, in whatever point or degree of its manifestation; for, as there is no life but in Christ, so (Christ being risen) must every one who lives in the Spirit have experienced a deliverance from the power (*ἐξουσία*) of darkness already.

This must be true of the repenting sinner, for Christ is the "author of repentance." Angels rejoice over him, not only because they see a certain state of mind in him, but because they see in him a member of the kingdom of Christ. I would suggest that the "fleeing for refuge" (repentance, with its anxious seeking for mercy) is not that by which a man obtains possession of Christ as a matter of fact, but in conscience only. Hence our word to the repenting sinner should rather be a word of comfortable hope that Christ is near, than that He is far off, and yet to be fled to—near for peace, for holiness, and for all things that belong to salvation.

JOHN M. TAYLOR.

Hebrews xiii. 2. Vol. III. 438.—The meaning seems to be, "Do not forget to entertain those who are strangers to you, and claim your hospitality; for remember how some saints, in practising this duty, have been permitted to entertain angels." We need not suppose that angels now visit our world in the appearance of men; but, just as the Old Testament saint brought a blessing on himself by entertaining strangers without knowing the real greatness of his guests, so we

may frequently receive a blessing if we supply the wants of God's messengers and servants, though strangers to us. Is there anything contrary to Scripture in believing that our profession of Christianity may often be really put to the test by God, through the medium of our fellow-creatures, by His sending some one to claim our charity? Doubtless the apostle alludes to Abraham. It were hard to quarrel with the heading of the chapter in Genesis. For we commonly call all visitants from heaven, unless otherwise specially designated, "angels;" and our Lord, the uncreated angel, is called an angel in Judges xiii. 18. True, the sacred historian calls them three men. Do we then derogate from the honour of God in calling them three angels—three messengers, any more than if we had retained the words of Scripture and called them three men?

אֲנִי, a wonder, miracle, from אָנָּה, to separate, distinguish.

Jehovah is designated as אֱלֹהֵי מִוְתָּו, doing wonders, miracles.

אֵל, if the keri be adopted, signifies a "miracle," the same as in Isaiah.

אֲנִי, if the chethib be taken, means "wonderful." Anyway it must, I believe, be taken as either the name or description of the angel, our Lord Jesus Christ. C. E. STUART.

Greek Testaments. Vol. IV. 92.—Words can hardly convey a graver charge against an expositor of Holy Scripture than those of Mr. KELLY, in which he states that the notes of my colleague and myself on the New Testament exhibit "a total blank, if not worse, as regards the proper hope of the Christian and the Church."

If this charge can be substantiated, we must confess that we have either failed to accomplish the object which we had more at heart than any other, or that we have utterly mistaken the nature of "the proper hope of the Christian and the Church." It was our earnest desire, founded upon our deepest convictions, to establish in the minds of students, as the great principle of interpretation, the truth that the Lord Jesus Christ himself, in his personal presence and manifestation, is the object of faith and hope, the promise of the Old Testament, the gospel of the New. In our preface (pp. xix.—xxi.) we have fully expounded this principle; and so conscious were we of having uniformly acted upon it that we thought it necessary to offer in the same place somewhat apologetic reasons for the frequency of its application. If Mr. KELLY will favour us with a closer examination of our work, he will discover that we have constantly set forth the personality of our blessed Lord as the foundation of all Christian hope, as well as of faith, and love, and duty. And

therefore I am entitled to expect that he will withdraw, or greatly qualify, the strong censure expressed in his words above quoted. Unless (is it possible?) he intends by "the proper hope of the Christian and the Church," not the Lord Jesus Christ himself, but his earthly millennial reign—not his personal presence whenever and wherever enjoyed by the believer and the Church, but a temporary mode and circumstance of its manifestation—not the great and blessed reality, concerning which all are agreed, but certain of its possible accidents, concerning which there is as much doubt as belief among the most spiritually minded. I cannot allow myself to anticipate such an alternative.

Derby.

W. F. WILKINSON.

The Difference between John's and Christ's Baptism.—Vol. III. 91; IV. 47. On this question the annexed quotation from "Fulke's Defence of Translations," &c. (Parker Society Edition, p. 453) may be worth the attention of your Correspondents and others.

Concerning that place, Acts xix. which hath troubled so many interpreters with the obscurity thereof, or rather with a prejudicate opinion of a difference in the baptism of John and of Christ, I am neither of Beza's opinion, nor yet of our translator's, for the understanding and translation of that place; neither do I think that mention is made of any second baptism; but that St. Paul instructeth those disciples that knew not the grace of the Holy Ghost, that they which heard John preaching to the people, that they should believe in Christ Jesus, which was coming after him, were also baptised in the name of Jesus Christ, who had granted those visible graces of His Holy Spirit to be bestowed upon them that believed, by imposition of the Apostle's hands. Thus, therefore, I am persuaded those verses are to be translated: "But Paul said, John truly baptised with the baptism of repentance, saying to the people, that they should believe in Him that cometh after him, *i. e.* in Jesus; and they which heard him (John) were baptised into the name of our Lord Jesus. And after Paul had laid his hands upon," &c. . . . Here the baptism of John is confirmed by the imposition of hands, rather than disgraced by reiteration . . . it cannot be proved that any which were once baptised by John were ever baptised again.

THOMAS PRESTON.

The Pharaoh of the Exode. Vol. IV. 21.—As one of the readers of THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR I shall feel much obliged if my friend Mr. Fysh will carry out his proposal of giving us "the correct chronology of the kings of Egypt from the time of Amenemes I. to the death of the great Sesostriis," *i. e.* as I suppose, according to Manetho's dynasties, the Amenemes, one of the sixteen Diospolite kings of the eleventh dynasty, who is said to have reigned sixteen years unto Sesostriis, the third king of the twelfth dynasty, who is said to have conquered Asia in nine years, and to have reigned in all forty-eight years.

But, as this period will not include that which is most interesting to the Christian student, the Pharaoh of the Exode, to whom he subsequently alludes, may I ask him to continue his chronology as far as that date, and to specify to what dynasty "Amounist," which he considers to be "Pharaoh's daughter," and "Mæris" her adopted son, really belong; for it is very difficult to ascertain from Manetho's lists, neither of those names appearing therein.

The important question, as Cory the author of "Ancient Fragments" justly observes, is to settle something definite respecting the eighteenth dynasty, as in one of those kings "the Pharaoh of the Exode," according to most authors, is to be found, though a considerable difference exists in deciding which it really was, *e. g.*—

1. In Africanus's list of the eighteenth dynasty, according to Manetho, it is the first king Amos or Amesis, as that author remarks, "in whose time Moses went out of Egypt, as we shall show."

2. Josephus (contra Apion II. 2) quotes Manetho as saying that "the Jews departed out of Egypt in the reign of Jethmosis," whom he elsewhere calls "the father of Chelron," and consequently must be the same as Amos or Amesis, as indeed it is so written in the canon of Syncellus.

3. The Armenian Chronicle of Eusebius places the Exode under Achencheres, the ninth king.

4. The Latin translation of the Armenian places it under Chenchenes the eleventh king.

5. Archbishop Usher considers Amenophath or Amenophis, or Menophes, as it is variously written, the sixteenth king, to be "the Pharaoh of the Exode." These all belong to the eighteenth dynasty.

6. Josephus quotes Lysimachus as saying that the Exode occurred under King Bocchoris, the only king whose name is mentioned in the twenty-fourth dynasty, "the Saitæ," of whom it is recorded "that he reigned six years, and in whose reign a sheep spoke."

7. Osburn, in his valuable "Monumental History of Egypt," considers it took place under Sethos II. the last king of the nineteenth dynasty, though his name does not occur in Manetho's lists, and the adopted son of Queen Thoutcris, whom he considers to have been "Pharaoh's daughter." Osburn mentions Mæris, the builder of the Labyrinth (*i. e.* Methusuphis, the third king in the sixth dynasty of Manetho), as the father of Phiops or Aphophis, whom he speaks of as being the Pharaoh who befriended Joseph. There is a Mæris also mentioned in the Laturculus of Eratosthenes as the thirty-fourth of the Theban kings. Will Mr. Fysh be good enough to explain to what dynasty he considers "Queen Amounist" and her adopted son "Mæris" to have belonged?

Newport.

B. W. SAVILE.

The Church. Vol. IV. 15.—The Holy Ghost, in the Old Testament, brings before us either individual saints or a nation as the objects of God's favour and counsels. It is of that nation (Israel) that the Spirit uses the term "congregation" in the Old Testament, which our translators have given as the "church in the wilderness," in Acts vii. 38. But Bishop Pearson admits, as indeed every fair man must, that this is a quite distinct thing from what is called "the Church of God," &c. in the New Testament. For the Epistle to the Ephesians, with great fullness, shows that the body of Christ, God's Church, is founded on the abolition of the distinction between Jew and Gentile, and therefore could not be till the cross broke down the middle wall of partition. Nor could believing Jew and Gentile be builded together for an habitation of God, till the Spirit came down in a fuller way than before, as the fruit of Christ's victory and ascension on high, where He took the new place of Head of the Church (not merely of King in Zion). Does not F. L. W. understand that this was an entirely novel work of God, and that Scripture gives to this new assembly of believing Jews and Gentiles (bonded together by the Holy Ghost, sent down from heaven in the name of Jesus) the name of "the Church of God?" It is not merely that the term "Church of God" is never, in the sense now spoken of, applied to the Old Testament saints; but the state of things could not be before Christ's death and resurrection as the basis, and the Holy Spirit's personal presence (not influence, gifts, &c. merely) as the power of this unity. It is founded on Christ exalted in heaven, after having accomplished redemption; and it is formed by that operation of the Spirit which not only quickens but unites Jewish and Gentile saints now to Christ in heaven and to each other on earth as one body.

Now, indubitably such was not the case in the wilderness, nor in the promised land: Jew and Gentile, whether believing or not, were rigorously severed by Divine command, and the saints were sustained by a promised Messiah, instead of resting on the accomplished work of the Saviour. Life of course, Divine life, they had through faith, else they would not have been saints. But there was no such thing as union with a glorified head in heaven. Nay, it did not exist even when our Lord was upon earth. The disciples had faith and life, but they were forbidden to go to the Gentiles, instead of being united to them, till Christ rose from the dead. But the moment the Spirit came down, consequent on Christ's exaltation above, the various tongues proclaimed God's grace to the Gentiles as well as Jews; and for the first time we read of "the Church," in the full and proper sense, as now subsisting on earth. (See Acts ii.) Christ had now begun to fulfil

His promise, "Upon this rock I will build my Church." How could this mean the old assembly which fell in the wilderness? It was a new and future building, as I hope F. L. W. will feel. I am surprised that he should say the quotations made (Vol. III. p. 149) on Ephes. iv. 4, have never been answered, seeing that they were answered carefully, though briefly, in p. 178. I am not aware of a single point evaded, as indeed there was no temptation; for the truth on this subject is to me clear and certain, though I do not expect to convince every one. What I have remarked in this paper spares me the need of replying to what is urged now, which is altogether beside the mark. The only thing of the least shadow of weight is Acts vii. 38, which has been fully explained (1 Cor. x.), and proves that Israel was typical of us. How does that show that they and we form "one body?" Christ was the Lamb foreordained before the foundation of the world (not slain from it). How does that prove that believing Jew and Gentile formed one body of old, as unquestionably they do now?

WILLIAM KELLY.

P.S.—Mr. BROOKE's kind paper in page 9 (on Col. i. 18) admits much, too much I think, to allow of a long or successful resistance to the rest. He allows that the "scriptural proofs of the peculiar blessings belonging to the Church, since" what he terms "its Pentecostal formation," are convincing; but he seems to conceive that the Old Testament saints may have had those privileges extended to them also, though in the separate state, and removed from earth to heaven. He does not pretend to cite Scripture for this very imaginative mode of embodying the Old Testament saints in the Church, which I apprehend will satisfy those who oppose my views as little as myself. He tries to make it out by the illustration of the French empire, established after some distant colony was formed, and then granting its imperial advantages to the colonists. But the answer is plain. Scripture, in presenting to our faith the groups of glory, distinguishes the spirits of just men made perfect (*i. e.* in resurrection) from the Church of the firstborn. There is no such thought there, as merging all in one; whereas a positive decree of the emperor would be needful to make good the claims of the colonists. Psa. lxxviii. 18 does not refer to departed saints, but to Christ's triumph over the evil spirits who had previously led His people captive.

Another writer, Mr. J. F. TOWN, referred to Rom. xi. and Gal. iii. in proof that the Church actually existed as such in Old Testament times. But this is evidently to confound things that differ, because the inheritance of the Abrahamic promises, of which their chapters treat, is not identical with the enjoyment of the Church's privileges; whereas their identity is assumed in the

argument. It is allowed that the New Testament saints do inherit those promises, but that is an essentially different thing from the blessings revealed, *e.g.* in the Ephesians. The olive is not the heavenly Church, but the earthly tree of promise and testimony, of which the Jews were the natural branches. Instead of the broken-off unfaithful branches, Gentiles are now grafted in; but, on their unfaithfulness, excision is the sure threat of God, and the Jews will again be brought into their own olive-tree, *i.e.* for the millennial inheritance. This is the plain teaching of Rom. xi.; and, though as Gentiles we may be grafted in, and as individuals we may be Abraham's seed, the special position of Christ's body, as made known in 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, Colossians, &c. is too distinct to require argumentation. When "the body" is spoken of, there is no cutting off nor grafting in. There is in it neither Jew nor Gentile. All is above nature there.

The Cross. Vol. III. 407.—Eusebius, who was present probably at the "invention" of the cross, has, in his life of Constantine, described its shape as resembling the Hebrew tau; not the Chaldee T, but the obelisk form †, found on the medals of Palestine, and on the mummy bandages in Egypt. (See Büttner's Comparative Table II., in Eichhorn's Einleit. A. T., end of Vol. I.) He says it also resembled a bird in flight. The name *crux*, "cross," was given to it in consequence of the transverse bar, and it was similar in shape to that which is now in use in China, and of which a recent number of the "Illustrated London News" gave a drawing in the representation of a Chinese place of execution. The Greek terms, *σταυρος*, post, and *ξύλον*, wood, points to the origin of this punishment as being inflicted by nailing to trees; but this was not the Roman practice in the time of Cicero (in Verrem, v. 66), and Josephus (War. VII. vi. 4).

Lichfield.

T. J. BUCKTON.

Fasting. Vol. III. 468.—Possibly the following remarks may not be unacceptable to H. M. C.

Is not fasting, strictly explained, a total abstinence from food for a season? Few, however, are able to bear this for any length of time; hence, in most cases, it is an abstinence for a longer or shorter period from our ordinary food, changing both its quantity and kind (*cf.* Dan. x. 3); this outward humbling and discipline of the body, betokening the inward contrition of the soul, and being always accompanied by prayer and confession of sin. Indeed they whose souls are seriously and earnestly affected by the sight of their own unworthiness and God's mercy can hardly do otherwise than fast, on special occasions of supplication and abasement. At such times and for such persons, "pleasant bread" has

no relish. And as a sober and temperate use of meats, at all times, tends to the freer action of the mind, so even in this respect fasting is not without use to those who seek to avoid all hindrances to thought and reflection.

The Scriptures afford many examples of fasting. There are the remarkable and miraculous fasts of Moses (Exod. xxiv. 18), of Elijah (1 Kings xix. 8), and our Lord (Matt. iv. 2). In the Old Testament we have instances of public fasts recorded in 2 Chron. xx. 3; Ezra viii. 21, 23; Nehem. ix. 1; Jer. xxxvi. 9; Jonah iii. 5; and in Joel i. 14; ii. 12, 15, we find direct commands to fast. Cases of private fasts are given in 2 Sam. xii. 16; 1 Kings xxi. 27; Neh. i. 4; Dan. ix. 3; Psa. xxxv. 13. Nor was the custom dropped in New Testament times. In Luke ii. 37, we read of Anna the prophetess, who "served God with fastings and prayers night and day," and the fasting, alms, and prayers of Cornelius were manifestly accepted of God (Acts x. 30). And it is a very important fact, that our Lord, who appears to have neglected the observance of the stated Jewish fasts (*cf.* Matt. ix. 14—18; xi. 18, 19; Mark ii. 15—22), and whilst condemning hypocritical and ostentatious fasts (Matt. vi. 16—18), nevertheless sanctioned the practice by giving directions how to perform it, and stated (Matt. xvii. 21) that it was at times absolutely necessary. To this we may add, that the apostles, whilst they denounced fasting when it interfered with any moral or Christian duty, did nevertheless use it on important occasions, as at the ordination of the elders (Acts xiv. 23), and that of Barnabas and Saul (Acts xiii. 3); moreover, Paul speaks of approving himself as a minister of God "in fastings" (2 Cor. vi. 5), which appear from the 11th chapter and 27th verse of the same epistle to have been frequent. To fasting, works of mercy are suitably joined (Isa. lviii. 6, 7). We can perhaps hardly say that fasting is a Christian duty, for duty denotes what is due from one being to another, and there certainly is no obligation on any one to fast, for the Scriptures, whilst commanding fasting, do not command it. But, beyond all controversy, both public and private fasts, when accompanied by inward humiliation and prayer, are accepted of God, and "may till the world's end be observed not without singular use and benefit." (Hooker, Eccl. Pol. lib. v. c. 72, sec. 2.)

Whilst some thoughtlessly depreciate, so do the papists foolishly exalt and make a merit of, the practice, and, as it appears to me, entirely destroy its scriptural simplicity, as any one who will take the trouble to read the trash put forth by their casuists may readily verify. They distinguish between fasting and abstinence, and divide fasting into spiritual, moral, and ecclesiastical.

The fasting days are, "the forty days in Lent; the ember days at the four seasons; the vigils or eves of Whitsunday, of Ss. Peter and Paul, of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin, of All Saints and of Christmas Day, and all Wednesdays and Fridays in Advent."

The abstinence days are "the Sundays in Lent, unless leave be given to the contrary; all the Fridays of the year," except Christmas-day, when it falls on a Friday; and "the Catholic Church commands all her children to abstain from flesh on all days of fasting and abstinence, and on fasting days to eat but one meal."*

According to the Catechism of the Council of Trent (Pars IV. cap. viii. qu. ix.), fasting and almsgiving are to be joined to prayer, to make it fervent and efficacious. "Quum enim peccando vel offendamus Deum, vel proximos violentus, vel nos ipsos lædamus: sacris precibus placatum reddimus Deum; eleemosyna redimimus hominum offensiones; jejuniis proprias vitæ sordes eluimus."

According to S. Thomas (Q. Q. q. 147, a. 1. in c.), the use of fasting is threefold, "Assumitur jejunium principaliter ad concupiscentias carnis reprimendas; secundo ad hoc, quod mens liberius levetur ad sublimia contemplanda; tertio ad satisfaciendum pro peccatis." By "peccatis," I apprehend, is meant the temporal punishment which the Papists hold is due to sin, and to discharge which, penance, purgatory, and the like inventions have been brought in.

To eat flesh on fasting days is said to be a mortal sin, though it is hardly settled what quantity is necessary to violate the rule. Wine is permitted, and so, if coffee, wine, water, "et similia quatenus talia" are actually necessary ("si potus sit necessarius, isque noceret stomacho, liceret aliquid sumere per modum medicinæ"), it is allowable to eat, lest the drink alone should injure the stomach.

The fast-day commences "ab horâ duodecima nocturnâ," and lasts "usque ad duodecimam noctis sequentis." The hour of the one meal allowed is generally about noon; it may be after, but not before. In addition to this meal, a "collatione vespertina," or supper, is allowed, which must be taken about the evening, when the fasters are permitted to refresh themselves with "fructus, herbas, panem vel libum, in hac patria butyratum, cum caseo," and there is some doubt whether fish may not be added to the bill of fare. Hot suppers are forbidden, very probably out of a regard to nocturnal comfort. It is not agreed how much a man may eat at this refection, some allowing a fourth, others a fifth, a sixth, &c. of an ordinary supper. The origin of this "cenula . . . antiquitus ignota" is stated to be this—"nomen sortitum est a collationibus

seu conferentiis et lectionibus spiritualibus vespertinis, quando fideles conveniebant; ubi tunc primum sumpserunt aliquid potus; deinde ne iste potus noceret vacuo stomacho, per modum medicinæ cum potu simul aliquid cibi accipere; paulatim iste usus ita increvit, ut ista collatione hodie sumatur ad aliquam nutritionem, relaxante eatenus ecclesiâ legem suam. Nullum quidem ecclesiæ decretum super ea relaxatione emanavit; sed consuetudine lex moderata est connivente ecclesiâ (Dens, Theolog. vol. iv. N. 262); but I need not go more into detail. It may be easy to find where popish fasting begins, but it is beyond my patience to discover where it ends.

A LAYMAN.

The Literal Interpretation of Unfulfilled Prophecy. Vol. IV. 15.—The best answer to this Query is contained, I fancy, in the following extract from Bishop Horne's Commentary on the Psalms. It will be seen that there only needs the fundamental admission that Israel is a typical people, and that Israel's prophecies have a two-fold interpretation—a typical as well as literal reference.

We are taught by the writers of the New Testament to consider this part of their history as one continued figure, or allegory. We are told that there is a spiritual Israel of God; other children of Abraham, and heirs of the promise; another circumcision, &c.; another land of Canaan, and another Jerusalem, which they are to obtain, and to possess for ever. . . . "These things happened unto them for ensamples,"—types (*τύποι*), or figures,—"and were written for our admonition."

Crookes Parsonage.

C. G. COOMBE.

The Querist.

1 Chronicles v. 2.—The birthright was Joseph's.

An old writer has the following remark:

Primogeniture among the Jews was reckoned after the mother; the first-born of a second wife was entitled to the rights attending it, in prejudice of the second son of a first wife, though born, in point of time, ever so long before him.

He mentions 1 Chron. v. 2, as a proof of the truth of his remark. This old writer says that only a first-born son could possess the privileges attending primogeniture, and that those privileges could not be transferred to a younger son of the same parents. Is not this statement irreconcilable with Gen. xxv. 33? He says also, that, if a daughter was the first-born, the rights of primogeniture could not be enjoyed "by the subsequent sons." Was this the case? The Jewish doctors say that the first-born had three privileges, namely, a double portion (Deut. xxi. 17), the principality, and the priesthood; but Patrick says he saw no ground to think that the priest-

* See Bishop Challoner's "Garden of the Soul."

hood belonged to them. Did it not originally do so, as the Jewish doctors say, before the tribe of Levi was selected in place of the first-born?

W. CAINE.

Isaiah x. 27.—And it shall come to pass in that day that his burden shall be taken away and the yoke shall be destroyed, because of the anointing.

How are these last words, "because of the anointing," *לְמַעַן הַמָּשֶׁחַת*, to be explained?

W. Lowth has this note on the words:—

For the sake of God's chosen people (especially the remnant mentioned ver. 20, 21), called his anointed (Psalm cv. 15), and likewise for the preservation of the kingdom and priesthood, both which offices were conferred by the ceremony of anointing. But without question the Messias, the anointed in an eminent sense (as the word signifies), and described as such (Psalm xlv. 7), is principally intended here, who was to rise from the stock of Judah, and whose coming is directly foretold in the following chapter: "God preserved the kingdom of Judah from utter destruction, because the Messias was to come from that tribe."

Gesenius translates thus: "And the yoke is broken, because of fatness;" and he says it is a metaphor taken from a fat bull that casts off and breaks the yoke. He refers to Deut. xxxii. 15, and Hosea iv. 16.

Grotius says,—

Jugum illud quod Assyrii Judæam imposuerant plane interibit, propter Ezechiam unctum sacro oleo. Alluditur ad vim olei, quod nodos quævis facile laxat.

But Bishop Lowth, in his translation of the verse, omits the words altogether; and in his note he says,—

I follow here the LXX, who, for *לְמַעַן הַמָּשֶׁחַת*, read *מִשְׁכַּח מִיָּדָם*, ἀπο τῶν αἰμάτων ὑμῶν; not being able to make any good sense out of the present reading.

I will add here the marginal conjectures of Archbishop Secker, who appears, like all others, to have been at a loss for a probable interpretation of the text as it now stands:—

è. leg. *שֶׁחַת*; forte legend. *לְמַעַן הַמָּשֶׁחַת*, vid. cap. v. 1 (Zech. iv. 14). Et possunt intelligi Judæi uncti Dei (Psa. cv. 15); vel Assyrii *מִשְׁכַּח מִיָּדָם*, hic ver. 16, ut dicat Propheta depulsum iri jugum ab his impositum: sed hoc durius. Vel potest legi *לְמַעַן הַמָּשֶׁחַת*.—SECKER.

The Vulgate has "et computrescet jugum a facie olei."

The Douay version renders the clause, "And the yoke shall putrefy at the presence of the oil."

Can any of your learned readers throw any light on this very difficult passage?

Manchester.

WILLIAM CAINE.

Zechariah xiii. 8, 9.—And it shall come to pass, that in all the land, saith the Lord, two parts therein shall be cut off and die; but the third shall be left therein. And I will bring the third part through the fire, and will refine them as silver is refined, and will try them as gold is tried.

Does this refer to the troubles which shall come

on the Jews, then partially restored, before the "fountain" is opened to them as a nation, "for sin and for uncleanness," before the Spirit is poured upon them, as is predicted in 12th chapter and 10th verse? Is this a tribulation distinct from that recorded in chap. xiv. ver. 10? What is the meaning of the expression, "I will turn mine hand upon the little ones" (ver. 7)?

Trinity College, Cambridge.

F. T.

Matthew xi. 13. For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John.

What is the nature of the connection between this verse and the context? Is its meaning to be ascertained by giving the emphasis to *προφητευσαν*? "John's predecessors only spoke of the kingdom of heaven as something future, whilst he himself had the privilege of saying, 'Behold the Lamb of God!'"

Brenchley. GEORGE MACKNESS (B.A. Oxon).

Matthew xxiv. 34. I am still, as I have long been, in difficulty as to the true explication of Matt. xxiv. 34. If it refer to the destruction of the temple by the Romans as to take place within the period of that "generation," then is not the passage misplaced? Standing as it does, it includes events which seem not yet accomplished, as Matt. xxix. 31. But, on turning to Mark xiii. 30 and Luke xxi. 31, I find the same statement in the same relative position with the context. Is it likely that the word *γενεα* in these places means "race," i.e. the Jewish race, and would this be a justifiable rendering? See Matt. xxiii. 36, where the wrath denounced was not surely to be confined to that "generation" of living Jews.

T. G. R.

In Vol. IV. p. 14, under remarks on John xviii. 16, your Correspondent asks the question "Why does St. John speak thus of himself here?" Is St. John referred to at all? Is it not "the other disciple" Judas—who certainly was known to the High Priest? Matt. xxvi. 14, 16. It is perhaps unnecessary to state that the same word in Greek stands for "high" or for "chief" priest, according to the English Version.

J. N. P.

Acts xxi. 4.—Who said to Paul, through the Spirit, that he should not go up to Jerusalem.

Was not the apostle disobedient in going up to Jerusalem after this warning? Or are we to suppose that he did not recognise that these disciples spake by the Spirit, and that therefore he made a mistake?

BARN.

Romans vi. 3, 4. What is meant by the phrases "Were baptised into Jesus Christ," and "are

buried with Him by baptism into death?" Is there any allusion in the latter to baptism by immersion? A brief explanation of the two verses will much oblige.

Inverness.

M. C. J.

1 Corinthians xv. 55. *Death and Hades.* Vol. IV. 6.—Would the BISHOP of CASHEL kindly inform me anxious for information, Is there any authority for his assertion, that, as Hades is the receptacle of departed spirits, so death is of departed bodies—more than that death has power only over the body? If so, his explanation of 1 Cor. xv. 55 in Vol. IV. p. 6, and of the other passages there quoted, is very precious.

Dundalk.

J. G. R.

Philippians iii. 13. If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead.

I would wish to ask two questions on this important text.

1st. What is "The resurrection of the dead" here spoken of? Is it "the resurrection from the dead" (Luke xx. 36) the first and blessed resurrection, or the resurrection of Christ's people with Himself, *i. e.* a realisation of it (Eph. ii. 5, 6)?

2nd. The force and meaning of "If by any means" (*ei πως*)?

Is it not equivalent to our expression, "That by some means."

Could the verb here for "might attain" be the fut. indic. instead of aor. subj. (*κατανησθω*)? for with indicative mood *ei* denotes possibility without any doubt. Rom. xi. 14 is a parallel instance to this passage.

Dundalk.

J. G. R.

Revelation xvi. 12.—And the sixth angel poured out his vial upon the great river Euphrates; and the water thereof was dried up, that the way of the Kings of the East might be prepared.

What country is meant by the East? Who are the Kings of the East? The words in the original are, *των βασιλεων των απο ανατολων*. Is the rendering of these words in the Authorised Version correct? Compare Matthew ii. 1, *μαγοι απο ανατολων*.

Manchester.

WILLIAM CAINE.

Early Missionary Movements.—On this subject, would some of your Correspondents oblige me by informing of the time and circumstances in which the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge originated, and what may have been the earliest missionary association in England in modern times. In Scotland the earliest appears to have been "the Society for Propagating Christian Knowledge." This was instituted, after various inquiries and efforts through the Scottish Church

and private benevolence, in 1700, chiefly with a view to the evangelisation of the Highlands, which was at the time a barbarous and turbulent region, equally disquieting to the statesman and the Christian. The subsequent spiritual and moral amelioration unquestionably accomplished in the Scottish Celts was an essentially missionary work,* carried on, in conjunction with the evangelical portion of the Scottish Church, mainly by this Society. But the association was instituted with reference also to "foreign parts," and in the course of last century was honoured to support, for forty years in succession, the illustrious missionary brothers Brainerd among the American Indians. Now I observe an interesting connecting link with the efforts of English Christians in the public records of the period when the Society was framing. In 1704 the General Assembly of the Scottish Church record their thanks to the English Society, and to various private individuals, for their concurrence and assistance in furnishing libraries for Highland parishes.

It is interesting to find what unnoticed bonds of connection with respect to Christian agency and effort may be traced between remote and seemingly isolated revivals of genuine religion, as also how the vital Christianity of a declining period, such as the beginning of last century confessedly was, sows a seed that survives succeeding seasons of blight and cold, to reappear in unexpected glorious fruit "after many days."

Inverness-shire.

A. C.

Swedenborgianism.—Can you, Mr. Editor, or any of your Correspondents, tell me of any book which refutes the doctrines of Swedenborgianism?

R. CORNALL.

"Και."

Λουτρον παλιγγενειας, και ανακαινωσιως Πενταματος Ἀγίου.—Titus iii. 5.

Θεον και Κυριον ἡμων Ιησουν Χριστον αρνουμενοι.—John 4.

Θεου, Σωτηρος ἡμων και Κυριου Ιησου Χριστου.—1 Tim. i. 1.

There is a difference of opinion, I think, amongst critics as to whether *και* in such collocations as these in the New Testament should be translated "and" or "even." It is a question well worthy of some notice from a learned student of ecclesiastical Greek, *e.g.* "Washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, or *even* renewing of the Holy Ghost;" "Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ, or *even* our Lord Jesus;" "God our Saviour and Lord Jesus Christ, or *even* Lord Jesus Christ." S. T. C. D.

* So the evangelisation of the Welsh Celts seems to have been regarded in the seventeenth century, *e.g.* Dr. Owen's earnest pleadings in his *Sermon before the Long Parliament*, April, 1646.

ERRATA IN VOL. III.

Page	Col.	Line	
478	2	17	Insert "και" before "οι τυφλοι," and also before "οι χηλοι."

ERRATA IN VOL. IV.

Page	Col.	Line	
12	2	39	For "Hithpaal" read "Hithpaal."
13	1	48	For "בָּנֵי" read "בְּנֵי."
24	2	19	For "the <i>χαρις</i> ," read "the word <i>χ.</i> "
"	2	32	For "חֶכֶם" read "חֵכֶם."
"	2	54	For "habendum" read "habendam."
25	1	8	For "vii. 5" read "vii. 7."
43	2	16	For "Procem" read "Proc."
46	2	30	For "His" read "this."
"	2	56	For "liturgy" read "litany."

Notices to Correspondents.

The Editor regrets his continued inability to attend to his accumulated Correspondents, and to the many valuable works forwarded to him for review.

All Correspondents writing for the "ANNOTATOR" or "REPLICANT" must send us their real names; not necessarily for publication, but for our own information and safeguard. *Papers not thus authenticated will be invariably laid aside.* We allow more latitude in the "QUEERIST" department.

Every paper should commence with the text or subject commented upon, written distinctly at the head of the article. Reference should then be made to the page or pages where the subject has been before noticed, and to which the reply, if it be one, is sent. Queries should have the text prefixed from the Authorised Version, or else should have such a heading as the Replicants can with ease refer to.

Every separate article should be written on a separate piece of paper, to allow of our arranging them in Scripture sequence. We cannot return manuscripts sent to us for publication.

No. 95 will be published (D.V.) on Saturday the 7th of March.

Just Published, Vol. III. well bound in cloth. Price 9s.

Vols. I. II. and III. Price 26s. 6d.

Quarterly Part, No. 12, in a neat wrapper. Price 2s.

All Communications to be addressed to THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR, care of Messrs. NISBET and Co. 21, Berners Street, Oxford Street.

All Communications respecting the supply of THE ANNOTATOR, as well as all Post-office Orders, or enclosures of Stamps, to be addressed to the publishers, Messrs. NISBET and Co. 21, Berners Street, Oxford Street.

A new and cheaper Edition of

MEMOIRS OF CAPTAIN HEDLEY VICARS, Ninety-seventh Regiment. 1s. 6d.

TRAVELS AND RESEARCHES IN CHALDEA AND SUSIANA. With an Account of Excavations at Warka and Shush. Under the Orders of Major-Gen. Sir W. Fenwick Williams of Kars, Bart. and also of the Assyrian Excavation Fund in 1853-4. By WILLIAM KENNETT LOFTUS, F.G.S. Demy 8vo, with many Engravings, Maps, Plans, &c. 12s. cloth.

THE DESERT OF SINAI: Notes of a Journey from Cairo to Beersheba. By HORATIUS BONAR, D.D. Crown 8vo, 6s. cloth.

THINGS NEW AND OLD IN RELIGION, SCIENCE, AND LITERATURE. Crown 8vo, plates, 5s. cloth.

UNCLE PEREGRINE; Annals and Incidents of Romantic Adventure. A Book for Boys. Crown 8vo, 8s. cloth.

PRAYER ANSWERED IN ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTEEN CASES RECORDED IN THE OLD TESTAMENT. Fcp. 8vo. 3s. 6d. cloth.

LIFE: a Series of Illustrations of the Divine Wisdom, in the Forms, Structure, and Instincts of Animals. By P. H. GOSSE, F.R.S. Plates. Crown 8vo, 5s. cloth.

THE BRIAR AND MYRTLE; or HEATHENISM AND CHRISTIANITY. Illustrated in the History of Mary. By Miss TUCKER, Author of "The Rainbow in the North," "Southern Cross," &c. Fcp. 8vo, 2s. 6d. cloth.

A RAY OF LIGHT TO BRIGHTEN COTTAGE HOMES. By the Author of "A Trap to catch a Sunbeam." With Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. cloth.

OSHIELLE; or, VILLAGE LIFE in the YORUBA COUNTRY. From the Journals and Letters of a Catechist there. By M. A. S. BARBER. 18mo. 2s. cloth.

MORNING WATCHES AND EVENING INCENSE. By the Author of "The Faithful Promiser," &c. In 1 Vol. 32mo. 1s. 6d. cloth gilt.

THOUGHTS AND APHORISMS on the CHRISTIAN LIFE. Edited by the Rev. JOHN BAILLIE. 16mo. 1s. 6d. cloth.

THE FRIENDS OF CHRIST in the NEW TESTAMENT. Thirteen Discourses by NEHEMIAH ADAMS, D.D. Small crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. cloth.

MEMORIES OF BETHANY. By the Author of "The Faithful Promiser," "Footsteps of St. Paul," &c. Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. cloth.

HYMNS OF FAITH and HOPE. By HORATIUS BONAR, D.D. Fcp. 8vo. 5s. cloth.

EXCELSIOR: Helps to Progress in Religion, Science, and Literature. Complete in Six Volumes. Crown 8vo. Price £1 4s. in cloth.

JAMES NISBET and Co. 21, Berners Street.

Just Published, demy 8vo. in a neat cover, Price 3s.

SKETCH OF a COPTIC GRAMMAR, adapted for Self-Tuition. By W. B. MACDONALD, of Rammerescales. Edinburgh: W. H. LIZARS. London: GEORGE PHILIP & Son, 32, Fleet Street: and all Booksellers.

Just published.

THE LIFE OF DAVID, in two Parts, a Class Book for Schools.

FROM THE SHEEP-FOLD TO THE THRONE. Price Sixpence.

FROM THE THRONE TO THE GRAVE. Price One Shilling.

Stamford: LANGLEY, High Street. London: HAMILTON, ADAMS, and Co. 33, Paternoster Row; J. HATCHARD and Son, 187, Piccadilly.

The Conservative Land Society.

Trustees.

The Lord Viscount RANELAGH.
The Hon. Colonel LOWTHORP, M.P.
Rt. Hon. R. A. C. N. HAMILTON, M.P.
J. C. CONNOLD, Esq. M.P.

By paying 8s. per month, and another 1s. quarterly, any person (children as well as ladies) may become the holder of a £60 Share without partnership liability of any kind. The entrance-fee per Share is 2s. 6d. and a pass-book (for any number of Shares) costs 1s.; the first enrolment would be therefore 12s. 6d., and 8s. monthly afterwards. Sums of £5 and upwards bear interest at the rate of 5 per cent. per annum paid half-yearly one month after Lady Day and Michaelmas. All the Members, whether they pay their subscriptions monthly in advance, or take completed Shares, price £52 4s. 6d. each, participate in the annual division of the profits. The Society has never paid less than 6 per cent. to investors. The taking of land is quite optional. Prospectuses to be had of CHARLES LEWIS GRUNDSSEN, Secretary.

Offices, 33, Norfolk Street, Strand, London, W.C.

THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR; OR, NOTES AND QUERIES ON SCRIPTURAL SUBJECTS.

[PUBLISHED ON ALTERNATE SATURDAYS.]

VOL. IV.—No. 95.

MARCH 14, 1857.

[Price Threepence.
Stamped Edition, 4d.]

THE ANNOTATOR:—

Strangers, by the Rev. Horatius Bonar, D.D.— Proverbs xxxi. 10, by J. Worthington—The great Thief and the great Saviour	65, 66
John xi. 21-26, by Rev. G. Studdert—Romans vi. 2-5, by R. Johnston—2 Cor. iii. 7-18; 1 Tim. i. 1— Inspiration	67-69

THE REPLICANT:—

Genesis i. 2, by Rev. F. Fysh—Exodus xii. 40, by Rev. E. Ryley—Psalm xcix. 6—Daniel vii. 11, with Rev. xix. 20, by S. P. Tregelles, LL.D.—Daniel ix. 27, and Matt. xiii. by W. Kelly	70, 71
Matt. xxiv. 15, by Rev. B. W. Savile—Mark i. 24, by R. Johnston and J. Worthington—Luke vii. 28— John viii. 51, 52, and xi. 26—xx. 19-26, by C. E. Stuart	72-74

Romans v. 12-21, by Rev. H. T. J. Bagge—Romans v. 18, 19, by Rev. J. M. Taylor	74, 75
Romans ix. 27-29, by Rev. H. Girdlestone—Eph. iv. 19, by Rev. Z. J. Edwards and J. E. Wakefield— Col. i. 13	76, 77
Temple of Janus, by John Finlayson—The Lord's Supper—The Antichrist, by Rev. Arthur Roberts —Literal Interpretation of Prophecy	77, 78

THE QUERIST:—

Isaiah i. 13, by G. Mackness—2 Peter i. 1, by Rev. J. I. Duncan—Syriac Grammars, by J. Hiles— Hymnology—Esau; Visit of the Magi, by the Rev. W. Caine	79
--	----

NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS	80
---------------------------	----

The Annotator.

STRANGERS.

Hebrews xi. 13; 1 Peter ii. 11; 1 Chronicles xxix. 15.
—It is held by some that the strangership into which faith brings the saint is a new thing in the earth; that it was not known, and could not have been experienced, before Christ came; or at least that it was not known by Israel, who, it is said, as possessors of an earthly inheritance, could not be "strangers on the earth."

If one however will study with care the 11th chapter of the Hebrews, he will see that the whole band of believing men and women from Abel downwards, the whole "cloud of witnesses," are reckoned strangers and pilgrims, and that we in these last days are merely occupying a position of separation from earth which every saint from the beginning occupied. Partakers of the same faith, washed in the same blood, saved by the same grace, anticipating the same "recompense of reward," we are separated from the same "present evil world," and set in the same position of hostility to the serpent and the serpent's seed and the serpent's world as they were.

With reference to Abraham and the patriarchs No. 95.

this cannot be questioned. The apostle clearly declares it: "They confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth" (Heb. xi. 13); they had the promise of an earthly inheritance; yet it is said "they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly." It would seem also from the apostle's statement respecting Moses that the same "strangership" pertained to him, though king in Jeshurun. And in reading the whole of the above chapter one feels that the apostle meant to affirm the same thing regarding Samuel and David, and Gideon and Barak, &c.

But this is not left to any inference of ours. Thus David writes respecting himself, "I am a stranger with thee, and a sojourner, as all my fathers were" (Psa. xxxix. 12). And just at the very time that he was heaping up gold and silver for the house of the Lord he says, not of himself only, but of his people, "We are strangers before thee, and sojourners, as were all our fathers" (1 Chron. xxix. 15). And the writer of the 119th Psalm, in later times than David's, says, "I am a stranger on the earth."

I wish to call the attention of your readers to these passages, because I observe in the remarks of some a tendency to lower the spiritual standing of the ancient saints, and to exalt that of the Church beyond due measure. This was the early leaven that

poisoned the Church—a leaven which one sees strikingly exhibited in the writings of Jerome—a leaven which led to the affixing of the title of saint before eminent believers since the coming of Christ, and denying it to those who lived before that time. The same popery that sainted Cyril, and Cyprian, and Augustine, unsainted Abraham, and David, and Elijah.

HORATIUS BONAR.

Proverbs xxxi. 10.—Who can find a virtuous woman? for her price is far above rubies.

Perhaps no word in the English language has undergone a greater change from its primitive signification than the adjective “virtuous,” especially in reference to woman: it is used only three times in the Bible, viz. as above, and xii. 4, and Ruth iii. 12; and in all the meaning intended is quite different from what appears on a cursory reading, and from that now usually given to it in that connection.

In the above, the subsequent part of the chapter is sufficient evidence perhaps of what it meant; but a comparison of the LXX. and Vulgate versions will show that it is the same in all:

Ruth iii. 12. *οτι γυνη δυναμεως ει συ.*
Mulierem te esse virtutis.

Prov. xii. 4. *Γυνη ανδρεα στεφανος τω ανδρι αυτης.*
Mulier diligens, corona est viro suo.

xxx. 10. *Γυναικα ανδρεαν τις ευρησει;*
Mulierem fortem quis inveniet?

It will thus be seen that it is a woman of energy, magnanimity, diligence, and care, that is intended; nor does the text given necessarily imply the rarity of such, for verse 29 says, “Many daughters have done virtuously, but thou excellest them all.”

John Fisher, “In Proverbia Salomonis Commentarius,” 1617, thus translates: xii. 4, “Uxor strenua;” xxxi. 10, “Feminam strenuam quis inveniet?” that is, a woman active and vigorous. On strenuus he says, “Heb. roboris vel strenuitatis. Intellegitur autem hic robor tum corporis tum imprimis animi.” So that the word “virtuous,” in the Bible, does not relate to chastity; that is only a modern application.

It would create a smile to see the use Rome makes of this text, were it not for the pain one must feel at such impious trifling.

In the following work, “Lazcanus de Immac. Concept. V. M., Venetiis, 1755, Superiorum permissu,” occurs this passage, p. 438. “Ait Salomon xxxi. 10 (according to Vulg.) Mulierem fortem quis inveniet? Procul, et de ultimis finibus pretium ejus. Ubi sermo est de Sanctissima Virgine Maria;” and for proof he quotes Jer. vi. 22, “Gens magna consurget a finibus terræ;” and then proceeds, “Sicut ergo credentes dicuntur ad Christum venire ex finibus terræ, cur hæc Mulier,

portans Cœlestem Panem, non dicitur venire a finibus terræ? sed, Procul, et de finibus ultimis? Quia hæc Sancta Mulier Maria non prodit a finibus terræ, sed a finibus supremi, ac altissimi Cœli Empyreï.” On the same page it is said, nothing is higher than the seat of Mary, “Nihil creditur altius sede Mariæ;” and this because she is seated on the Throne of Divine Majesty,—in “Throno Majestatis! Divinæ Majestatis!! Sanctissimæ Trinitatis!!!”

Bootle.

J. WORTHINGTON.

THE GREAT THIEF AND MURDERER, AND THE
GREAT SAVIOUR. John x. 10.

I. The Great Thief and Murderer.

Whatever Christ primarily intended by the thief and murderer here, we know that Satan is both. He cometh to steal us out of the hands of Jesus; to deprive the Son of God of the fruit of the travail of His soul; the reward for which He humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. He cometh also “to kill and to destroy.” If it be “killing” to drag the sinner to hell, then it is “destruction” to keep him there for ever. Let us not question the justice of this terrible doom. Just it must be, if the Just One have decreed it; and certain it must be, since the True One has declared it.

II. The Great Saviour—manifested to defeat the efforts and disappoint the expectations of the great thief and murderer, “I am come, that they may have life,” &c.

i. He had been saying for four thousand years, “I am coming.” At first, though the voice was heard, its meaning was faintly perceived. “The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent’s head.” But who might conjecture the higher nature of the woman’s seed? Who might dare to guess that the woman’s God would assume the woman’s nature, and appear as the woman’s seed? The fullness of time, however, approached, and the voice sounded nearer and clearer, “Unto us a child is born.” Is not this the woman’s seed? “and His name shall be called The mighty God!” And again, “He shall grow up before Jehovah as a tender plant.” Is not this the child of Eve growing up to sorrowing yet holy manhood, “increasing in wisdom and in stature, and in favour both with God and man?” “Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows; yet we did esteem Him stricken of God. He was bruised for our iniquities, and wounded for our transgressions;” and so, behold the weapon, even the atoning cross, with which the seed of the woman bruised the head of the serpent.

ii. Now, Jesus proclaims, “I am come,” and the purpose, “that they may have life.”

1. Legal life—the reversal of the sentence of condemnation pronounced by the holy, just, and

good law of God, so that "there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus."

2. Spiritual life—so that "they walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit."

3. Heavenly life—for "we know that if the earthly house of this present tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."

4. Resurrection life.—True, "all that are in the grave shall hear the voice of the Son of Man, and shall come forth," but not all to the resurrection of life. "They who have done good," we are told, unto the "resurrection of life." And verily there is a difference between the "good-doing" of angels and the "good-doing" of sinners. It is good for the angels to keep the estate of unsinning holiness, and good for the sinner to strive to reach it. It is good for the angels never to need repentance, but good for the sinner to be repenting always, and always coming to Jesus for life. And what of "the rest of the dead?" They shall come forth to "the resurrection of condemnation." Their lost spirits shall be reclothed, though with what forms of fearful degradation who may tell? Assuredly none but the saved can say, "He shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body."

5. And, as the crown of the whole—eternal life. "I give unto my people eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand."

M—Manse.

M. S. J.

John xi. 21–26.—Martha meeting Jesus at once bursts forth in words almost of rebuke (21), giving vent, we may suppose, to what had been uppermost in her own mind for the last four or five days; and then, as if somewhat ashamed of herself, endeavours to soften down her hasty remarks by adding, in terms of apparent faith (22). Whereupon our Lord answers her, in accordance with her own announcement, distinctly granting what seemed to be her request; just as if he had said, as at other times, "Be it unto thee according to thy faith;" "Thy brother shall rise again." Martha then at once betrays her want of faith in the literal fulfilment of these words of Jesus, and shows plainly that the assertion she made use of was more that of compliment than the language of a believing heart, for she replies (24). To this our Lord again answers (25, 26), and concludes with this pointed rebuke, "Believest thou this?" As much as to say, "You do not believe what I have already said about thy brother rising again; but do you believe me really to be the cause and source of the Resurrection?" May we not gather from this view of the passage, how much comfort we deprive ourselves of by so continually overlooking the literal

fulfilment of the words of Jesus? We give them a colouring according to our own unbelieving hearts, instead of receiving them as the words of Him who "cannot lie," and so waiting for the accomplishment of His promise, though at the time we may not be able to see how matter spoken of can be realised.

Drumcar.

GEO. STUDDERT.

Romans vi. 2–5.—Being not altogether satisfied with any of the comments I have read or heard on this interesting passage, I would with all humility offer a few remarks upon it, in the hope that they may prove acceptable to the readers of THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR.

The Apostle is shewing in this chapter the inseparable connection between justification by faith and sanctification, and vindicating the former from the objection commonly brought against it, viz. that it is opposed to holiness.

The 2nd and 3rd verses may be paraphrased thus:—"God forbid. How shall we that are justified, or legally dead to sin, live any longer in the practice of it? Know ye not that so many of us as have been united to Christ by faith, through the baptism of the Holy Spirit, are in virtue of that spiritual union identified with Him in His death, and consequently entitled to all the blessings purchased by it?" In support of this interpretation, I would remark that the baptism here referred to is not "baptism in the name of Christ," which is water-baptism, but "baptism into (εἰς) Christ," which is the baptism of the Spirit, by which regeneration and union to Christ are effected, as the following passages clearly shew—"For by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body" (*i. e.* the mystical body of Christ. 1 Cor. xii. 13); "For as many of us as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ" (Gal. iii. 27). According to these texts, all who have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ, and are members of His mystical body,—a fact which cannot be predicated of all who have been baptized with water.

Verse 4th. "Therefore we are buried with Him (ὁὐα) through the baptism into His death," &c.—Therefore, having been baptized into His death, we are buried with Him. If the baptism be spiritual, which I think I have already proved, there is no foundation whatever for the opinion held by some, that in the word "buried" here there is a reference to immersion. This verse seems intended to convey the idea that, as a man's burial is a proof of the reality of his death, and of his continuance therein, so those who are united to Christ by faith are truly dead to sin, and shall ever continue so. The first clause is connected with the second by the conjunction ὅτι (that, in order that), to intimate that the de-

sign of God in justifying His people is that He may sanctify them. It deserves to be remarked, too, that the Apostle does not found the argument in support of his position on the mere analogy between the death and resurrection of Christ on the one hand, and the justification and sanctification of His people on the other, but on the spiritual union existing between Him and them—a union by which they are identified with Him in His death, burial, and resurrection; and, consequently, their sanctification, which corresponds to His resurrection, follows their justification, which corresponds to His death, as necessarily as His resurrection followed His death and burial.

Verse 5th contains a beautiful illustration of the same point, drawn from the vegetable world, in which it is a general law that the germinating process does not begin till the seed has been committed to the ground, and has died. In like manner it is a law in the kingdom of grace that a man must first become legally dead to sin before he can live to God, or bring forth the fruits of holiness.

R. JOHNSTON.

2 Corinthians iii. 7—18.—If the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses, for the glory of his countenance, which glory was to be done away, how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious? Seeing then that we have such hope, we use great plainness of speech: and not as Moses, which put a vail over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished: but their minds were blinded: which vail is done away in Christ, &c.

An interpretation of this passage, in connection with Exod. xxxiv. 29—35, has lately caught my attention, which, on account of the high authority of the writer, as well as for the error it contains, may deserve some notice.

It is said that Moses veiled himself, not to conceal the glory of his countenance, but to conceal its departure as it died away; and that this was to indicate, not the inability of the children of Israel to penetrate the mysteries of the glory of the Law, but their inability to understand that it should all fade away, and come to an end, when Christ came. To *τελος* is taken, not for the glorious consummation of the Law in the Gospel,—as when it is said, “Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness to every one that believeth,”—but for the mere close of the Mosaic dispensation.

Now what I have to observe is this: that such an idea is objectionable as entirely making void the main object of the Apostle's argument; this is, to magnify the glory of the Law, in order to magnify still more the glory of the Gospel in comparison with it. And one point in which the glory

of the Law is to be noted, is the inability of the Jews to see into its essential meaning (it being “a figure” for the time then present) with a steady eye: and this the vail indicated.

But what means that verse which says, “the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses,” significant of the Law, if the intensity of its glory were not the thing concealed and not the close?

And what also have we to contrast with the Apostle's “great plainness of speech” in the Gospel, if the vail does not refer to the darkness of the meaning of the Law, and not the close? A contrast is essential to his argument, but the close affords none.

The correct rendering of Exod. xxxiv. 29, &c., that Moses spoke to the people with open face, and did not put on the vail until he had done speaking, is assumed to favour this mode of interpretation. But it is evident that the people, though filled with fear at first, did afterwards look upon the glory of Moses' face ere he began to speak: and there is a manifest propriety in his continuing to be seen by them as invested with a divine glory while he delivered to them the words of God; and then, for all further common intercourse, putting on the vail, till he went in unto God again.

To read as follows seems to make all plain: it only puts out our italic “till,” in ver. 33, as ought to be done.

When Moses came down, with his face irradiated, all, beholding him, were afraid. He called Aaron however, and the rulers, to him; and afterwards all the congregation were encouraged, and looked upon him (ver. 32) while he gave them in commandment all that the Lord had spoken with him in Mount Sinai. And Moses came to an end of speaking with them, and (then) put a vail upon his face (ver. 33). And when Moses went in before the Lord to speak with Him, he took off the vail until his coming out: and he came out, and spake unto the children of Israel that which he was commanded; and the children of Israel saw the face of Moses (evidently all the while he was speaking), that the skin of Moses' face shone: and Moses replaced the vail upon his face (as soon as he had done speaking what was commanded), until he went in to speak unto the Lord again.

This is all.

Hence the people had transient views of the glory, as of God, but ordinarily and permanently understood it not.

Also the face of Moses always shone beneath the vail; but he was habitually veiled in his common intercourse with the people, still all about the Law.

P. G. D. B.

1 Timothy i. 1.—*της ελπίδος ἡμῶν*, “our hope,” i. e. the object of our hope, on whom our hope rests. Thus, St. Paul adopts toward Christ the

language of the Psalmist toward God (Psa. lxxi. 5); and thus he shows indirectly that Jesus Christ is God. (See Psa. xl. 4, "his trust," literally, his hope.) If Christ be not God, St. Paul (according to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Psalm) was turning himself to a lie when he hoped in Him!

Bexley.

T. H.

1 Timothy vi. 17-19.—Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not highminded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate; laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life.

This is a passage which I think difficult to explain consistently with such a statement as 1 Cor. iii. 11, and Rom. iii. 20. The following translation I think might bear criticism:—

The Greek word for "laying up in store (for—selves)," *αποθησαυριζοντας*, is, in a different case from that, used for "them that are rich," *τοις πλουσις*, and so does not mean the same as if the Greek were *αποθησαυριζουσι* (dative agreeing with *τοις πλουσις*).

Instead, therefore, of "laying up in store," &c., following (as it does in the English Version) the infinitive verbs "be not highminded," "trust in uncertain riches," &c., "do good," "be rich in good works," "ready to distribute," "willing to communicate," and meaning that by these various good deeds they should "lay up in store for—selves a good foundation," &c., "lay hold on eternal life," I think "laying up in store for—selves," &c. should precede and is the accusative before these infin. *ς* (*αυτους* sc. *πλουσις* being understood). It would run thus: "Charge them that are rich in this world that they lay up in store for selves (*i.e.* while doing so) a good foundation (even 1 Cor. iii. 11) against the time to come, that they may lay (*i.e.* in order that (thus*) they may lay hold, &c.) hold on eternal life; be not high-minded, nor trust in uncertain riches, &c. that they do good; be willing to communicate." Latter being the effect of former; latter being the practice built upon the "good foundation."

Dundalk.

J. G. R.

INSPIRATION.

There are certain statements made by the Apostle Paul, in the seventh chapter of 1 Corinthians, which have been held to imply that on some occasions he was conscious that he was not inspired. Of course, if this view be correct, the argument in favour of his inspiration in all passages in regard to which he does not absolutely

* "Thus" refers not to what follows, but what precedes.

exclude it becomes all the more powerful. But I am inclined to doubt the correctness of the common interpretation of these passages.

After speaking of occasional separation between husband and wife, he adds, "This I say, *κατα συγγνωμην ου κατ' επιταγην*." Is not the meaning, "This I say by way of advice, not by way of command," instead of as in the English translation, "by permission and not of commandment?" And if so, was not Paul's advice as much inspired as his commandment? A little further on, he says, "But to the married I command,—not I, but the Lord, let not the wife separate herself from her husband." What is this but saying that Christ himself had uttered this command when upon earth? He goes on, "But to the rest I say, not the Lord," that is, he adds certain injunctions bearing upon cases which had not occurred when Christ spoke and to which therefore he had not alluded; but are not these inspired injunctions, though not spoken by the Lord in person? Again, at verse 25, he says, "Respecting virgins I have no command of the Lord; but I give advice as one that hath received mercy from the Lord to be faithful." Surely this was inspired advice though not inspired command. Lastly, in verse 40, he says, "But she is happier if she so remain, according to my judgment, and I think that I have the Spirit of the Lord." Now the word "think" or "suppose" (*δοκω*) does not imply any uncertainty, but is rather a confident assertion that his judgment was an inspired judgment, though he was not instructed to promulgate an unvarying law or rule on the subject.

I conceive therefore that these passages do not warrant the belief that the Apostle ever wrote without inspiration.

On the same subject of inspiration I would remark further, that we should be careful not to strain the doctrine beyond what Scripture warrants. The inspiration for which we contend is the inspiration of Scripture, and not of all which is contained in Scripture. An inspired narrator gives us a true narrative; but it does not follow that all the sayings which he records are inspired sayings. The speech of Tertullus in the Book of Acts, for example, was not inspired.

Now, I observe that in Mr. Lowe's "Inspiration a Reality," he spends much time in reconciling an apparent contradiction in the speech of Stephen recorded in the Book of Acts. But the question here at issue is not the inspiration of Luke, but the totally different one of the inspiration of Stephen. I am by no means disposed to deny that the proto-martyr was inspired; but suppose that I were forced to admit this, it would not in the very least affect my belief in the inspiration of Scripture. There is obviously room for a distinction here which, in my opinion, ought to be always observed.

W. R. W.

The Replicant.

Genesis i. 2. Vol. III. 492.—I perceive that Mr. Buckton objects to the rendering which I have given of the first clause of this verse. I conclude he will object also to the rendering which I now propose: "Now the earth had become a wreck and a ruin;" more literally thus: "Now with respect to the earth, it had become a wreck and a ruin."

In order to obviate all objections, I will take the four Hebrew words in the order in which they occur:

והארץ "Now the earth," or, "Now with respect to the earth." We have here the nominative absolute, as is intimated by the disjunctive accent reviah. Lee's Hebrew Grammar, p. 383.

היתה "it had become," or "it was become." These two renderings are in effect both the same. They are both the pluperfect tense of the verb to become. Mr. Buckton thinks that this rendering would require a ל after היתה. But the passage which I have quoted from Isaiah proves that the ל is not necessary.

תהו ובהו "desolation and emptiness." My only reason for assigning "a wreck and a ruin" as the translation is, that the alliteration of the words "wreck" and "ruin" may imitate the rhyme of the original. It is as close an imitation as the English language will allow. Luther's "leer und wüste" gives the meaning.

For my opinion that the first verse is an argument or summary prefixed by Moses to his account of the six days' creation I have the best of all authorities, that of Moses himself. See Genesis ii. 4.

Torquay.

F. Fysh.

Exodus xii. 40. Vol. IV. 46.—Your Correspondent is no doubt correct in his supposition that the "430 years" are not by the text intended to fix the exact time of the residence of the children of Israel in Egypt, but may be extended to other places of their sojourn, for "the Hebrew word is not to be rendered 'which,' as relating to the time of their sojourning, but 'who,' as belonging to the persons sojourning, as our translation well renders it."

Now in Gen. xv. 13, and Acts vii. 6, the time of the affliction of Israel is mentioned as 400 years, while in Exod. xii. 40, the duration of the sojourning is 430 years; but mark, the latter passage does not allude to any affliction during the whole of that period, and possibly for this reason, that for the first short portion of 30 years of the 430 Abraham and Isaac lived in much honour and comfort, so that, if this suggestion be correct, after Isaac grew up the afflictions of the 400 years commenced, and continued till the

period of Exod. xii. 41. The exact number of years is said to be 405. It is generally conceded that the words "a land that is not theirs" are not necessarily confined to Egypt, as in Gen. xv. 14, but the preceding verse (13) may also include the land of Canaan, as is plainly put in Gen. xvii. 8. If it be disputed that Gen. xv. 14, must only refer to the bondage of Egypt, and therefore Canaan cannot be included, then the difficulty can be met by considering that, as Egypt was the principal seat of the servitude of Israel, and the instrument of their sorest bondage, so the minor afflictions of Canaan, through part of the 400 years, were lightly regarded in comparison with the afflictions of Egypt, and the period of 400 years, was therefore allotted as the time of their greatest trials, for the afflictions of Israel would necessarily for the first 215 years (taking the whole period as 430) be confined to what befel the small number of the 70 souls "who went down into Egypt;" the heaviest would therefore fall upon Israel when they had increased so rapidly in the land of Egypt.

E. RILEY.

Psalms xcix. 6. Vol. III. 326, 364, 398.—The similar question before put in THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR will be found with answers on Deut. xii. 13, 14; Vol. I. 270; Vol. II. 68, 155, 279, 307.

F. L. W.

Daniel vii. 11; Revelation xix. 20. Vol. IV. 13.—In reply to the question of Mr. ARTHUR HALL, whether I believe that the same person is spoken of in both those passages, and how I meet the seeming discrepancy (if I do so identify them), that the one beast is slain, and the other cast alive into the lake of fire, I must first state what I believe to be the meaning and reference of this part of the vision in Daniel.

The beasts in Daniel are four successive kingdoms; and thus, although the actings of any head of a kingdom may be regarded as the deeds of the kingdom itself, yet still it is easy to see how far they are not commensurate. The fourth beast in Daniel comprehends the Roman empire, from its rise up to its final divided condition when the Lord Jesus comes: and it is on the beast, as such, that the destruction falls. The saying that the beast is slain, no question necessarily comes before us of any person or persons: it shows us what Daniel saw in a symbolic vision; the fourth monarchy, utterly destroyed by an act of Divine justice, receiving such a doom as was aptly symbolised by the slaying of the beast, and the burning of his body.

Now I should say that the symbol of the last power of evil in the Roman earth (in Dan. vii.), is not the beast precisely, but that horn which speaks great words and blasphemies, and which

wears out the saints of the Most High. In the Revelation, on the contrary, the beast itself stands as the symbol of the final actor in evil: he bears the form of the fourth beast in Daniel vii., because he holds his power, and is in fact the one in whom it is finally concentrated. In the symbols there is this difference, that in Daniel our attention is especially directed to the last horn of the beast, while in the Revelation no such horn is even described; because in Daniel the Roman empire is regarded in its historical aspect, while in the Revelation it is the final condition and the final actings of him who wields the power that is simply contemplated. The fourth empire had arisen when John saw the Revelation; but even he does not rest on the internal changes: the coming of Christ as the hope of His Church was before his eyes, and God, instructing his servant as to this, taught him what would be the aspect and actings of Roman power towards God and Christ, and towards the saints of God, especially in connection with that hour when the Son of Man shall come forth.

Thus I think that there is no discrepancy between Daniel and the Revelation: the latter shows us the judgment which will fall upon an individual, the former treats of the doom of the last empire.

It is well for us humbly and prayerfully to contemplate all that the Scripture teaches us as to the Lord's coming, and the promises and warnings connected with that day. Believers are called to "patience of hope;" the knowledge of secured blessing in Christ may enable us calmly to look on; the perfect righteousness which He wrought out for us in His living obedience, and the efficacy of His blood as the propitiation of infinite preciousness, may indeed give us confidence and ground of rejoicing; and the Holy Ghost is given to us as the revealer of these blessings and as the earnest of the coming inheritance.

It is, I believe, deeply important that we should remember that the last scene in which the Church of God is found on earth, up to the coming of the Lord in manifested glory, is one of special persecution and trial. There is no resurrection of the saints (and therefore no rapture of any) until the beast wears out the people of Christ, for those whom he causes to suffer rise in the first resurrection; but "they overcame by the blood of the Lamb and the testimony that they held, and they loved not their lives even to the death." It is thus a special grace that the Church should end her course here in such testimony; and, if the Spirit of God has taught us this in the word, we may well seek to regard our hope as connected with this grace, seeing that it is when thus suffering that we shall be delivered by the coming of Him who is our life.

Those who know not truly the Gospel of Christ

may well shrink from the thought of such trial; but the knowledge of life in Christ as a present portion and of hope in resurrection hath been given us that we may endure and be moved by none of these things, seeing that we are appointed thereunto.

S. P. TREVELLIS.

Daniel ix. 27. Vol. IV. 13.—I believe that it is impossible legitimately to connect the death of the Messiah with the covenant confirmed with the mass, or many, for one week (*i. e.* 7 years) in this passage; and that for several reasons. First, the Messiah was already regarded as "cut off" at the close of a previous division of the weeks, *viz.* after the first $7 + 62 = 69$ weeks = 483 years. Secondly, the disastrous end of the city and the sanctuary is supposed to have come before the seventieth week begins. (Compare the conclusion of verse 26.) After the Messiah was cut off and before the last week, it will be noticed by the careful reader that there is an interval of indefinite length, filled up by the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, and a course of war and desolation which is not yet terminated. Thirdly, after all this, comes the last or seventieth week, which has to do with Antichrist as clearly as the first 69 weeks bring us down to Christ's death, the interruption of the chain being left room for, and supplied in the latter part of verse 26. Fourthly, it is clear that when the Messiah has been cut off, another personage is spoken of as "the prince that shall come," whom it is absurd to confound with the Messiah, because it is His people who ravage the Jewish city and sanctuary: that is, it is a Roman prince, and not the promised Head of Israel. Fifthly, as this future prince of the Romans is the last person spoken of, it is most natural, unless adequate reasons appear to the contrary, to consider that verse 27 refers to him, and not to the slain Messiah: "and he shall confirm covenant" (not "the" covenant, as the margin shows). Sixthly, this is remarkably strengthened by the time for which the covenant is made, namely, for seven years, which has, in my opinion, no sense if applied to anything founded on the Lord's death, but exactly coincides with the two periods of 1,260 days (Rev. xi.) and 42 months (Rev. xiii.), during which the Roman beast acts variously in the Apocalypse. Seventhly, it is yet more fortified by the additional fact that, when half the time of this covenant expires, "He shall cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease," just as might be gathered from Rev. xi. and other Scriptures.

WILLIAM KELLY.

Matthew xiii. Vol. IV. 14.—The connection between these several parables is asked. It will be observed that they are in all seven, the number of spiritual completeness in good or evil.

(See Leviticus and the Revelation *passim*.) Next, it is manifest that the first differs from the rest, inasmuch as it is not a likeness of the kingdom of heaven, which the following six are. Further, of these six, three were said (besides the "sower") to the multitude outside, as well as the disciples; the last three to the disciples alone within the house. All this bears upon the true interpretation, not as deciding, but as confirming it. For the first parable is evidently general, if it do not particularly refer to our Lord's personal ministry on earth, before the kingdom of heaven was introduced by His ascension. It is not here the heir sent to receive the fruit of the vineyard; Jesus is "a sower;" and his sowing is hindered and opposed by the world, the flesh, and the devil, as we find in the explanation (verses 19—22), though a portion of the seed takes root in good ground.

The three public comparisons of the kingdom of heaven follow—the wheat and tare field, the mustard seed, and the leaven. The sower here is still the Son of Man, but it is His work from heaven (just as in Mark xvi. 20; Ephes. ii. 17). It is the kingdom of Christ when rejected by the Jews—of Christ absent, not present in visible power and glory. It is the kingdom of heaven on earth, entrusted to servants who, alas! are soon asleep, and the devil sows his wicked children in the midst of the true children of the kingdom. The general teaching, then, is, that the new dispensation, as far as man's responsibility was concerned, would see ruin introduced by the enemy, which nothing could remedy but the judgment executed at the end of the age. But this is not all. Christendom would grow from a diminutive beginning into "a tree," emblematic of a towering earthly power, which would even shelter the instruments of Satan. (Compare verses 4 and 19 with 32.) Nor this only: for a system of doctrine, nominally at least Christian, should spread over a certain defined mass, till the whole was leavened. Whether this mixture, this worldly aggrandizement, this propagation of, not life or truth, but profession, such as it was, was of the Lord or His enemy, must be gathered not merely from hints here, but from Scripture generally.

Then, upon the dismissal of the multitude, the Lord explains the chief of the first three similitudes of the kingdom, and adds three more, which develop not its external appearances, but its internal aspects to the spiritual man. Treasure hid in the field, the pearl, and the drag-net comprehend their further instructions. Christ buys the field for the sake of the treasure, His own that He loved in the world. This, nevertheless, did not fully tell out either His love or their beauty in His eyes. Therefore, as it seems to me, the parable of the pearl follows—"one pearl

of great price," the unity and the peerless charms of the Church in the Lord's eyes, for which he gave up "all that He had," as Messiah here below—yea, life itself. The net evidently presents the closing circumstances of the kingdom, as to which I would briefly call attention to two facts often confounded, that the fishermen gather the good into vessels, casting the bad away, while the angels at the consummation sever the wicked from among the just. Our part is to take forth the precious from the vile; theirs to separate the vile from the precious.

Guernsey.

WILLIAM KELLY.

Matthew xxiv. 15. Vol. IV. 35.—Agreeing with Mr. WEEKES that "ver. 37—9 allow no place for the Millennium before Christ's return," I venture to demur to his statement that he "has shewn clearly that the Roman army was not the abomination of desolation," &c. for it has always appeared to me that the arguments are irresistible for so interpreting it. May I notice a few of them in reply to your Correspondent, who has so ably stated his side of the question? Before entering upon them I would remark there is scarcely a single passage in the Scriptures on which more union has been manifested by commentators than in referring this to the Roman desolation. Probably no harmony of the gospels that ever was drawn up has failed to make this correspond with St. Luke xxi. 20, which Mr. WEEKES admits was fulfilled by the Roman army. A distinguished writer of the present day, Mr. Birks, in his "Elements of Prophecy," justly observes,—

The prophecy in St. Luke xxi. compared with that in St. Mark and St. Matthew, has every token which can prove it to be the same. In each case, it follows the denunciation of woe against the Scribes and Pharisees, and closed the public ministry of our Lord. It follows in each evangelist the same commendation of the poor widow. It was delivered, as each evangelist tells us, soon after our Lord had departed from the temple for the last time. It arose in each instance from an exclamation of the disciples on the beauty of the sacred buildings. The question to which it is the immediate reply is given almost exactly in the same words by St. Mark and St. Luke. The whole structure of the prophecy also, in each account, is precisely the same. No marks of identity can be more strong and conclusive than those which the Spirit of God has here brought together. So plain is the truth, that no harmonist, amidst their numerous diversities in other parts, seems ever to have dreamt of separating those passages from each other (p. 197).

It seems to me that a conclusive argument for applying Matt. xxiv. 15 to the Roman army consists in this, that its fulfilment was to be a guide to the disciples "in Judea to flee into the mountains," a command exactly similar to that recorded by St. Luke, when armies surrounded

Jerusalem and the desolation thereof was nigh. Epiphanius (Adv. Hær. xxix. c. 7) and Eusebius (E. H. l. iii. c. 5) both affirm that the disciples acted upon their Lord's command, did flee to Pella a mountainous district, and thereby escaped the vengeance which overtook their brethren in the flesh who remained in Judea. Now if we apply Matt. xxiv. 15 to the future siege of Jerusalem, which, I conclude, Mr. WEEKES does, as it is described in Zechariah xiv., not only is there no intimation there given about the disciples fleeing from Judea, but there are the strongest grounds for believing that the disciples will have previously been removed to "meet their Lord in the air," and will accompany Him, when He comes attended by His Saints to fight against the Gentile nations, who have come up against Jerusalem, and in behalf of the afflicted House of Israel, who will then, according to the prophecy, "look upon Him whom they have pierced, and mourn for Him as one mourneth for his only Son."

Considering then that our Lord was speaking of the Temple and city which was then existing, and which was visible to the disciples around him, it seems contrary to all Scripture analogy to argue that our Lord was referring to a future Temple and to another city some 2,000 years after the desolation to which he was evidently alluding had commenced.

But it is argued that because our Lord spoke of "the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place" (St. Matthew), "where it ought not" (St. Mark) which Mr. WEEKES considers can refer to nothing else than "the Holy of Holies," and that as the Temple was destroyed before the Roman army penetrated so far, therefore it cannot yet be said to be fulfilled. In reply to this I would remark, 1st. That the absence of the definite article in the Greek (*ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ*) is sufficient to prove that our Lord was not referring to the Holy of Holies. 2nd. That as Jerusalem is called in Scripture (Matt. iv. 5) emphatically "the holy city," our Lord's declaration of "the abomination of desolation standing in a holy place or where it ought not, i. e. in the holy city of Jerusalem, was literally accomplished in a threefold way.

1st. When Cestius Gallus the Roman general penetrated, as Josephus tells us (J. B. l. ii. c. xix. §. 5, 6), into the city of Jerusalem with hostile intentions at the commencement of the war, and might then have extinguished the war at once, had he not, to the surprise of everybody, as suddenly retreated from the city. Upon which the Christians, in remembrance of their master's injunctions, took the opportunity to quit the doomed city for the mountains, or, as the historian expresses it, "Many of the most eminent of the Jews swam away from the city as from a ship when it was going to sink." (J. B. ii. xx. 1)

2nd. When Titus at the termination of the war captured Jerusalem, having previously compassed the city with his army, which was encamped "on Mount Olives," as Josephus notices, the very place where Christ delivered His warning, and was then saluted Emperor by his troops when "they brought their idolatrous ensigns (Tacitus calls the eagles and other ensigns 'deities peculiar to their legions,' Annal. l. 11; and Tertullian remarks that 'the entire religion of the Roman camp consisted in worshipping their ensigns,' Apol. xvi.) to the Temple, and set them over against its Eastern Gate." (J. B. vi. vi. 1.)

3rd. When the Emperor Hadrian, about 50 years after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, built a new city there called *Ælia Capitolina*, and on the site of the destroyed Temple erected another to Jupiter in place of one to the true God, and then completed the climax of desolation by sacrificing swine, the forbidden animal of the Jew, to his idol God.

If these things have not sufficiently fulfilled what our Lord said concerning the threatened desolation spoken of by Daniel, it would be difficult to say that any prophecy in Scripture has been accomplished. But Mr. WEEKES brings forward another argument. Applying our Lord's words to Dan. ix. 26, 27, he considers that the word "desolate," or "desolator" (marg.) refers personally to the leader of the Roman army, and that, as Titus did not receive any judgment at the hands of God, therefore it must refer to some future Roman leader, and some future abomination of desolation to be set up. If, however, we accept the authorised translation of the text, which I believe to be correct, there can be no doubt that a heavy judgment has fallen upon the "desolate" Jew; or, if any contend for the word "desolator," it is no less true that a marked judgment has fallen, not upon the personal leader, which sense the passage does not require, but upon the "desolating" Roman, if we consider what she was then, with (*ubi lapsa*) what she is now.

B. W. SAVILE.

Mark i. 24. Art thou come to destroy us?

Vol. IV. 14.

In answer to the query of your reverend Correspondent M. C. I., I would remark that the language in question is the language both of the "unclean spirit" and of the "man;" of the former as the agent that suggested or dictated it; of the latter, as the mere instrument that gave utterance to it, resembling in this respect the serpent, which was employed by Satan as his mouthpiece in the temptation of Eve.

That it is the language of the man is plain, from the fact that the participle *λεγων* (saying) in this verse agrees with *ανθρωπος* (man) in the verse preceding; and that it is the language also

of the unclean spirit appears from the fact that in verse 25th *auto* refers not to the man, but to the unclean spirit, which would have been more apparent in our English Version if the verse had been rendered thus:—"And Jesus rebuked it (*i. e.* the unclean spirit), saying, Hold thy peace and come out of him (*i. e.* the man)."

R. JOHNSTON.

The words are evidently those of the unclean spirit, one of the demons or devils of which Satan is the prince (Mark iii. 22): the man is possessed, and merely the instrument; this is quite clear, from the rebuke of Jesus. A voice exclaims, "Art thou come to destroy us?" The command of Jesus is, "Hold thy peace, and come out of him." The demon obeys the command and comes out "of the man." If it had been simply the voice of the man, there could be no meaning in saying, "Hold thy peace, and come out of him."

Bootle.

J. WORTHINGTON.

Luke vii. 28. Vol. III. 327, 383, 432, 493.—The same subject was treated of in Vol. I. pp. 37, 61, 100, 117, 132, 190.

F. L. W.

John viii. 51, 52, and xi. 26. Vol. IV. 46.—I think your Correspondent J. G. R., upon an examination of the following passages, will see, that *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, with a negative particle, is best rendered by "never."

Matt. iii. 29, "hath never forgiveness," *i. e.* "neither in this world, nor in the world to come," Matt. xii. 32.

John iv. 14, "shall never thirst," not at any time, for (as follows) "the water," &c.

John x. 28, "they shall never perish," neither now, nor in the other world.

John xiii. 8, "never wash." Certainly Peter meant not to say, "thou shalt not wash my feet eternally," but never at all; and therefore Jesus replies, "If I wash thee not, thou hast" (present tense) "no part with me."

1 Cor. viii. 13, "I will never eat flesh;" the Apostle intends a present and continuous abstinence.

These passages seem clearly to illustrate the force of *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, with a negative particle; and in this sense the phrase transfers great emphasis to any verb with which it is connected. For example: John viii. 35, "abides not in the house for ever," *i. e.* never abides in the family. The servant is in the house for a time, but is not one of the permanent, inseparable members of the family. Hence, in chap. xi. 26, "shall never die" is the right rendering, and the emphasis is thrown on the word "die." He may die in one sense, *i. e.* bodily; but in its worst sense, as the punishment of sin, he shall "not taste of death," he shall not die.

And just so the Jews understood our Lord's words, chap. viii. 51, "he shall never see death." For when they immediately objected, "Abraham is dead," &c., it is manifest that they took our Lord's meaning to be, not that whosoever kept his saying should not suffer eternal death, but should never die at all; otherwise there would have been no force in their objection—Abraham is already dead.

Bexley.

T. H.

John xx. 19, 26. Vol. III. 247.—F. L. W. asks, whether we should conclude that our Lord's appearance among his disciples on these two occasions was miraculous or not? Surely it was. On the first occasion, it is true, we are told the reason of the doors being shut, but on the second, though the fact is mentioned, no reason is assigned. The mentioning of the fact on each occasion would seem intended to call our attention to it as one of peculiar importance. "The evangelist," to quote Calvin, "does not say that he entered through the shut doors, but that he suddenly stood in the midst of the disciples, though the doors had been shut, and had not been opened to him by the hand of man. . . . Let us be satisfied with knowing, that Christ intended by a remarkable miracle to confirm his disciples in their belief of his resurrection."

C. E. STUART.

Romans v. 12—21. Vol. IV. 37, 44.—I am afraid that the renderings of *ἡμᾶρτον*, in ver. 12, given by Mr. KELLY and Mr. JOHNSTON, are hardly likely to conduce to a correct understanding of this passage, or to a due estimate of its difficulties. Mr. KELLY adopts the authorised translation, which renders the aorist as if it were a perfect; and proceeds to explain by saying, "Sin was theirs through one; besides all had sinned." I must confess I do not understand this, but he appears to merge into a pluperfect. Mr. JOHNSTON, on the other hand, would adhere strictly to the primary aoristic meaning, and would refer *ἡμᾶρτον*, with the other aorists in the verse, to a "single definite action, which took place at a certain time, and was then finished." Of the two renderings the latter is unquestionably the most grammatical, but I humbly think that in this case they are both equally incorrect. For this appears to be one of those by no means uncommon cases in which the aorist is used to express a future event which must certainly happen. (Jelf, Gr. Gr. 403, 2.) Fritzsche, in his commentary on Rom. viii. 30 (a passage which notably illustrates this usage), explains the usage in terms precisely suited to the present instance. "Ponitur aoristus de re, quæ, quamvis futura sit, tamen pro peractâ recte censeatur quum aliâ re jam factâ continetur."

With Adam ἡ ἀμαρτία, ad peccandum proclivitas, entered into the world, *i.e.* the human race. Cf. John i. 10; iii. 16, 17, &c. It is important to observe that, since κόσμος represents thus the human race in its entirety, and as a mass, the word εἰσῆλθεν, indicating entrance into that mass, implies the necessary infection of each and every individual composing it, and therefore implies that necessity to sin which is afterwards expressed in the words πάντες ἡμαρτον. Of this proclivity to evil Adam's transgression was the first actual development, and with that transgression death became immediately connected. Thus, then, in the person and act of Adam, death became inseparably connected with the proclivitas ad peccandum; and so (καὶ οὕτως) death became universal, *i.e.* pervaded the whole mass of mankind, because (ἐφ' ᾧ, which, with a past tense, is equivalent to διότι) all sinned, *i.e.* because ἡ ἀμαρτία having entered into and so pervaded the mass of mankind, sin became an universal necessity and certainty; so necessary and so certain, that it is spoken of as a past act, πάντες ἡμαρτον. "For," the Apostle proceeds to explain, "sin was in the world" no less before than after the law, that is, as in the former verse, sin as a propensity, an infection of nature. (To express this, ἀμαρτία ought properly to have here, as before, the article, and, in fact, Origen, with Theophylact, and one or two cursive MSS., do read ἡ ἀμαρτία. But I do not think that there can be a doubt about the word having here the same meaning as in ver. 12.) "But," the Apostle proceeds, "sin is not reckoned where there is no law," *i.e.* sin, as an actual development of the proclivitas ad peccandum is not put to the account of the individual. Nevertheless, death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those who had not committed a direct transgression in the face of a definite command; that is, these persons sharing, through birth, with Adam, a sinful nature, shared death, which, in his person and act, had first become connected with sin; but this death was the immediate consequence and punishment, not of their acts of sin, but of that of Adam, both his and theirs being equally the developments of the proclivitas ad peccandum. And so the Apostle goes on to say, in ver. 15, if by the sinful act of the one man the many died (not "have died," as Mr. KELLY translates), much more, &c. And, in ver. 16, "the sentence was out of one (παράπτωμα, sinful act) (as the immediate occasion or cause thereof) unto (general) condemnation." The sentence was, that, having disobeyed, Adam should die. The effect of that sentence was felt by all who, through birth, shared the nature which sinned, although they did not actually sin after the similitude of Adam's transgression.

But Adam was τυπὸς τοῦ μέλλοντος. Let us then trace the parallel between the type and the

antitype. With Christ a propensity to righteousness first entered into the man of the new creation, *i.e.* those who should be regenerate and united to Him and His nature through faith. Of this propensity Christ's obedience was the first development, and with that obedience eternal life became immediately connected. So that in the person and obedience of Christ life eternal became inseparably connected with the propensity to righteousness which belongs to a vital union with Him by faith. But the actual developments of this propensity are not put by God to the account of the individual; and life eternal is the immediate consequence and reward, not of the acts of the believer, but of the obedience of Christ.

And here it is important to notice one point of apparent discrepancy between type and antitype—a single disobedient act is sufficient to condemn—a life of obedience is necessary to justify. In the one case then we have an act tending to universal condemnation; in the other, the righteousness of a lifelong obedience tending to universal justification.

Thus, then, "as through the disobedience of the one man the many were constituted ἀμαρτωλοὶ," *i.e.* sinners in act in the developed disobedience of Adam, "so through the obedience of the one man the many shall be constituted δίκαιοι," *i.e.* righteous in act in the developed obedience of Christ.

HENRY T. J. BAGGE.

Rom. v. 18, 19. Vol. IV. 37.—Therefore, as by the offence of one judgment came upon (εἰς) all men to condemnation: even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon (εἰς) all men unto justification of life.

The attempt to reduce the force of the preposition "upon," εἰς, to a tendency only, as contrasted with an actual effect in the last clause of the 18th verse, involves the necessity of rendering the same preposition in the same way in the first clause of that verse, and is thus shown to be contrary to the mind of the apostle. He has spoken clearly enough in the 12th, 14th, and 15th verses (at least)—of the one offence, as bringing in, no mere tendency, but an actual and awful effect. The word "therefore," at the beginning of verse 18, prepares us for a conclusion upon those statements; but a conclusion that the one offence has brought in a "tendency" towards condemnation only, would be in effect an abandonment of the previous statements of "death coming in," "death reigning by one," "many being dead," as too strong or too definite. The attempt to diminish the force of the preposition here must be regarded therefore as a failure, while it is the only way in which the term "all men" can be made to bear a universal sense: for if Paul is speaking of actual effects, then the "all men" here must be the "all" that are in Christ, who are justified.

So also, when Mr. KELLY speaks of the 18th and 19th verses as setting forth, the first a tendency, the second, in contrast, an actual effect, it should be noted that the word "for," which connects the 18th and 19th verses, is not a word which suggests the idea of contrast at all.

JOHN M. TAYLOR.

Romans ix. 27—29. Vol. IV. 15.—St. Paul's quotation is no accommodation. Having in the previous part of this epistle shown the helpless guilt of man under law, and again how he may obtain justification under the covenant of grace, namely, freely for the sake of Christ through faith; lastly, having stated the duties, conflicts, and comforts of the believer; now, at length, he comes in chap. ix.—xi. to the case of the Jewish nation. How great was his grief to see so great a wreck go down in such a flood of ungodliness! How great had been their privileges, especially that they had the oracles of God! Had, then, the Word of God been given them in vain? By no means: some had been saved. The nation would be rejected, but this very result had been in the Word of God itself, both foreshadowed in types, and foretold by the prophets—in the types of Ishmael and Isaac, of Esau and Jacob. Ishmael and Esau were types of the visible Church of the Jews under the law (Rom. iv.; Gal. iv.), Isaac and Jacob of the true believers under grace. He then meets the objection, as if God must needs be merciful to them, though on the Gentiles he might execute judgment. Exactly the reverse; He must be just, whoever is the culprit. Shall not the judge of all the earth do right? But we have his own testimony concerning his own ways, that he will shew mercy to whom he please. The mention of the Gentiles at the close of the paragraph (ver. 24) only shews the extent of God's mercy; but ver. 25 begins a new paragraph, which transfers his argument on the case of the Jews from the proof by types to another by prophecies.

The prophets foretold of judgment and mercy on the Jews with the same results. Hosea (i. 11) foretold that a time would come when it should be said of both the Houses of Israel, that they were not God's people, though it is true that afterwards it should be again said to them, Thou art my people. Isaiah (i. 10) had foretold that only a remnant should be saved, and the rest cut off. He had even foretold (viii. 33) both the cause of their ruin, and their only remedy, namely, that the Rock of Ages, which should have been to them an altar and a sanctuary, would become to them, through their unbelief, a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence. (Compare Luke ii. 34; Matt. xxi. 42—44.)

H. GIEDLESTONE.

Ephesians iv. 19.—Who being past feeling.

Vol. IV. 29.

Does not *πωρωσις*, translated "blindness," marg. ref. "hardness," clear up the meaning of this expression? *Πωρωσις* is properly a callousness, derived from *πωρος*, tophus, tuff-stone; hence *πωρωω*, to turn into stone, make callous. Here, then, the Apostle speaks of hearts of stone, a callousness of heart, which is hardened and obdurate, and proof against the influence of any inward monitor. *Ἀπαλγηκοτες* seems correctly translated, "past feeling," the very opposite of *αλγειω*, to feel; as *απαλειφω*, to wipe out, is the contrary of *αλειφω*, to anoint. How deplorable is the state of those who, by inuring themselves to every vicious habit, and acting in diametrical opposition to the voice of conscience and the preaching of God's Word and ministers, pursue such a reckless course that their hearts are rendered perfectly callous, and they work all uncleanness with greediness!

AXMINSTER.

Z. J. EDWARDS.

Whilst it is quite clear that the moral condition of those spoken of in this verse must have been "death in trespass and sins," that is not the point which the Spirit by the apostle wished to urge.

If the entire chapter is looked at, it is evident that the practical walk of the Ephesians is the leading subject, "That ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called," &c.; and that, after giving reasons for this admonition, and having directed their minds to the "Head," from whom all effectual working power must come, the apostle enters his solemn warning and protest (*τοῦτο οὖν λεγὼ καὶ μαρτυροῦμαι ἐν Κυρίῳ*), against the walk of the rest of the Gentiles (*τα λοιπα εθνη*), lest the Ephesians should follow in their ways. The Apostle then draws the fearful picture described by the words quoted by your Correspondents, and those in immediate connection with them. That, being past feeling, their understanding being darkened, and their hearts hardened (*πωρωσις*), they had given themselves over unto lasciviousness, to work all uncleanness with greediness.

The teaching of this passage, as far as the Gentiles are concerned, is very similar to that of Rom. i. 19—31.

I do not think that judicial hardening is implied in the passage in Ephesians. The Gentiles are described as walking and acting in accordance with the suggestions of their unregenerate hearts, and the moral issues of that course are stated.

In the passage in the Romans above alluded to, there is judicial acting towards the Gentiles, on the part of God, who, it is stated, because of

their apostacy, which resulted from the non-recognition of him as revealed in creation, "gave them over to uncleanness;" "gave them up to vile affections;" and "gave them over to a reprobate mind."
J. E. WAKEFIELD.

Colossians i. 13. Vol. IV. 29.—Surely this blessed change was true of those addressed the moment they believed in the Lord Jesus Christ. He then became their life. God, in His wondrous grace, regarded them as He regards His Son "As He is, so are we in this world" (1 John iv. 17), for they were "accepted in the Beloved" (Ephes. i. 6). Christians are not left here to acquire a meetness for heaven, as some ignorantly think, but to reflect the glory of Him who hath saved them, and to be servants of others for His sake. As another has well said, "You cannot have repentance towards God without having faith in the Lord Jesus Christ they are things inseparable in fact, though you may of course distinguish them in thought and expression;" and therefore, "in recording cases of conversion, Scripture speaks in some only of repentance, and in others only of faith." Surely the latter is nothing less than "taking God at His word;" the intellectual assent to certain facts merely, which I suppose the Querist means by "intellectual faith," never yet saved any man. Multitudes admit the facts of Christianity whose hearts are strangers to the solemn and blessed truths connected with those facts; while faith sees in them a precious revelation of God, as manifested in Christ, which must lead to trust or confidence in Him. The simple, unquestioning, child-like reception of God's testimony to His Son must give peace, and that at once, without any reflection of the soul about its own acts. Faith is not an "act," it is crediting a testimony (1 John v. 9). The language of the New Testament is, "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God;" and I see neither warrant nor example there for the "syllogistic process of reasoning" of which the Querist speaks; nor can I think it a thing at all to be commended, for the person thus occupied would be drawn away from the great object of faith, by dependence upon whom alone he can become "spiritually healthful and vigorous." The gaoler believed and rejoiced, so did the eunuch; and those who "gladly received the word" in Acts ii. are all blessed instances of "peace in believing;" and surely that peace was to be maintained and established in the same way in which it was at first received, "looking unto Jesus;" "holding the beginning of their confidence firm unto the end." ВЪН.

P.S. I do not of course for a moment deny that for the detection and conviction of mere nominal profession there are effects and characteristics of true faith given in the Word of God

(1 John; James, &c.); but peace is there connected with believing.

Temple of Janus. Vol. III. 423, 452; IV. 12, 31.—If Mr. SAVILE will consult pp. 224—6 of Jarvis's Chronological History of the Church (London, Cleaver, 1844), he will find it proved that the Temple of Janus was opened, after the third time of its being closed by Augustus, in the year u.c. 757—58, in 4718 of the Julian period, and in the consulship of M. Remilius Lepidus and L. Arruntius.
JOHN FINLAYSON.

Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin.

On the Lord's Supper. Vol. IV. p. 15.—The answer to this question may be obtained by considering the simple words "Do this in remembrance of me." I am sure there is many a soul who "does not know his acceptance in the Beloved," who yet does wish to "remember" that Beloved One, and who does know that he loves that Beloved One. Why should want of knowledge of acceptance prevent him obeying the command to do this in remembrance of Him, when the constant desire of his heart is to remember Him? It has been well remarked by some one that there is a communion of the body and blood of Christ at all times when faith is exercised in the atoning sacrifice, as well as at the time when bread and wine are partaken of in obedience to Christ's command. Is the want of knowledge of acceptance to be a reason for a man carefully to exclude himself from every other opportunity of exercising faith in the atoning sacrifice, as well as from the partaking of the bread and wine? Surely not. It cannot be too much borne in mind, that partaking of bread and wine is utterly useless unless done in faith.

F. L. W.

The Antichrist. Vol. III. 486.—I had, of course, only reason to expect that Mr. ECHLIN, and your Futurist Correspondents, would refuse their acquiescence to my paper on this subject; though I confess I cannot but feel much surprise that enlightened Protestant divines, acquainted with the foul and hideous history of Romanism, and with its many centuries of internecine warfare waged against Christ's Church and cause, should think "the Antichrist," "the Man of Sin," to be too strong epithets to brand it with. For my part, I cannot stretch my conceptions of wickedness beyond the doings of the papacy. It appears to me implicitly, though not avowedly, to deny both the Father and the Son, exalting Mary and the saints into the room of the Almighty, and the one Mediator at His right hand. There, doubtless, are and ever have been many antichrists and many men of sin; but I must claim the definite article for popery, "by merit raised to this bad eminence."

It is the popes who, with an individualism of character perfectly amazing, have exalted themselves above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, have sat as God in a temple dedicated to His worship, and have filled the world with lying wonders, which men, under a strong delusion, have greedily embraced.

Woodrising Rectory. ARTHUR ROBERTS.

The Literal Interpretation of Prophecy. Vol. IV. 15.—In answering F. P.'s queries on Romans ix. 27, 28, 29, and Galatians iv. 27, we must bear in mind that St. Paul has ultimately in his view the one true Church, which is composed both of Jews and Gentiles, and of each an elect remnant. Phraseology originally applied to the Jews only becomes the best and most appropriate for the elect among the Gentiles who have succeeded to their spiritual privileges, yea, and to far more at the present time. But they are our elder brethren, and shall one day be restored to more than their ancient glories, with privileges as a nation peculiarly their own. We need not wonder then that doctrines relating to the whole Church of Jew and Gentile united in Christ (see Eph. ii. 11 to 22), are expressed in language borrowed from the elder dispensation, which in all things typified the new covenant. The 24th verse of Romans ix. seems to prove that it is this union of Jew and Gentile in the elect Church, who are the chosen vessels of mercy, that St. Paul is speaking of. The whole subject of the chapter is God's electing love, displayed among Jews and Gentiles. Therefore the quotation from Hosea is doubtless an illustrative adaptation, in proof of the doctrine of election, and that, as it was an elect remnant even among the Jews, that chosen people, so the Lord has shewn his free and sovereign grace now unto the Gentiles, revealing unto them the righteousness which is of Jesus Christ by faith (see ch. x. 4). The 27th, 28th, and 29th verses refer to the then impending judgments on the Jewish nation; and we know their numbers were never greater than when their crimes were ripe for vengeance. Those Jews who at that time received the Gospel were indeed a remnant, of whom Paul and his fellow apostles, and the first-fruits of the Pentecostal preaching, were a portion. In the 25th of Galatians iv. there is also an allusion to the state of Jerusalem at that time—truly in bondage with her children—in bondage to the Romans, who were soon about to lay very heavily the yoke, and carry them away captive and destroy their city—and in bondage to their blind perverse zeal for the Law, after the "grace and truth" of Jesus Christ had appeared among them.

The passage in Galatians iv. is not on the same subject, though in another point they coincide; namely, that the true children of God are the

children of promise, believers, receiving his promises by faith in Christ Jesus, and not by the Sinai covenant. The subject of this latter part of Galatians iv. is a comparison of the two covenants, of works, and of grace, under the allegory of Hagar and Sarah, and their respective children; shewing the far greater excellence of the covenant of grace, and that by it should many more children be brought to God than by the covenant at Sinai. It does not appear that the quotation from Isaiah liv. 1, is an adaptation merely; on the contrary, bearing in mind all the previous train of argument of this epistle (especially ch. iii.), we learn that the Jews themselves cannot enter into all that was promised them in Abraham, until they become believers in Jesus Christ, partakers of the covenant of grace; children of Abraham by faith as well as by natural descent; children of the heavenly Jerusalem and not of the earthly only. St. Paul's ultimate view is the glory of the whole Church in the latter times, when Jew and Gentile, united in spiritual things in Christ Jesus (see ch. iii. 28), and alike partakers of the covenant of grace, there shall be a more abundant increase of children unto her than this earth has yet witnessed. The Jerusalem which is above, which is free, and the mother of us all, Jew and Gentile united in one mystical body, shall in the latter days no more remember the reproach of her widowhood, nor her desolation, nor her childless state, so abundant shall be an accession to her from the North, the South, the East, the West. And this would seem to be the meaning of the prophecy in Isaiah liv. which St. Paul quotes from, especially as he introduces the quotation in reference to the words, "Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all; for it is written, Rejoice," &c.: and on turning to Isaiah liv., the prophecy is couched in such glowing and exalted terms, that they can only be compared to the heavenly Jerusalem in the Apocalypse, the Church mystical. It would seem too contracted a sense to apply it to the Jews only, on their restoration and conversion, or the Gentile Churches only; but if we consider it to mean the glory and happiness of the mystical spouse of Christ in the latter days, all becomes plain. And these will be the triumphs of the covenant of grace! so humbling to the pride of the natural heart! so annihilating to self-righteousness! This view will be confirmed by observing that the covenant with Noah is referred to, of which the rainbow is the well-known sign; which would seem to embrace a larger span of love in God's redeeming mercy than the national part of the Abrahamic covenant. Truly, in Abraham's promised seed all the families of the earth shall be blessed, and in him only can we receive new covenant mercies. But Noah is the ancestor of the whole human race,

and thus both Jew and Gentile believers are comprehended in that blessed sign of the rainbow. Observe also the important promise at ver. 13, "and all thy children shall be taught of the Lord," quoted by our Lord in John vi. 45. Which teaching, ever leading unto Christ, is the distinguishing mark of the new covenant, and the proof of having become "children of grace," "born after the Spirit." E. T.

The Querist.

Isaiah i. 13.—The new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with.

Will some one inform me how the phrase, "to away with," comes to mean "to endure" (as it is generally explained); and also what other instances of a similar use of the words occur in old English writings?

Brenchley. GEORGE MACKNESS, B.A. OXON.

2 Peter i. 1.—The Socinians have lately asserted, in a very clever and plausible tract, that St. Peter does not in either of his Epistles speak of Christ as God. An examination of the two Epistles in the English version will make this statement appear to be perfectly consistent with truth, but on turning to the original the reader will remark, that the words in 2 Peter i. 1, are as follows: "..... ἐν δικαιοσυνῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ." Now it may be asked by what authority have our translators changed the position of the conjunction? Why did they translate it before instead of after ἡμῶν. For by so doing they present a contrast or distinction which does not seem to have been intended by the Apostle, for he never taught that it was one kind of righteousness which emanated from the Father, and another from the Son. Nor have we any reason to suppose that the righteousness ordained for us by the Father, and wrought out for us by the Son, is capable of any distinction or difference of degree when emanating from those two persons of the blessed Trinity. It may be well to bring forward the view of this passage which both Bishop Hall and Dr. Hammond has supported, as it may serve to render the position far less tenable, that St. Peter was in doctrine a Unitarian.

J. I. DUNCAN.

Theile and Stier's Polyglot Bible.—Will any competent person give me the character, and particularly the typographical accuracy, of the Polyglot Bible, by Drs. Theile and Stier?

G. C. W.

The Righteousness of Christ. Vol. III. 376.—I have deeply thought with Hooker, that on an expression in this verse "I must take heed what I say." Does "the righteousness of God" mean a

righteousness provided and procured by God, or a righteousness similar to that of God? Is God's righteousness more than a perfect righteousness? And are we not to be "perfect in Christ Jesus;" may, are we not complete (πληρωμένοι) in Him? The apposition between the latter and former parts of this verse appears to favour the latter of the two interpretations. G. C. W.

Syriac Grammar.—I should be obliged for information as to where a Syriac grammar can be obtained that would be suitable for self-instruction.

Wavertree.

JOSEPH HILES.

Hymnology.—Can any of your Correspondents kindly tell me the author of the following hymns, beginning—

Hark! a glad voice the sinner cheers.

Far from our thoughts vain world begone.

O thou who in the form of God.

My God, the steps of pious men.

O King of Kings! thy blessing shed.

Thou Lord our guard, our light, our way.

Sons of men behold from far.

Go worship at Immanuel's feet.

Lord may the inward grace abound.

O for a martyr's glowing zeal!

All those who in the Lord confide.

B.

Esau.—What is the derivation of this word? Does it come, as Gesenius says, from עָשָׂה, an unused root, meaning, "to be covered with hairs?" Or does it come from עָשָׂה, "to make, to effect," as Cartwright says, "Rabbi Salomon ait eum sic appellatum quod esset perfectus et completus, ac si multorum fuisset annorum עָשָׂה quasi עָשָׂה, i.e. factus, perfectus." Some think that the word Esau means a firebrand.

Have we any reason to believe that when the prophets speak of the destruction of Edom they are predicting the destruction of Rome? Is Rome intended under the name of Edom? Compare Isaiah lxiii. 1-6, with Revelation xiv. 18-20, and xix. 15.

If any of the readers of THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR take any interest in the curious opinions of the Jewish rabbins respecting Edom and Rome, they may find them briefly stated in Winning's "Manual of Comparative Philology," pp. 195-198.

Manchester.

WILLIAM CAINE.

Visit of the Magi.—How old was our Saviour when the Magi came to Bethlehem and worshipped him? And what was His age when He went down into Egypt? How are we to explain Luke ii. 39, "when they had performed all things according to the law of the Lord, they returned

into Galilee to their own city Nazareth?" Compare Matthew ii. 12, 13, 23, with Luke ii. 22, 39.

Manchester.

W. CAINE.

Notices to Correspondents.

The weak state of health of the Editor still disables him from giving his attention to **THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR**. He returns his best thanks to the various friends whose contributions have enriched the pages of the present Volume, which he trusts will grow in interest and importance month by month. He particularly regrets his inability to answer many Correspondents with whom he is most desirous to communicate, and also the necessary suspension of "The Critic." Books for review have accumulated greatly, but this department of his labour he cannot delegate to another pen. In the good providence of God, he believes that he is recovering, and that he may shortly be enabled to resume the active duties of life.

All Correspondents writing for the "ANNOTATOR" or "REPLICANT" must send us their real names; not necessarily for publication, but for our own information and safeguard. *Papers not thus authenticated will be invariably laid aside.* We allow more latitude in the "QUERIST" department.

Every paper should commence with the text or subject commented upon, written distinctly at the head of the article. Reference should then be made to the page or pages where the subject has been before noticed, and to which the reply, if it be one, is sent. Queries should have the text prefixed from the Authorised Version, or else should have such a heading as the Replicants can with ease refer to.

Every separate article should be written on a separate piece of paper, to allow of our arranging them in Scripture sequence.

We cannot return manuscripts sent to us for publication.

No. 96 will be published (D.V.) on Saturday the 28th of March.

Just Published, Vol. III. well bound in cloth. Price 9s.

Vols. I., II., and III. Price 26s. 6d.

Quarterly Part, No. 12, in a neat wrapper. Price 2s.

All Communications to be addressed to The Editor of **THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR**, care of Messrs. NISBET and Co. 21, Berners Street, Oxford Street.

All communications respecting the supply of the **ANNOTATOR**, as well as all Post-office Orders, or enclosures of Stamps, to be addressed to the publishers, Messrs. NISBET and Co. 21, Berners Street, Oxford Street.

Now ready, Eighth Thousand, small crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. cloth.

MEMORIALS OF CAPTAIN HEDLEY VICARS, 97th Regiment. By the Author of "The Victory Won." London: JAMES NISBET & Co. 21, Berners Street.

This day, Eighth Edition, 12mo. 6s. 6d. cloth, **BASKETS OF FRAGMENTS**; or, Notes from Sermons preached by the Rev. Thomas Jones, of Creaton. By Miss PLUMPTRE. London: JAMES NISBET & Co. 21, Berners Street.

Recently published, Third Edition, crown 8vo. 6s. cloth,

INCIDENTS in the LIFE of our SAVIOUR: Illustrative of His Divine Character and Mission. By the Rev. A. L. R. FOOTE, Brechin. London: JAMES NISBET & Co. 21, Berners Street.

This day is published, Third Edition, crown 8vo. 6s. cloth,

THE FOOTSTEPS of ST. PAUL: being a Life of the Apostle, designed for Youth. By the Author of "The Faithful Promiser," &c. With many Illustrations. London: JAMES NISBET & Co. 21, Berners Street.

Second Edition, 18mo. 1s. cloth, **LITTLE CHILD'S BOOK of DIVINITY**: or, Grandmamma's Stories about Bible Doctrines. By the Author of "The Faithful Promiser." London: JAMES NISBET & Co. 21, Berners Street.

Nearly ready, Third Edition, crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

A MEMOIR of the Rev. J. J. WEITBRECHT, late Missionary of the Church Missionary Society in Bengal. Compiled by His Widow, from his Journals and Letters. With a Preface, by the Rev. H. VENN, M.A. London: JAMES NISBET & Co. 21, Berners Street.

Twenty-second Edition, fscap. 5s. cloth, **THE RETROSPECT**; or, a Review of Providential Mercies. With Anecdotes of Various Characters, and an Address to Naval Officers. By the Rev. RICHARD MARKS. London: JAMES NISBET & Co. 21, Berners Street.

This day is published, price 6d. **A CONSPECTUS of the VARIOUS EVIDENCE CONFIRMING the DIVINE AUTHORITY of the GOSPEL**: with an Attempt to Assign the True Place to the Inquirer and the Inquiry. By D. WALTHER. London: JAMES NISBET & Co. 21, Berners Street.

This day is published, price 8d. **THE APPLE of DISCORD** is the Christian Sabbath an Ecclesiastical or Divine Record? Being the Arguments (put against) of the most celebrated Controversialists on the subject. Condensed by an M.A. of Cambridge. London: JAMES NISBET & Co. 21, Berners Street.

This day is published, price 1s. 6d. a cheap Edition of

MEMORIALS OF CAPTAIN HEDLEY VICARS, of the 97th Regiment. London: JAMES NISBET & Co. and all Booksellers.

This day is published, crown 8vo. 5s. cloth,

A MEMOIR of the late CAPTAIN ALLEN GARDINER, R.N. By the Rev. J. W. MARSH, Vicar of Bleasby, Notts. London: JAMES NISBET & Co. 21, Berners Street.

Just published, **THE LIFE of DAVID**, in Two Parts, a Class Book for Schools.

FROM THE SHEEP-FOLD TO THE THRONE. Price Sixpence.

FROM THE THRONE TO THE GRAVE. Price One Shilling. Stamford: LANGLEY, High Street, London. HAMILTON, ADAMS, and Co. 33, Paternoster Row; J. HATCHARD and Son, 187, Piccadilly.

Just Published, demy 8vo. in a neat cover, Price 3s.

SKETCH of a COPTIC GRAMMAR, adapted for Self-Tuition. By W. B. MACDONALD, of Rammerscales. Edinburgh: W. H. LIZANS. London: GEORGE PHILIP & SON, 32, Fleet Street: and all Booksellers.

THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR; OR, NOTES AND QUERIES ON SCRIPTURAL SUBJECTS.

[PUBLISHED ON ALTERNATE SATURDAYS.]

VOL. IV.—No. 96.

MARCH 28, 1857.

[Price Threepence.
Stamped Edition, 4d.]

THE ANNOTATOR:—

Gen. iv. 7—1 Sam. x. 5—Psalm cxvii. 1, 2—Isa. i. 6 —lxiv. 4, by the Rev. Wm. Reid	81—84
Matt. xvi. 18, by R. Johnston—Rom. ix. 6 (Israel the Nation and Israel the Church)—1 Cor. xv. 51, by the Rev. A. Roberts—Gal. iii. 17, by the Rev. F. Fysh—Col. ii. 12	85, 86
Heb. iii. (The Heavenly Calling), by W. Kelly—Rev. xxii. 3, by J. Dawson	87, 88

THE REPLICANT:—

Gen. i. 2—xii. 10, by the Rev. Thos. Myers—Deut. xxviii. 68, by the Rev. W. Caine—Dan. ix. 27, 28,

by C. E. Stuart—Prov. xiv. 24, by the Rev. W. Caine	88, 89
Matt. xi. 13—xi. 28, by the Rev. Z. J. Edwards—xii. 40, by the Rev. F. Fysh—xiii. 24, by the Rev. E. Ryley and R. M. Norman—Rom. v. 15-17—vi. 3, 4, by the Rev. John Harrison	90—92
1 Cor. xv. 1-9—2 Cor. v. 21—Philipp. iii. 13	93, 94

THE QUERIST:—

Gen. xv. 2, by the Rev. W. Caine—1 Sam. vi. 19— Jer. xlix. 23—Psalm xiv. 3—Gal. vi. 16, by J. Worthington—Rev. xx. 9	95
NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS	96

The Annotator.

Genesis iv. 7.—The sense of this passage in the Authorised Version is not clear. The Hebrew, when rightly understood, is full of instruction. The following remarks are far from being altogether new, though some points may perhaps be put in a light which will be new to many. May God the Holy Ghost bless them if correct, make them to be forgotten if not! I divide the verse into three distinct parts, for the sake of greater clearness:—

A. "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted?"

B. "And if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door."

C. "And unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him."

A. "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted?"

הָלוֹא אֲסִיּוּב שָׂאָה

Here it is only the word שָׂאָה concerning which there can be any difficulty. It is rendered in the Authorised Version "rising" (seven times), "excellency" (twice), "dignity" (twice), "raiseth up self" (once), "highness" (once), and here "be accepted!" (once).

No. 96.

Gen. xlix. 3, gives an insight into the meaning: "Reuben, thou art my first-born, my might, and the beginning of my strength, the excellency of dignity, and the excellency of power."

יָחֵד שְׂאָה וְיָחֵד עֹז

Reuben was the first-born; Cain was the first-born. The first-born had a certain pre-eminence before the law: for before the law, as well as under it, if the elder brother died childless, the younger was to take the widow, and raise up seed to the brother, to be reckoned as that of the first-born (Gen. xxxviii).

Abel the younger, who by faith "offered of the firstlings of his flock, and of the fat thereof," offered them beyond a doubt as sin-offerings to the Lord. He was unquestionably persuaded, more or less distinctly, that the wages of sin is death, and shed the blood of his offerings in token that his own deserved to be shed, and with a view, more or less clear, to Him that was to come—the promised seed of the woman. And it pleased God to prefer him, and to give him the excellency and the dignity, rather than to Cain, the first-born.

Hence the significance of the Lord's gracious, condescending, and patient remonstrance with Cain, "If thou doest well (shalt thou) not (have) the pre-eminence?" As much as to say, "Why

F

should I take it from you, the first-born, if you do what is acceptable in my sight? It should still be yours."

B. "And if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door."

וְאִם לֹא תִיטֵב לִפְתָּח הַמָּאָה רָגַץ

1. Here the first word that needs examination is **רָגַץ**. It is rendered in the Authorised Version "sin" (one hundred and sixty-two times), "sin-offering" (one hundred and fifteen times), "purification of sin" (twice), "punishment" (twice), "purifying" (once), "punishment of sin" (once), "sinner" (once).

The context must determine in which of these, especially in which of the two first, it must be taken in each passage. This point seems to be determined by the word—

2. **רָגַץ**. The verb occurs thirty times in the Scriptures, and the cognate substantive, **רִגְצָן**, four times. As few have a Concordance at hand, it will be worth while to cite the English textually, but briefly. This is the readiest way to carry conviction. The primary sense is evidently "to couch, or lie down," in Kal; in Hiphil, "to make to lie down."

i. It is thus used of animals (or men spoken of under the image of such, as sheep for instance) twenty-three times out of the twenty-nine which occur, exclusive of Gen. iv. 7. Thus:—

Gen. xxix. 2: Flocks of sheep lying. Gen. xlix. 9: He couched as a lion. Gen. xlix. 14: Issachar is a strong ass couching down. Exod. xxxiii. 5: The ass lying under his burden. Numb. xxii. 27: The ass fell down under, &c. (= lay down). Deut. xxii. 6: The dam sitting upon the young. Ps. xxiii. 2: He maketh me to lie down in green pastures. Ps. civ. 22: Lay them down in their dens. Cant. i. 7: Thou makest thy flock to rest. Isa. xi. 6: The leopard shall lie down. Isa. xi. 7: Their young shall lie down. Isa. xiii. 20: Neither shall the shepherds make their fold. Isa. xiii. 21: Wild beasts shall lie there. Isa. xvii. 2: Flocks shall lie down. Isa. xxvii. 10: There shall he (the calf) lie down. Jer. xxxiii. 12: Causing their flocks to lie down. Ezek. xix. 2: She lay down among lions. Ezek. xxix. 3: The great dragon that lieth. Ezek. xxxiv. 14: They shall lie in a good fold. Ezek. xxxiv. 15: I will cause them to lie down. Zeph. ii. 14: Flocks shall lie down. Zeph. ii. 7: The sea-coast shall be dwellings and cottages for shepherds and folds for flocks, and the coast shall be for the remnant of the house of Judah; they shall feed thereupon they shall lie down in the evening. Zeph. iii. 14: They shall feed and lie down.

ii. It is used in the same sense, "to lie down," of man, when not directly spoken of under the image of some animal, twice:—

Job xi. 19: Thou shalt lie down. Isa. xiv. 30: The needy shall lie down.

iii. It is translated "to lie," "to couch," in two

passages where it is applied to the sea, and where the beauty and force of the expression are lost unless the primary sense be borne in mind, and the great sea lying down at rest on the coast of the inheritance of Joseph be seen in this truly poetical image:—

Gen. xlix. 25: The deep that lieth under. Deut. xxxiii. 13: The deep that coucheth beneath.

iv. There remain but two other passages, exclusive of Gen. iv. 7. In these the primary sense does not appear to be so clearly kept in view.

Deut. xxix. 20: The curses shall lie upon him. Isa. liv. 11: I will lay thy stones with fair colours.

v. The cognate substantive **רִגְצָן** occurs four times; in three of them with the primitive sense, and applied to animals, or men spoken of under the image of such; as—

Isa. xxxv. 7: Habitation of dragons where each lay. Isa. lxxv. 10: For herds to lie down in. Jer. i. 6: My people hath been lost sheep . . . They have forgotten their resting-place.

In the remaining passage the primary sense is not so clearly kept in view.

Prov. xxiv. 15: Lay not wait against the dwelling of the righteous; spoil not his resting-place.

Thus the primitive and almost constant sense of **רָגַץ** being that of an animal couching or lying down, it seems most proper to take it in this sense here, if the context allows it, which it does, since **רָגַץ** may mean either "sin-offering" or "sin."

The sense will then be, "If thou doest well, shalt thou not have the pre-eminence? and if thou doest not well, there is a sin-offering lying down at the door:" as much as to say, "Close to you, at the very door of the tent where you are assembled, among the firstlings of your brother's herds and flocks, which he has brought, and which are lying down all around you, you may find a sin-offering. Draw near to me with such, and as your brother has done, and I am still ready to accept you."

C. "And unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him." The very same words in Hebrew and English, except the change of pronouns, as those spoken to Eve, with reference to her husband Adam.

Gen. iii. 16: Thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.

And now the sense of the whole may be summed up somewhat in this manner: "I have had respect to thy brother, and not to thee; to him the younger, and not to thee the elder. Hadst* thou done well, not only shouldst thou also be accepted, but the pre-eminence and dignity, as first-born, should still be thine. And though* thou doest not well, I am even yet

* The future in Hebrew being often employed as the *modus conditionalis*. See Gesen. Heb. Gr.

ready to have respect to thee, if thou wilt take of the firstlings of his flocks, which he has brought, and which are lying close around thee, and draw near to me, as he has done, with a sin-offering in thine hand. Nay more, I am not only ready to have respect to thee, and to receive thee, but even to restore thee to thy forfeited pre-eminence and dignity as the first-born."

Should an objection be raised against sin-offerings before the law, the same would lie against burnt-offerings. But these last we know were offered by Noah, Abraham, Job, &c. Moreover, the very object of this first record after the Fall is to show that without shedding of blood there is no remission or acceptance. It is the special lesson of the whole passage, not to speak of the intimation in Gen. iii. 21, that such sacrifices were instituted by God Himself.

Once more, I cannot myself see the sequence of clause C, "And unto thee shall be his desire, and he shall rule over thee;" or clauses B and A, if clause B be rendered, "sin lieth at the door," not "a sin-offering lieth at the door;" whereas all is easy and natural with the latter rendering: not to say that the expression "sin lieth at the door" is not of that simple kind which, with reverence be it said, we might expect would be used in the primitive condition of the human family.

A few words, in conclusion, on the important lessons taught by the passage when rendered as here proposed. While all Scripture, rightly understood, plainly sets forth that all who are saved are saved by sovereign grace, and that all who perish, perish through their own fault, what a striking comment at the same time is the gentle and long-suffering remonstrance of God with Cain on the words of the Holy Ghost by an apostle and by a prophet: "God is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." "Why will ye die, O house of Israel? I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord God: wherefore turn and live."

And oh! the riches of the goodness of God and of His mercy in the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world! Here is God condescending to reason with proud and rebellious man; mercy offered even to a Cain; and not only pardon and acceptance for the sinner, who will take the vicarious sin-offering so graciously pointed out to him by his offended Maker, but an entire restoration to all that he has forfeited, and to all from which he has fallen, through sin. While, on the other hand, the fearful hardening of the heart which ensues where God's gracious offers are held up plainly before the sinner's heart, but perversely refused and rejected, is most fearfully and fatally exemplified.

Nice.

β. β.

1 Samuel x. 5.—It is a good remark of Bertheau, a Neologian commentator on the Books of Samuel, who often unsettles rather than helps the reader's thoughts, that here גִּלְיָד should be understood as meaning "pillars." There is no doubt it means "pillar" in Genesis xix. 26, "גִּלְיָד מְלָח" pillar of salt. Possibly it was a trophy erected by the Philistines when they took possession of this part of the land—nay more, probably the trophy raised by them in the form of monumental pillars when they gained the battle of Aphek or Ebenezer, in which they took the ark. It seems impossible to suppose that the school of the prophets would meet regularly and have their residence in a place where "a garrison of the Philistines" held the town.

If a pillar be not meant, and if we are to retain the *garrison* sense of גִּלְיָד, then we must at any rate understand "where the Philistines once had a military station." φιλος.

Psalm cxvii. 1, 2.—The heathen world is called upon to praise God for "mercy and truth" manifested toward the Jews,—*"us."* What, then, do such calls imply, but the three principles, which St. Paul so strikingly urges in his Epistle to the Romans, viz.—

1. That the "mercy and truth" to Israel may be shared also by the heathen (chap. xv. 8—11), why else should they be mocked by being exhorted to praise God for a blessing they can never attain to? (See also chap. x. 13—15).

2. That "mercy and truth," signally manifested by God toward Israel, will re-act in winning the heathen also unto God (chap. xi. 12—15); for the exhortation to praise implies that the heathen shall praise God.

3. That the praising of God by the heathen for "mercy and truth" enjoyed by them will re-act again on the Jews, to quicken, by a kind of "jealousy," their faith in God and thanksgiving to Him (chap. xi. 11—14). When the Psalmist goes forth to the heathen to summon them to praise God for "mercy and truth toward" Israel, it is a tacit rebuke to those of Israel who praised not,—a hint, that the mercy offered (if despised) might be taken away and given to others, and a provocation administered to Israel not to forfeit their blessing by neglect and unthankfulness.

All these three principles had already been embodied in that original call of Moses, "Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with his people" (Deut. xxxii. 43).

Bexley.

T. H.

Isaiah i. 6.—Wounds, bruises, and putrifying sores: they have not been closed, neither bound up, neither mollified with ointment.

It appears to be not without profit to distin-

guish between these different hurts, and to apply to each respectively the mode of cure mentioned here. Thus, "wounds" result from the attacks of an enemy; the agent here is the devil, the healer is Christ: they are "closed up" by Him (Ezek. xlvii. 12; Rev. xxii. 2). "Bruises" come from falls; the agent here is the world, which causes the child of God many a sore fall; they must be "bound up," and the healer here also is Christ, as the above-cited passage will shew. "Putrifying sores;" this is an ulcerating gangrene when the blood coming from the very fount of life carries poison with it; the agent here is the flesh. These sores must be "mollified with ointment;" the healer is the Holy Spirit, who is ever in Scripture compared to ointment, and whose office it is to sanctify the flesh. E. and C.

Isaiah lxiv. 4 (Heb.).—In those is continuance, and we shall be saved.

This clause is wholly inexplicable. No meaning suited to the context can be evolved from it as it stands in our English Bibles. The Bible "with nearly twenty thousand emendations" does not at all mend the matter by rendering it "in thy ways we shall be saved, for they are everlasting." The true key to the sense is to be found in the marginal reading in the Hebrew Bible. Instead of the verb *שָׁלַח*, "to set free," employ the verb *שָׁחָה*, "to fall away, transgress," and the meaning is obvious, while the consecution of the confession is preserved.

The prophet is deeply moved for the condition of his nation; and he betakes himself to the throne of grace, and pours out his contrite confession before the Lord, deprecates His wrath, and implores His commiseration and merciful interference on their behalf.

In chap. lxiii. at verse 15, he begins his prayer by saying, "Look down from heaven, and behold from the habitation of thy holiness and of thy glory," &c. and his prayer increases in intensity of earnestness as he advances; and at chap. lxiv. 1, he says, "O that thou wouldest rend the heavens, that thou wouldest come down, that the mountains might flow down at thy presence." In verse 2 he would have God to make known His name to his adversaries, that the nations might tremble at His presence. He would have God's manifested presence among them, as in the former days. To these manifestations he refers in the third verse,—*"thou camest down,"* "thy presence." He is in next verse acknowledged as the only God who was ever known to interpose in behalf of "him who waited for him." And in verse 5 (I quote now according to the versing of the English Bible) he is acknowledged as a God,

whose character led him to be ever ready to come to the assistance of the man whose constant aim it was to render a cheerful obedience to his commandments, and have an observant eye directed towards his providential dealings.

But here the prophet appears to realise the nation's guilt, and he exclaims, "Behold thou art wroth," and he acknowledges that there is just cause, "for we have sinned." We cannot come before thee with the plea of obedience to thy commandments. Thou hast said, "I am with you while ye be with me;" but seeing that "thy holy cities are a wilderness," &c. we have many tokens of thy displeasure, many signs of thy wrath, many indications that thou art wroth and hast forsaken us, and there is abundant cause for thy wrath, for we have sinned in breaking thy commandments, and it is not by a transient act or two, but we have "continued to persevere in our transgression." And the consequence is, we, having continued to violate the precepts of the national covenant as well as thy other commandments, have put ourselves into the unclean nation's place (ver. 6), and are now no better than the heathen. And, being out of covenant and out of communion with the Father and God of our nation, our performance of all the religious duties incumbent upon us is as filthy rags—unsightly to look upon and defiling to the wearer. And the performance of a round of religious duties out of communion with God, and while we are not standing right with him, gives no spiritual strength, but, on the contrary, God being absent, "we all do fade as a leaf," and being in this fading condition we are ever ready to be hurried away into open sin, as well as liable to be overcome by our enemies (ver. 6). And, these things being so, earnest prayer is restrained, for although "they come before thee daily," and profess to pray, the spiritual vitality of the people is gone—they may continue the outward forms, but "there is none that stirreth up himself to take hold of thee, for thou hast hid thy face from us, and hast consumed us, because of our iniquities" (ver. 7).

They had thus got into the most helpless, hopeless, and miserable condition, for their only hope was in God; and they had sinned away "the Spirit of Grace and of supplications," and he had hid his face from them, and allowed them to be consumed "by the hand" of their iniquities! Where could they now turn? How were they to act? They had no "works of righteousness, done with a joyful spirit," to plead; on the contrary, they had by continued transgression of their sovereign's laws raised up a mountain-barrier between them and their God. The prophet feels, however, that he may still fall back on God's character, and found his plea for mercy on it, although he has nothing to hope from his own, or from the character of his people.

He betakes himself, therefore, to his paternity—"but now, O Lord, thou art our Father." He had said that his name was "the Everlasting Father," and he had said, "I have nourished and brought up children," "I am a Father to Israel," and he will regard Him still as their "Everlasting Father," whose compassions fail not. This is still the refuge of the helpless and hopeless—"God is a Father."

He also has respect to His sovereignty: "We are the clay, and thou our potter." They had nothing to expect from justice, but in sovereignty he might cause "Mercy to rejoice against judgment," and yet spare and save them.

He also mentions His "purpose and grace:" "We all are the work of thy hand," "This people have I formed for myself, they shall shew forth my praise." And, taking all these things into account, he says, "Be not wroth—very sore, O Lord, neither remember iniquity for ever; behold! see, we beseech thee, we are all thy people;" and he terminates his prayer by a most touching description of their desolated condition; and, having spread the whole matter before the Lord, and taken refuge in his paternal love and sovereign mercy, he cries, "Wilt thou refrain thyself for these things, O Lord? Wilt thou hold thy peace, and afflict us very sore?"

I hope I have succeeded in making my meaning plain, although it is not easy to do so in so small compass. I have given what appears to be the primary signification of the passage; it would be well could all the Lord's prophets enter into the deep spiritual meaning of this pathetic prayer, and utter it before the Lord at the present time. I fear there is one thing we too much neglect in our writing here, and that is to "exhort one another." A line or two would suffice. Are we, then, laying to heart the spiritual desolations of our land, and stirring up ourselves to take hold of God, that he may not utterly forsake our nation, but return and pour us out His Holy Spirit? Let our earnestness at the throne of grace be like the prophet's, and God will "cause his face to shine, and we shall be saved."

Stirling.

WILLIAM REID.

Matthew xvi. 18. And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church.
Vol. IV. 29.

May I be permitted, in answer to the query of R. BETA BETA, to give the following extract from an article of my own on this text, which was published in a respectable periodical some time ago.

The Greek words on which the argument turns are, when written in corresponding English characters, "Petros" and "petra," the one being translated "Peter,"

and the other "rock." Papists maintain that Peter is the rock on which Christ builds His Church; but this is tantamount to confounding things that differ, for "petros" is not synonymous with "petra," as the following passages in Homer plainly show.—*Iliad*, vii. 320; xvi. 494, 500, and 892. See also Xenophon's *Anabasis*, iv. c. ii. 17, and vii. c. vii. 54. Examples might be quoted from other classic authors to prove that "petros" means "a stone," "a large stone," and "petra," an "immovable rock;" but these are sufficient for our purpose. I come now to Scripture itself for proof of the same thing. "Petra" occurs very frequently in the Septuagint, and is uniformly employed in the sense of an "immovable rock." Moreover, it has the very same meaning in all the passages in which it occurs in the New Testament. Christ compares Himself to a rock in Matthew vii. 24, where He says, "Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, is like unto a wise man who built his house on a rock (petra);" but in the two following passages He is expressly called a "rock." "And that rock (petra) was Christ" (1 Cor. x. 4). "Behold, I lay in Zion a stumbling-stone, and rock (petra) of offence, and whosoever believeth in Him shall not be ashamed" (Rom. ix. 33). "Petros" is never used in the New Testament except as the name of Peter; but, if both the Septuagint and the inspired penmen of the New Testament uniformly employ "petra," like Homer and other classic authors, in the sense of an "immovable rock," may we not infer that they attached the same meaning to "petros" as these did? I am aware that it has been said by some that the language employed by Matthew in this passage is a translation of our Saviour's words, who spoke in the corrupt Hebrew of that time, and that it is probable that He used the same word in both clauses, viz. **פֶּטְרוֹס** or **פֶּטְרָא**; but this is nothing more than mere conjecture. Where do we ever find, if it be not in this passage, Peter called the foundation of the Church? The Apostle Paul does no doubt say in Eph. ii. 20, "And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets," &c.; but he most certainly does not mean to convey the idea that the apostles and prophets were themselves the foundation, but only that the great subject of their preaching and predictions was Christ as the true and only foundation; for he says in 1 Cor. iii. 11, "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." In the last-cited passage the Church is represented under the metaphor of a building, and Peter, taking up the same figure (1 Peter ii. 5), speaks of believers as "living stones built up a spiritual house," having Christ of course for its foundation; but Peter himself was a living stone, a part of this spiritual house, therefore he must have been built upon the foundation, and consequently could not be the foundation. I would paraphrase the passage thus:—"And I say also unto thee, that thou art a great stone in the building of mercy, for upon thee will I confer the distinguished honour of being the first to proclaim the everlasting Gospel both to Jews and Gentiles, and of being instrumental in adding many living stones to the Church, which I will build upon this rock (pointing to himself), upon my own person as God-man, the Christ, the Son of the living God, whom through His grace thou hast confessed me to be."

R. JOHNSTON.

ISRAEL THE NATION AND ISRAEL THE CHURCH.

Romans ix. 6.—They are not all Israel which are of Israel.

The first "Israel" in this verse is "Israel the Church," the second is "Israel the nation." "They are not all members of Israel the Church who are citizens of Israel the nation." It may be added, And many who never belonged to Israel the nation have belonged to Israel the Church. Let us not confuse the two in our thoughts, the nation and the Church, the heirs of Abraham's body and the heirs of his faith, for they are distinct in fact. By Israel the nation understand all the posterity of Jacob, but by Israel the Church understand all true believers of all ages, of whom some are Jews and many Gentiles.

Of "Israel the nation" the destiny is clearly announced in the Word of God. God shall collect together the scattered bones of the "whole house of Israel." God shall restore them to their own land. God shall convert them there, and bless them there.

But more glorious is the future of Israel the Church. Partakers of the First Resurrection, or glorified without tasting of death, they shall inhabit the New Jerusalem, the heavenly city, whose builder and maker is God. Yet, between the Church and the nation (this last supreme amid the other earthly nations), between the new heavens and the new earth, what blissful intercourse shall be maintained, the antitype of the olden converse between men and angels, the renewal of the days of Eden, when Adam heard the voice of the Lord God "walking in the garden in the cool of the day!" Is it said, How incongruous this intercourse between the immortal and the mortal, between Israel the glorified Church and Israel the nation, and other nations still in sinful though sanctified flesh? But incongruous with what? With the teaching of scripture concerning the future? Let it then so be proved, and, *cadit questio*, controversy ends. Assuredly not incongruous with the history of the past. For "The Lord appeared unto him," unto Abraham, in the flesh, "in the plains of Mamre." "And there came two angels to Sodom at even, and Lot sat in the gate of Sodom." "Behold there stood over against Joshua, the captain of the Host of the Lord." And our risen and immortal Lord! He is visible to His mortal servants. He talks with them, permits them to inspect and to handle His body, yea partakes with them "the broiled fish and the honeycomb."

M—Manse.

M. S. J.

1 Corinthians xv. 51.—We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed.

Here the statement of the Apostle is actually

reversed by the Vulgate, which renders it, "Omnes quidem resurgemus, sed non omnes immutabimur." This is followed, as usual, by the Rhemish translators: "We shall all indeed rise again, but we shall not all be changed." Calvin mentions also another Latin translation varying from the Greek. These variations he considers to have proceeded from an idea that this statement of St. Paul's was at variance with his words in Heb. ix.: "It is appointed unto men once to die." This notion, as he thinks, led some daring pen to make the change. An awful thing thus to tamper with God's word!

Woodrising.

ARTHUR ROBERTS.

Galatians iii. 17.—And this I say, that the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect.

It is commonly assumed that the Exodus occurred four hundred and thirty years after the Call. But this is not the case. It occurred four hundred and thirty years after the Covenant. By accurate investigation I have discovered that an interval of two years intervened between the call of Abram and the covenant. This discovery is most important. It fills up the gap which exists in Old Testament history. The Exodus occurred four hundred and thirty-two years after the Call, four hundred and thirty years after the Covenant, and four hundred years after the mocking of Isaac by Ishmael. The true date of the Exodus is B. C. 1620, A. M. 2516; and from this date the other dates can be easily computed. I only add, that the Pharaoh who perished in the Red Sea was THOTHMES IV.

Torquay.

F. FISH.

Colossians ii. 12.—This and the parallel passage of Rom. vi. 4, are, I believe, generally supposed to refer to immersion. It appears to me that they do not. To take Colossians. If the being buried in baptism has any reference to mode, analogy requires that the resurrection likewise should refer to mode. Then if mode be the reference in the use of the expression of resurrection, any one that is baptised by immersion, if he comes up from under the water, is a partaker of this resurrection, which, in this view, refers to his mode, viz., his rising up from under the water. This resurrection would then be partaken of by any one who was thus baptised. His fitness for baptism would evidently not enter into it, since an unprepared candidate could just as well rise from under the water as the one who was prepared. But our passage is against this. This resurrection is not partaken of by all irrespective of their fitness. It is "risen with Him (Christ)

through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised Him from the dead." This resurrection is then to be enjoyed by faith only. It does wholly refer to the moral fitness of the candidate, and cannot consequently refer to mode, which could have no reference to the moral fitness. If it then is a resurrection by faith, it is a moral resurrection—a rising to a new life, a death unto sin, and a new life unto righteousness. This resurrection being, after baptism, an obligation upon us; seeing that the intention of baptism is to make us members of Christ's body, who has died to sin. And if the body is risen to righteousness so ought the members. Since then this is a moral resurrection, the burial must be wholly a moral burial, viz., a total renunciation of sin; and the reference to mode in baptism must be a misapprehension. G. C. W.

THE HEAVENLY CALLING.—Hebrews iii.

It is of no small moment to bear in mind that, while the "heavenly calling," as a developed system, depends on the ascension of the Lord Jesus Christ into heaven, the faith of Old Testament believers was far in advance of their calling and circumstances. Thus, the Lord called Abram from his country and kindred and father's house to a land that He would shew him; and it was certainly by faith that he obeyed and went out, not knowing whither he went. But Heb. xi. 9, shows us the further action of faith; for when he got to the land he sojourned in it as in a strange country, because a ray of the distant heavenly glory had dawned on his soul. "He looked for a city which hath foundations," &c. Thus he and the other patriarchs died, as they lived, in faith, not in actual possession. Nevertheless, such strangership as this neither amounts to nor implies the "heavenly calling." Doubtless, the "heavenly calling" now produces and enjoins strangership also; but this in no way proves that itself was published and enjoyed of old.

For the "heavenly calling," brought before us in Hebrews, grew out of the position of the Lord as having appeared, and when He had by himself purged our sins, as having sat down on the right-hand of the Majesty on high. Hence the earthly tabernacle and the rest in the land, and the Levitical priesthood and sacrifices entirely disappear, for the partakers of the heavenly calling who are addressed in the epistle. This state of things was not true either of the fathers or the children of Israel. Their hope was intimately bound up with the land (no doubt, under the Messiah and a glorified condition, but still their land and people as the medium of blessing for all others); but the "heavenly calling" was not revealed, nor could be till He came whose rejection led to it and whose redemption and consequent

glorification in heaven became its basis. Hence Abram had his earthly altar. Hence he sacrificed, as did his descendants, in due season, of the flock, or the herd, or the appointed clean birds. Then comes the worldly sanctuary and its most instructive furniture and rites, that spoke of better things looming in the future. Nobody that I know disputes that individual saints saw beyond these shadows, dimly perhaps but really, to a coming Saviour and a heavenly country. Still the land to which the patriarchs were called was an earthly land, and the entire polity of Israel was that of a nation governed under the eye of a God who displayed himself on earth in their midst—in contrast with "the heavenly calling," of which not the less it furnished striking types, *mutatis mutandis*. Accordingly, in Heb. xi., after having traced the precious individual traits of the Spirit in the Old Testament saints, not only from Abraham but from Abel downwards, we are guarded against the error that would merge all in one lump, by the incidental statement of the last verse (See also ch. xii. 23). The elders have not received the promise; they are waiting till the resurrection for that. Meanwhile God has provided unforeseen some better thing for us. He has given us not promise only but accomplishment in Christ. He has made us worshippers once purged, having no more conscience of sins. He calls us boldly to enter into the holiest by a new and living way consecrated for us. None of these things could be so predicated of them, and yet these things are but a part of the heavenly calling. Truly, then, has God provided some better thing for us, even if we only look at what is now made known through the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven. It is also true that they without us shall not be made perfect. They and we shall enter on our respective portion in resurrection glory at the coming of Christ. Meanwhile we have no earthly calling, nothing but an heavenly one.

So far is it from being true that the early ecclesiastical writers erred by distinguishing too sharply between the dispensations, that their main characteristic is Judaising the Church by denying the real differences. Jerome did this no less than others, even to the confounding of Christ's ministry with Jewish priesthood.

WILLIAM KELLY.

Revelation xxii. 3.—His servants shall serve him.

What are the occupations of the saints in glory?

1. Praise to God and Christ. We learn this from Rev. vii. 9—12: "I beheld and, lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb,

clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands; and cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb. And all the angels stood round about the throne, and about the elders, and the four beasts, and fell before the throne on their faces, and worshipped God, saying, Amen: Blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, and honour, and power, and might, be unto our God for ever and ever. Amen." We have an account of a similar scene in chapter v. verses 8-14.

2. They shall be judges. Daniel affirms that judgment "shall be given to the saints of the most High." St. Paul reproves the Corinthians for going to law with one another before heathen magistrates, and exhorts them to settle their disputes amongst themselves, for, says he, "Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? And if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matter? Know ye not that we shall judge angels?" (1 Cor. vi. 2, 3).

3. They shall be rulers. From the seventh chapter of Daniel, the eighteenth verse, we learn that "the saints of the most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever." The same fact is asserted by the Spirit in His message to the Churches. "And he that overcometh, and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations; and he shall rule them with a rod of iron" (Rev. ii. 26, 27). "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne" (Rev. iii. 21). How pregnant with solemn instruction are these considerations! In heaven we shall have to uplift our voice in highest strains of praise; as life is but a preparation for eternity, how diligently should we strive to attune our hearts to these celestial melodies. We shall have to judge and rule—how earnestly should we prepare for this exalted station! And how shall we make this preparation? By diligence and self-denial, and above all by constant prayer for the aid of that good Spirit who aids our infirmities and enlightens our darkness, and who gives us wisdom and strength sufficient for every emergency.

Ewell.

JOHN DAWSON.

The Replicant.

Genesis i. 2. Vol. IV. 70.—Will your Correspondent, Mr. Fysh, allow me to say that I think he has sacrificed sense to sound in translating the two Hebrew words (Gen. i. 2) by "wreck" and "ruin," merely for the sake of imitating the paronomasia in the original. A

work in the "process of creation" cannot well be either of these, which in common language is applicable only to what has been "already completed," such as a "ship" or a "tower."

The words in question, תהו ובהו, have an indefinitude of meaning which makes it extremely difficult to translate them exactly. Gesenius translates "Et erat terra vastum et vacuum," desolation and emptiness. The same paronomasia is found in Jer. iv. 23-25, which we might almost imagine a description of our globe at the dawn of creation. "I beheld the earth, and lo! it was (תהו ובהו) without form and void; and the heavens, and they had no light. I beheld the mountains, and lo! they trembled, and all the hills moved lightly. I beheld, and lo! there was no man, and all the birds of the heaven were fled." Under a veiled prophecy of God's judgments upon Jerusalem, the earth is represented as brought back to its primæval state of chaos and confusion.

I may conclude by remarking that the LXX translate the words by ἀορτος καὶ ἀκατασκευαστος, invisible and incomplete or rough. The first expression appears strange, but may it not be connected with the next verse, "Darkness was upon the face of the deep?"

Cheltenham.

H. P.

Genesis xii. 10. Vol. IV. 21-50.—I concur with Mr. SAVILE (Vol. IV. 58) in asking my friend Mr. Fysh to give us his authorities for concluding that he knows the name of "Pharaoh's daughter," and also the correct date for the foundation of the Egyptian monarchy. He adopts the supposition that Menes was a person, and thus far agrees with Bunsen; but Bunsen, Lepsius, and those Egyptologists who follow their lead in taking Manetho literally, run the dynasties back to a period reaching nearly to the date B.C. 4000, usually assigned to the creation of the world. These writers either disbelieve in Noah's deluge entirely, or confine it within very narrow limits; for during its existence they assert that kings were reigning and cities flourishing in Egypt. The fundamental hypothesis has never been proved, that Menes was a person. His name is said to be found on the Turin papyrus, and on the palace assigned to Ramesses—Sesostris of the nineteenth dynasty: for there is a list of kings beginning with an escutcheon, read as MENA. But, granting the correctness of the reading, it is merely evidence for the antiquity of the tradition: some cannot forget the *Ménu* of the Hindoos, the *Minos* and *Minyas* of the Greeks, the *Minerva* of the Etruscans, and the *Mannus* of the Germans.

Mr. SAVILE too, in quoting, from the "Ancient Fragments" the assertion that the Pharaoh of the

Exode was one of the kings of the eighteenth dynasty, tacitly assumes the historic value of the Manetho lists. If they are to be received as truly and actually historical, what becomes of the chronology of the Pentateuch? The Germans tell us plainly the conclusion to which they have come. See for instance the preface by Mr. Heywood, M.P. to Von Bohlen's Genesis, translated, p. xxx. London. 1855. In 1845 August Böckh published at Berlin a treatise, "Manetho and the Annus Canicularis, a Contribution to the History of the Pharaohs." He shows satisfactorily that Manetho's chronology is a mixture of the historical and the astronomical.

Lepsius again is a great authority with the Egyptologists who ignore the Mosaic chronology. In his supposed decyphermets of names within the great pyramid, he has determined so many noble families, with their offices and titles, that he can now draw up a court calendar for king Cheops, and inform us who formed the chief officers of his court nearly 5000 years ago.

Mr. Osborn too gives too much countenance to this unsatisfactory system of conjectural names of persons. His "Monumental History of Egypt" is not based upon any firm foundation of correct induction. It is a mass of private judgments, which are as likely to be false as true.

I fear that the answer which Mr. FISH will give to Mr. SAVILE's last question, at the bottom of page 58, will be equally conjectural. At least, I should ask him not only for his opinion, but for the grounds of it. Let us be on our guard against giving our sanction to any system which seems positively at variance with the Word of God, and which is constructed by fallible, unspiritual men upon a very sandy foundation.

Having paid some attention to Egyptology, as it illustrates the Pentateuch, I should like to know the opinion of your readers on Mr. Forster's method of reading these monuments. He applies the old Arabic (successfully I think) to the euchorial character, verifying Dr. Young's singularly happy discovery; but he differs from Champollion in his plan of reading the hieratic character, and I think his method will ultimately turn out to be the correct one. It may be put to the test by any one wishing to follow it out, with comparative ease, and it seems to me remarkably illustrative of the Word of God. Mr. GOSSE, who adopts Sir Gardiner Wilkinson's lengths of Egyptian reigns, places Abram's visit to Egypt under Amum-m-ha II. B.C. 1290, but says of the chronology, "it will be easy to adapt it to that of Dr. Hales, or any other that may be preferred" (Ancient Egypt, p. 95). This is exactly what I complain of. The want of fixity, in which all the Egyptologists of this school delight to luxuriate. This king is of the sixteenth dynasty. Must we then of necessity have kings

and dynasties before the era of the Flood? And had they been reigning for centuries in Egypt before Noah's ark rested on Mount Ararat? If so, prove it; if not, away with it for ever.

Sheriff Hutton.

THOS. MYERS.

Deuteronomy xxviii. 68. Vol. IV. 12.—Mr. BEDDY will be pleased to know that several of the old commentators agree with him. Vatablus renders: "Et reddetis vos vendibiles, vel quæretis ut vendamini." Amama, after saying that there is a contradiction in the rendering "Ye shall be sold, &c., and no man shall buy you," remarks: "Necessario ergo vertendum, Vendere te ipsum voles, quæres, venum te expones. Primo illud notum, verba Hithpaël reciprocas significationes plerumque habere. 2. Verba apud Ebræos sæpe conatum tantum significare." As instances of this he quotes Exodus xii. 48, and Genesis xxxvii. 21. Parkhurst says: "In Hith. to give up oneself as if sold for a slave." Gesenius translates the word as the Authorised Version.

Manchester.

WILLIAM CAINE.

Daniel ix. 27, 28. Vol. IV. 13.—The question R. BETA BETA asks must depend on the construction of the words. What is the nominative to הַנְּבִירִי? It is surely the last person mentioned, "The prince of the people that shall come." If this be the case, if the words are to be construed grammatically, the confirmation cannot be predicated of the Lord Jesus Christ, but of the antichrist foretold here, and in many other parts of Scripture. Has not your Correspondent overlooked the dates of the prophecy? The crucifixion is said to take place "after threescore and two weeks," to which must be added the previous seven weeks allotted to the rebuilding of the city, i.e. at the end of the sixty-ninth week, four hundred and eighty-three years after the fulfilment of the prophecy commenced, and not four hundred and ninety years, as R. BETA BETA seems to intimate. R. BETA BETA will find this prophecy plainly and fairly expounded in Dr. TREGGELLES'S Notes on Daniel.

C. E. STUART.

Proverbs xiv. 24. Vol. IV. 3.—Gesenius supposes that the last clause of this verse may mean "the pre-eminence (or great honours) of fools are folly," i.e. a fountain of foolish actions. He thinks it possible that הַנְּבִירִי may be used in the sense of "power, pre-eminence," as from the root נָבַל. But the old commentators translate the verse as our English version, and they explain the last words of it thus: "As an ape is always an ape, even if it be clothed in purple, so the foolishness of fools cannot be concealed by the possession of riches. So far from riches conceal-

ing folly, the folly of fools becomes greater if they become rich. Their folly becomes known to all men when they are rich, whereas if they were poor their folly would not be seen."

Patrick says: "The folly of wicked men is such, that their wealth makes them the more vile, and only gives them the greater means to show what senseless fools they are."

Amama quotes the proverb *πιθηκος εστι πιθηκος, καιν χρυσαια εχη συμβολα.*

The LXX render the verse: *Στεφανος σοφων πανουργος, η δε διατριβη αφρονων κακη.* How is this to be explained?

Manchester.

WILLIAM CAINE.

Matthew xi. 13. Vol. IV. 62.—As an interpretation of this passage I would suggest the following:—Up to the time of John's appearance the Law and the Prophets were the two great dispensations under which God had communicated His revelation. John the Baptist was the usherer in of the third, the greatest and last dispensation, viz. the Gospel, under which God was to make known his will by his Son Jesus Christ. The connexion, then, of this verse with the context will be, that John was the link joining the Gospel and the Prophets; that is, binding together God's entire revelation to man. The great practical point in this passage seems to be, that between Malachi and John the Baptist no inspired communication of God's will was revealed to mankind.

Further, I think that the meaning of the passage is not ascertained by giving the emphasis to *προεφητευσαι*, for John was a prophet as well as Moses, Isaiah, &c., that is, one who announces the sayings and revelations of God. Compare Exodus ch. iv. ver. 16, with ch. vii. ver. 1, and concerning him our Saviour declared, "Among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist" (ver. 11).

West Derby. J. C. R. (M.A. Camb.)

Matthew xi. 28. Vol. III. 437.—Without in the least disputing that the former verses allude to the knowledge of the Father, and our Lord's communion with Him, I am rather inclined to doubt whether *αναπαυσω*, translated "I will give you rest," applies directly to this knowledge and communion. *Αναπαυω* properly means, "to make to cease:" thus,

ὅς ῥα τε ἐργων

Ἀνθρώπους ἀνεπαύσει ἐπὶ ῥῆονι.

HOM. lib. xvii. 549.

Homer here speaks of a storm, "which made men cease from their works." In later Greek *αναπαυω* is interpreted "to relieve." Thus, in this passage, those who are *κοπιωντες*, "labouring," *πεφορτισμενοι*, "laden with burdens," *φορτια βαρεα*, Matt. xxiii. 4 (whether the burdens be ceremonial, as enjoined by the Pharisees, or moral, as affecting the conscience), are promised by our

Lord a blessed relief. Like as a poor overlaid animal feels ease and comfort when a heavy load is taken from his shoulders, so the child of God is relieved when the burden is removed and his soul is at liberty. In strict language, *αναπαυω* implies relief, and the relief is found by coming to Jesus.

Axminster.

Z. J. EDWARDS.

Matthew xii. 40. Vol. III. 70, 110, 142, 188.—Mr. TOMLIN has put a simple question which requires a simple answer. At present I merely state that the idea of Thursday being the day of the Crucifixion must be abandoned, since that supposition would require the Crucifixion to be assigned to some other year than A.D. 29. It appears to me to be clear that A.D. 29 is the true date of the Crucifixion, and B.C. 1620, A.M. 2506, the true date of the Exodus. From the slaying of the first paschal lamb to the death of Christ, the true Paschal Lamb, is 1648 years to a moment. And it is very remarkable that this very number 1648 is the numerical value of ΜΩΥΣΗΣ.

M	=	40
Ω	=	800
Υ	=	400
Σ	=	200
Η	=	8
Σ	=	200

ΜΩΥΣΗΣ = 1648

Thus the opinion held by some of the Fathers, that the Mosaical dispensation lasted 1648 years, is true to the very letter.

Torquay.

F. Fysh.

Matthew xiii. 24. Vol. IV. 14.—The beauty of the parable of the "tares and the wheat" is enhanced by the true signification of the word "tare," or *ζιζανιον*. This only occurs here, and is the *αιρα*, or "lolium temulentum," the German "tollkorn," the French "yvroie," and in Ireland "ryley"; "temulentum" is added to "lolium" to distinguish it from the "lolium" proper, with which it has nothing in common but the name, and to indicate the vertigo which it causes when mingled with and eaten with bread. And this in the East not uncommonly happens, it being so hard to separate it from the wheat. However, it will be well to bear in mind that the wheat and tares are not seeds of different kinds, but the last is a "degenerate" or bastard wheat. Lightfoot quotes similar words (distinctly asserting it from the Talmud). "Wheat and zuzin are not seeds of different kinds," where the gloss of this is, "Zuzin is a kind of wheat which is changed in the earth both as to its form and nature." There is a progressive deterioration in wheat sown in the same soil for three years together, and even "triticum et hordeum in lolium

mutantur." So that the tares of the parable sown in the field are the degenerate wheat "oversown" the good seed, and immediately after; a practice common in India, where the natives maliciously sow "pandinella" after the good seed; and, in Ireland, an outgoing tenant, to spite the ejector, will sow wild oats before leaving the farm.

Now the disciples required no teaching that they might understand that there would be mixture of good and evil in the "world," though they must have been so little prepared to expect the same in the "church," that it was very needful to warn them beforehand, both that they might not be offended, thinking that the promises of God had failed, when the evil should appear, and also that they might know how to conduct themselves when that mystery of iniquity, now foretold, should begin manifestly to work. But the consideration of the last part of Querist's subject would involve an inquiry into the whole history of the Donatists' heresy; suffice it to say, in the words of a well-known modern writer (Dean Trench), already freely quoted:

The term "world" here used need not perplex us in the least, it was "the world," and therefore was rightly called so, till this seed was sown in it, but thenceforth was the world no longer. No narrower word would have sufficed for him in whose prophetic eye the word of the Gospel was contemplated as going forth into all lands, as a seed scattered in every part of the great out-field of the nations.

E. RYLE.

The phrase "Kingdom of Heaven" certainly admits of more than one interpretation; but the most legitimate is no doubt that which takes it to be the visible kingdom of Christ upon earth, and which is commonly called the millennium. Taking this to be its meaning in the above passage, there appears a striking similarity between the state of the world as described in the parable and that of the earth during the millennial period as depicted in Rev. xx. The great characteristic of that period is the universal submission of the whole world to the personal reign of Christ: but we learn both from the parable, and we gather from the account in Rev. xx. that it is merely an outward submission; the serpent's seed is still lurking in the hearts of the nations, for no sooner is Satan again let loose than he finds them fitting and willing recipients of his delusions. During the preceding period, whilst Satan was bound, there was no apparent difference between the tares and the wheat, they both grow together till the end of the world or age; then their real character is made manifest, and the fire of God consumes them. The same state of things is alluded to in Psalm xviii. 44, where the stranger or heathen is said to yield but a feigned obedience to the conquering sword of the true David. I would not be understood as excluding other interpretations of the parable: but, though it may

be usefully accommodated to different states of the Church or individuals, I think it finds its final fulfilment at the period I have mentioned.

ROBERT M. NORMAN.

Romans v. 15-17. Vol. IV. 44.—I do not believe that any material difference of judgment exists between Mr. JOHNSTON and myself as to the general doctrine of this passage, although I continue to think it better to speak of Adam as the natural and not the federal head of mankind.

Federal headship, in strict propriety of speech, implies a *fœdus* or uniting-bond of some description quite independent of natural kin.

When Mr. J. cites those passages of Genesis in which words, whether of blessing or of condemnation, are addressed to Adam as the head of an unborn race, in proof of his "representative capacity," an identity of signification is assumed for the two terms, "representative" and "federal."

In this view I cannot acquiesce, because it is evident that a representative capacity may attach to relationships to which the application of the term "federal" would be quite inappropriate. It would, for instance, be a departure from all usage to speak of a father as federally related to his own son, although beyond question the father of every family is its natural representative and head.

With respect to the bearing of this question upon the doctrine of imputation, I heartily concur with Mr. J. when he denies that the Apostle meant to teach us that men die only on account of their own personal sins. But when he goes on to say that we ought not to ascribe universal mortality to the common fraternity of the first sinner, and states as his reason for this that "innate depravity itself is a penal evil and presupposes guilt," his objections have to my mind the most conclusive effect in establishing the distinction which I desire to maintain, *i. e.* that natural and hereditary sin is man's mortal condition, and not a federal imputation of sin.

Human life having been corrupted in its source, the natural reproduction of the Adamic form was a generation of sinners, and therefore of mortal men. Accordingly, the *φρονημα της σαρκος*, or natural disposition of man, is declared to be enmity against God. "We were," says the Apostle, "children of wrath by nature" (Eph. ii.), "born in sin" (Psa. li.), &c.

In Heb. vii. we have a striking example of the way in which the act of a parent may be ascribed to his natural descendants. After demonstrating the superiority of Melchisedec to Abraham, who paid him tithes, he adds: "And as I may so say, Levi also, who receiveth tithes, paid tithes in Abraham; for he was yet in the loins of his father when Melchisedec met him" (verses 9, 10).

In like manner it is that all are said to have sinned in Adam. He is the natural progenitor of all; and his children, being but the multiplication of his own likeness, are severally chargeable and charged with that which originally was a single act.

Adamic sin, then, is found to exist, together with its judicial consequences, in all mankind by virtue of the natural unity of the race. While, therefore, I feel no disposition to quarrel with the use of such expressions as "federal" and "imputation" in relation to this subject, especially at a time when errors of a far more serious description than mere verbal inaccuracy are so rife and active on all sides, I may say that the former appears to me open to objection on the score of exactness, while the latter is superfluous rather than wrong. Adamic sin is my sin, and need not formally be imputed to me by reference to any federal tie. To my grief I know that I am born a sinner, a fact which never fails to evince itself when fit occasion comes. (Cf. *Psa.* lviii. 8; *Rom.* iii. 10, seq.)

On the other hand Christ is in the perfect sense of the expression a federal head. It was for the children's sakes who should be given Him that the Word became incarnate (*Heb.* ii. 13, 14). Distinct from all alike, as the only-begotten of the Father, in the intrinsic qualities of his person—holy, harmless, separate from sinners, light in the midst of darkness—He came forth from the Father, to become, by means of his obedience unto death, the manifested covenant of peace and truth to God's elect. Accordingly we find that natural ties, even when in the mystery of the incarnation they really existed, are emphatically disallowed, that the lasting and paramount relationships of grace might be more distinctly manifested, to the glory of Him who had ordained them. (Cf. *Matt.* xii. 47—50; *John* i. 12, and vi. 37—40).

I would conclude these remarks by a brief reference to a previous paper in the same No. by Mr. KELLY. The Authorised Version is there said to be "clearly wrong" in giving (verse 18) "upon all men" as the proper rendering of *εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους*. On the contrary, I consider it to be perfectly right. The difference between *ἐπὶ* and *εἰς* may be easily allowed when (as in the instance quoted by Mr. K.) they occur together, but it needs no argument to prove that *εἰς* by itself frequently carries its primary signification of progress to the full extent of attainment; "an" or "in" being then its more exact equivalent than "towards."

It is so, I conceive, in the present instance. "We have," says Mr. KELLY, "in verse 18 the universal aspect of the act whether of Adam or of Christ." I think we have very much more. Condemnation rests on all men naturally, even as

justification is imputed freely unto all men who are under the federal headship of Christ.

The aspect of Divine mercy, as distinguished from its appropriative effect, is clearly shewn in *Rom.* iii. as quoted by Mr. KELLY. Here, however, we have a different view of the subject.

I venture also, even at the hazard of incurring the blame of "mere ignorance," to think that *παντες* and *οἱ πολλοι* are "equipollent" in the apostle's present argument. For it will hardly be asserted that many and not all were made sinners by the one disobedience. But if so, then the mistake needs no further elucidation.

The matter then stands thus: Adam, the natural man, ruining himself by sin while yet without heirs, has in the wisdom of God been suffered to perpetuate his sin and its effects in the natural generation of his likeness.

The second Adam, abiding alone in his righteousness, and glorifying God in the likeness of those who had dishonoured Him, becomes, by the mystery of redeeming grace, the parental head of all those who, being born of the Spirit through the gospel, are joined by faith to Him. And thus "as by the offence of one the many were constituted sinners, so by the obedience of one shall the many be constituted righteous." The parallel is perfect in all its parts. *αχρηστος*.

Romans vi. 3, 4. Vol. IV. 62. By baptism a person is brought into an external state of union with Christ, by which he becomes one with Him in His crucifixion, death, and resurrection, as we are taught in the beginning of this chapter. (See Vol. III. 134 and 197.) I cannot think there is any allusion here to baptism by immersion.

I. The burial of our Lord and immersion are utterly dissimilar as to mode. Christ was not actually buried in our sense of the term: he was placed in a sepulchre, with the intention, after the Sabbath was over, of making the requisite preparation, and then burying. He was not let down into the sepulchre, but a door was left for entrance, and his body was conveyed into it, and a stone was placed against the entrance, not upon it.

II. The water used in baptism is emblematical of purification; but, if immersion is here alluded to as to mode, the baptistry would symbolise with the grave, which is emblematical of corruption. We are said here, and in the second chapter of *Colossians*, to be dead with Christ, but there can be no proper analogy between death and immersion.

III. If in the interpretation of this passage we keep in mind that the point of comparison is not between our baptism and the burial and resurrection of Christ, but between our death to sin and rising to holiness, and the death and the resurrection or living of Christ, all will be simple

and obvious. And that this is the right mode of interpretation is plain from the language itself. In the fourth verse, where we have the phraseology "raised up from the dead," we should have expected in the antithesis, if any allusion to immersion had been intended, something that would have reminded us of rising from the water; but the words are "even so we also should walk in newness of life," plainly denoting that the apostle did not so much allude to the rising of Christ as to mode, but to the glorious fact of his living again, and as he lived again so also should we live a new life. The same apostle, in the second chapter of Colossians, in the former part of the twelfth verse, speaks of our being "buried with Christ by baptism;" but the opposite of this is not a resurrection from anything that might represent a grave in which Christians have been buried, but a resurrection by faith, *i.e.* a spiritual and moral one, "through the faith of the operation of God," or, as some would translate it, "through faith in the power of God." The ancient Syriac version has "while ye believed in the power of God." Both here and in the passage of Scripture under consideration, as well as in many other passages, too much stress must not be laid on the words "rising" and "resurrection," for "living again" is what they mainly denote. (See Matt. xxii. 23, "Resurrection," *i.e.* future life; John xiv. 19, and Col. ii. 13, made alive, not raised.

Burslem.

JOHN HARRISON.

By the phrases "baptized into Jesus Christ," and "buried with Him by baptism into death," I understand—

1. Taking upon oneself the profession of Christianity, that is, becoming a disciple of Christ, it is parallel with 1 Cor. x. 2, which points out the disciples of Moses.

2. Baptism by immersion, the warmth of the country allowing such a manner of dedication to God. The idea of burial—death of sin—is more perfectly visible by means of immersion.

West Derby.

J. C. R. (M.A. Camb.)

1 Corinthians xv. 1–3. Vol. III. 437, 463, 479.—I apprehend that the difficulty, in relation to 1 Cor. xv. 1–3, arises from placing the emphasis on the wrong word in the announcement, *i.e.* on "our," instead of on "Christ." The announcement there does not refer so much to the persons for whom the death was suffered as to the person dying. We may take Rom. viii. 33, 34, as an explanation of both: "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth." "Who is he that condemneth (*i.e.* no doubt the elect)? It is Christ that died" (evidently for them). It destroys the unity of the counsel and work of the Trinity to make Christ's

work, in dying, more extensive than the work of the Father in electing, and of the Holy Ghost in sanctifying. It destroys the unity of Christ's own work to make his priestly work more extensive than his prophetic and kingly work; for without doubt he is a prophet and a king only to those whom he enlightens and subdues to himself, *i.e.* his Church, and he is a priest to no other. Still more, it destroys the unity of his priestly office to make him die for those for whom he does not intercede. Would he do the greater and refuse to do the less? It is to charge him with—what he himself repudiates—beginning to build without finishing. He himself says, "I lay down my life for the sheep;" and in the same place he declares to some that they are not of his sheep, from which we are constrained to conclude that he did not lay down his life for them. Their not being of his sheep did not mean that they were not believers, for he there claims as his sheep many who were not yet believers—not yet brought into his fold, and consequently not yet converted—when he says, "Other sheep I have, who are not of this fold, them also I must bring." Also, the apostle says, "Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it;" and that he loved the Church, and gave himself for it only, is plain from the duty which the apostle enforces from this consideration—that of husbands loving their wives. It would never do here to say, Christ loved more besides the Church, for that would destroy the whole force of the apostle's argument. Also, Isaiah says, "For the transgression of my people was he stricken." Now, the universal language is capable of being interpreted in accordance with this, but this language is not capable of the universal meaning; and if Christ died in the universal sense, this language ought never to have been used. As to the objection that this limits the death of Christ, we reply that it only makes it more limited; for, let it be extended to all, it is still limited, inasmuch as mankind themselves are limited. So this merely makes it more limited, and Christ seeks no credit for doing more than he actually does. What Paul says of himself, Christ may say of himself, "I do all things for the elect's sakes."

The declaration in 1 John ii. 2, that Christ is the propitiation for the (sins of the) whole world, is well explained in John xi. 51, 52, where it is said that Christ should die for the Jewish nation, "and not for that nation only, but that also he should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad;" and also in Rev. vii. 9, where it is said, "After this I beheld, and, lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb." The expression, then, the whole world, is in opposition to the Jewish nation only, and

not in opposition to an elect number throughout the world; and to this agree the words of Peter (Acts xv. 14), who says that "God had visited the Gentiles to take out of them a people for his name."

Then as to inviting sinners, there is no difficulty in telling them that "Christ came into the world to save sinners," and that they must come to him. It helps a sinner nothing, whether he be a careless or convinced sinner, to tell him that Christ died for him. This may be false, and if he be a careless sinner he may be lulled asleep in his indifference by it; and if he be an anxious, convinced sinner, he cannot receive this upon the word of any man or of all men, so long as he knows that it is said that Christ laid down his life for the sheep, and that Christ loved the Church, and gave himself for it. Whatever comfort a truly convinced sinner receives must consist with Christ's giving himself for his Church only. Whether Christ died for him he must ascertain by coming to Christ, and in coming he is sufficiently supported by the declaration, "Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out."

Morayshire.

W. D. D.

2 Corinthians v. 21. Justification. Vol. IV. 25, &c.—I do not propose to enter upon this controversy, but, as the doctrine entertained by those who hold with me is often misunderstood, I would wish to state as briefly as possible what I believe to be the scriptural meaning of justification. In Psa. xxxii. 1, David uses these words, "Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered; blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity." The Holy Ghost, by the mouth of Paul, tells us there is in these words the description of one "unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works."

Again, in Heb. x. 14, &c. the perfection in which the believer stood was said to have been witnessed by the Holy Ghost in those words of Jeremiah (xxxi. 34), "I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more."

Through the man Christ Jesus, therefore, is now preached the forgiveness of sins. By Him all that believe are justified from all things.

In the types of the law the lamb was to be chosen out of the flock—it was to be a lamb without spot. The priest too must be without blemish. These matters were largely dwelt upon. The antitype was one chosen out of the people. He offered Himself without spot to God; and such a High Priest became us, who was holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners. This was, I believe, one special object of His fulfilling all righteousness, that He might be manifested to be a proper substitute, a suitable High Priest. The Lamb being now found, the sinner is (so to speak) put out of view—Christ is made sin for us. Him-

self knowing no sin (not merely a sin-offering, but sin), just as the object lifted up on the cross in the wilderness was a brazen serpent—that which had diffused its fiery poison through the limbs of the Israelites, nailed to the cross, and lifted up to the eye of faith—He was made sin for us. On Calvary then we have no longer a controversy between God and the sinful ones, but between God and the sinless One, made sin. Jesus, our Lord and Master, so identifying Himself with His people, as that He could cry out in those ever memorable words of the 69th Psalm, "O God, Thou knowest my foolishness, and my sins are not hid from Thee." The penalty is paid, sin is obliterated: He hath blotted out the handwriting of ordinances which was against us, nailing it to the cross. And now the One who in that dread hour had been made sin, who had stood in the place of the sinner, and as the sinner had paid the penalty of sin, bursts the bands of death, is thus declared to be the "Son of God" (a relationship which seemed for a moment lost in the sin-bearer)—"declared to be the Son of God, with power, according to the Spirit of Holiness by the resurrection from the dead." Him hath God set forth to be a propitiation through faith in His blood; and now God can be just, and the justifier of him that believeth upon Jesus. The believer is thus made in Christ the righteousness of God—he is risen with Christ, and sits in heavenly places in Him. To whom be the glory for ever and ever. Amen.

To now bring in a fulfilled law, and say that is imputed to the Christian, appears to me not only without scriptural sanction, but injurious to the wonderful truth connected with the resurrection.

Is the risen Jesus now "Son of God" because He fulfilled the law? Though He were a Son, yet learned He obedience. Does He stand in the position of justification before God because He fulfilled it? If so, then we will concede that all His people stand in the same, for they are accepted in the Beloved.

ALFPH.

Philippians iii. 13. Vol. IV. 63.—The *ἐξανάστασις* is a peculiar term, and is made more special and peculiar still by the manner in which it is used, viz. with the article before and after, *τὴν ἐξανάστασιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν*, "the rising up, the one that is out from among the dead." Surely this choice of expression was meant to mark out the fact of the believer's resurrection being the first resurrection—a resurrection that takes place while still "the rest of the dead live not again till the thousand years are finished" (Rev. xix. 3).

As to the general bearing of the sentence, I suggest the following inquiry. Was not Paul speaking of the future attainments which in the state of glory he expected to make? He hopes yet to arrive at the mine of gold from which at

present he is getting specimens from time to time. He expects "to win Christ" at the time when he is "found in Him," *i.e.* the day of his appearing. (See 2 Peter iii. 14.)

Now, it seems to be with his eye on that time that Paul adds—"that, if so be I attain to the resurrection from the dead (of which he had no more doubt than is expressed in 1 Cor. ix. 26, 27), I may know Him, whom as yet I know so imperfectly! yes, know the power of His resurrection and fellowship of His sufferings; what all this implies! and may be conformed to his death; as entirely dead to sin and devoted to the Lord as He was when He bowed his head and gave up the ghost."

Φίλος.

The Querist.

Genesis xv. 2.—And the steward of my house is this Eliezer of Damascus.

Is it true that the Jews, as I have seen stated, understand the word *עלֵיזֵר* not to be the name of the birth-place of Eliezer, but a noun which means "industry?" If so, they would translate thus: "And the steward of my house is this industrious Eliezer," literally, "this Eliezer of industry." Some of the old commentators thought that Damesek was the name of Abraham's steward. They rendered the clause in this way: "And the steward of my house is this Damesek [son of] Eliezer." How are we to translate the version of it in the Septuagint: *ὁ δε υἱὸς Μασεκ τῆς οἰκογενεῖς μου, οὗτος δαμασκός* *Ελιεζερ*? The Vulgate version is, "Et filius procuratoris domus mee iste Damascus Eliezer." I find that Gesenius gives a new interpretation of the passage: "the son of possession (*i.e.* possessor of my house, *i.e.* of my domestic property), will be the Damascene Eliezer." He renders *עלֵיזֵר* "possessor," and not "steward," as in our authorised Version. He asks what would be the meaning of the words, "I am childless, and the steward of my house (the person who has charge of my servants) is Eliezer of Damascus."

Manchester.

WILLIAM CAINE.

1 Samuel vi. 19. Men of Bethshemesh smitten.—Is there any difficulty in the way of understanding this passage thus: "He smote," *i.e.* with emerods not with the stroke of death? the 50,070 smitten ones were not slain—only struck with emerods, or some form of pestilence. "Slaughter" in the end of the verse is *מָחַת* "stroke," no more. Now chap. v. 9, the verb *חָטַף* is the very term for smiting with emerods. See Propt. Journal, vol. vi. p. 114.

Can any of your readers mention any work on 1 and 2 Samuel which they reckon very valuable as casting light on it, or suggesting lessons?

Φίλος.

Jeremiah xlix. 23.—There is sorrow on the sea; it cannot be quiet.

In this passage the ceaseless heaving of the ocean appears to be connected in some way with sorrow (the marginal reading makes the sentence unintelligible); we see a dim intimation of such connection in Isa. lvii. 20, 21; and Micah vii. 19; and especially in Rev. xxi. 1, where one of the peculiar marks of the sinless, curseless world is, that "there was no more sea." Can any of your readers offer a reason for this strange connection?

E. and C.

Psalms xiv. 3.—Several observations have been made as to the omissions and other errors in the Septuagint (vol. i. 223; vol. ii. 307; vol. iii. 21, 131, 263). I request to know what is supposed to be the authenticity of the latter part of the above verse as it is found in the Septuagint, in the Church of England Prayer-book version, and as quoted (Rom. iii. 13), &c.; while, from its being omitted in the Authorised Translation of the Bible, I presume it is not found in the Hebrew text.

F. L. W.

Galatians vi. 16.—And as many as walk according to this rule, peace be on them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God.

Who are "the Israel of God," as distinguished from those mentioned in the preceding part of the verse? I shall, perhaps, shock the prejudices of many, if I say I think they are neither Gentile believers nor Jewish converts, but the Jewish nation.

It will be seen that St. Paul has been speaking of circumcision in the preceding verses; he must therefore have had the Jewish nation in his mind. It seems that St. Paul did not forget to obey the Scriptural injunction, "Pray for the peace of Jerusalem" (Psa. cxxii. 6), for he knew that eventually there should be "peace upon Israel" (Psa. cxxv. 5), when they shall be brought under the "new covenant" (Jer. xxxi. 31—34), and "all Israel shall be saved."

Bootle.

J. WORTHINGTON.

Revelation xx. 9.—And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city.

Originally the whole territory from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates (including that of the seven nations) was given to the posterity of Abraham (Gen. xv. 18—21). Hereafter the territory of the seven nations (excluding that occupied by the two tribes and a half to the east of the Jordan) will be especially allotted to the twelve tribes of Israel (Ezek. xlviii.) Query whether this allotment be not called, after the camp in the wilderness, "the camp of the saints," with the city in the midst of it—"the Lord is there." H. GIRDLESTONE.

ERRATA IN VOL. IV.

Page	Col.	Line	
41	1	last	For "עָלָה" read "עָלָה."
44	2	57	For "justification even unto life" read "justification of life."
58	2	24	For "Jethmosis" read "Tethmosis."
"	2	25	For "Chelron" read "Chebron."
"	2	47	For "Thouris" read "Thouris."

Notices to Correspondents.

All Correspondents writing for the "ANNOTATOR" or "REPLICANT" must send us their real names; not necessarily for publication, but for our own information and safeguard. *Papers not thus authenticated will be invariably laid aside.* We allow more latitude in the "QUEERIST" department.

Every paper should commence with the text or subject commented upon, written distinctly at the head of the article. Reference should then be made to the page or pages where the subject has been before noticed, and to which the reply, if it be one, is sent. Queries should have the text prefixed from the Authorised Version, or else should have such a heading as the Replicants can with ease refer to.

Every separate article should be written on a separate piece of paper, to allow of our arranging them in Scripture sequence.

We cannot return manuscripts sent to us for publication.

No. 97 will be published (D.V.) on Saturday the 11th of April.

Just Published, Vol. III. well bound in cloth. Price 9s.

Vols. I., II., and III. Price 26s. 6d.

Published this day, Quarterly Part XIII. containing Nos. 91 to 96, neatly stitched in a wrapper. Price 1s. 6d.

All Communications to be addressed to The EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR, care of Messrs. NISBET and Co. 21, Berners Street, Oxford Street.

All communications respecting the supply of the ANNOTATOR, as well as all Post-office Orders, or enclosures of Stamps, to be addressed to the publishers, Messrs. NISBET and Co. 21, Berners Street, Oxford Street.

Now ready, Eighth Thousand, small crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. cloth.

MEMORIALS OF CAPTAIN HEDLEY VICARS, 97th Regiment. By the Author of "The Victory Won." London: JAMES NISBET & Co. 21, Berners Street.

Nearly ready, Third Edition, crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

A MEMOIR of the Rev. J. J. WEITBRECHT, late Missionary of the Church Missionary Society in Bengal. Compiled by His Widow, from his Journals and Letters. With a Preface, by the Rev. H. VENN, M.A. London: JAMES NISBET & Co. 21, Berners Street.

Recently published, Third Edition, crown 8vo. 6s. cloth.

INCIDENTS in the LIFE of our SAVIOUR: Illustrative of His Divine Character and Mission. By the Rev. A. L. R. FOOTE, Brechin. London: JAMES NISBET & Co. 21, Berners Street.

This day is published, Third Edition, crown 8vo. 6s. cloth.

THE FOOTSTEPS OF ST. PAUL: being a Life of the Apostle, designed for Youth. By the Author of "The Faithful Promiser," &c. With many Illustrations. London: JAMES NISBET & Co. 21, Berners Street.

This day, Eighth Edition, 12mo. 6s. 6d. cloth.

BASKETS OF FRAGMENTS; or, Notes from Sermons preached by the Rev. Thomas Jones, of Crenon. By Miss PLUMPTRE. London: JAMES NISBET & Co. 21, Berners Street.

Second Edition, 18mo. 1s. cloth.

LITTLE CHILD'S BOOK of DIVINITY: or, Grandmamma's Stories about Bible Doctrines. By the Author of "The Faithful Promiser." London: JAMES NISBET & Co. 21, Berners Street.

Twenty-second Edition, fcap. 5s. cloth.

THE RETROSPECT; or, a Review of Providential Mercies. With Anecdotes of Various Characters, and an Address to Naval Officers. By the Rev. RICHARD MARKS. London: JAMES NISBET & Co. 21, Berners Street.

This day is published, price 6d.

A CONSPICUOUS of the VARIOUS EVIDENCE CONFIRMING the DIVINE AUTHORITY of the GOSPEL: with an Attempt to Assign the True Place to the Inquirer and the Inquiry. By D. WALTHER. London: JAMES NISBET & Co. 21, Berners Street.

TO ADVERTISERS.

We fear that our advertising friends have misunderstood the unusual frankness with which we spoke to our Correspondents at the close of last year respecting the circulation of THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR, and they seem for the most part to have forsaken us.

It may be well to state that at our worst the circulation of THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR never fell so low as 1,100, and that it is now about 1,500.

This is not, indeed, a large circulation, but, considering the peculiar class of which it is composed, viz. the most highly educated and most spiritually-minded portion of the Christian community, we cannot but think that Authors and Publishers will do well not to overlook the peculiar value of THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR as an Advertising Medium.

TERMS AS HERETOFORE.

s. d.

Not exceeding ten lines of body type . . . 3 6

Every additional line 0 6

This day is published, price 8d.

THE APPLE OF DISCORD: is the Christian Sabbath an Ecclesiastical or Divine Record? Being the Arguments (put against) of the most celebrated Controversialists on the subject. Condensed by an M.A. of Cambridge.

London: JAMES NISBET & Co. 21, Berners Street.

This day is published, price 1s. 6d. a cheap Edition of

MEMORIALS OF CAPTAIN HEDLEY VICARS, of the 97th Regiment. London: JAMES NISBET & Co. and all Booksellers.

This day is published, crown 8vo. 5s. cloth.

A MEMOIR of the late CAPTAIN ALLEN GARDINER, R.N. By the Rev. J. W. MANSH, Vicar of Blensby, Notts. London: JAMES NISBET & Co. 21, Berners Street.

Just Published, demy 8vo. in a neat cover, Price 3s.

SKETCH of a COPTIC GRAMMAR, adapted for Self-Tuition. By W. B. MACDONALD, of Rammerscales. Edinburgh: W. H. LIZARS. London: GEORGE PHILIP & SON, 32, Fleet Street: and all Booksellers.

THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR;

OR,

NOTES AND QUERIES ON SCRIPTURAL SUBJECTS.

[PUBLISHED ON ALTERNATE SATURDAYS.]

VOL. IV.—No. 97.

APRIL 11, 1857.

[Price Threepence.
Stamped Edition 4d.]

THE ANNOTATOR:—

The Fall of Man (Gen. iii. 1), by the Rev. H. Girdlestone—Exod. xii. 40, by the Rev. F. Fysh—Numb. i. 52, and ii. 2—Isa. liii. 8—Psa. cxviii. 6—Mark xi. 13, and xvi. 3, 4 97—99
Luke xvi. 9, by T. G. Darton—Rome and Israel (Rom. xi. 17-26), by the Rev. P. Dowe—Eph. ii. 3—Conscience—Veracity of Scripture (The Pool of Bethesda), by Wm. Kelly 100, 101

THE REPLICANT:—

Numb. xxii. 22, by C. E. Stuart—Psa. xvii. 14, by the Rev. A. Roberts—Matt. xvi. 18—Mark iv. 31, 32, by the Rev. E. Ryley—Luke xviii. 13—Acts xxi. 4, by G. Mackness—Rom. v. 12, 21, by the Rev. D. Nihill 102—104

Rom. vi. 3, 4, by J. Worthington—1 Cor. i. 30, by R. M. Norman—Col. i. 18, by W. Browne—2 Thess. ii. 2 105, 106
2 Peter i. 2—Greek Testaments, by W. Kelly—Gehenna, by the Rev. W. Caine—On the Lord's Supper, by the Rev. C. G. Coombe—The Church, by G. W. Gipps 107—110
Hymn. Why do you Weep? 111

THE QUERIST:—

Ezek. xlv. 15—Acts xxiii. 3-5—1 Cor. xiv. 22, 24, by C. Grove—2 Cor. iii. 17—Rev. xx. 4, by the Rev. W. Caine 111

THE CRITIC:—

The Worth of the Soul: a Sermon by the Rev. Henry Woodward 112

NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS 112

It has pleased the great Head of the Church that the illness of the Editor should end, happily for him, in ceasing from his labours. Of him, if of any, it may be truly said, he sleeps in Jesus.

This sudden event will necessitate new arrangements, and may delay the appearance of the next Number, if, as is hoped, the CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR should be continued.

The Annotator.

THE FALL OF MAN.

Genesis iii. 1. Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made.

According to the common exposition of the Mosaic history of the fall, Satan incorporated himself with the serpent, a beast of the field; but this was not the exposition of the Apostle Paul. Speaking of the false apostles who tampered with the faith of the Church at Corinth, as "transforming themselves into the Apostles of Christ" (that is, pretending to be true Apostles No. 97.

of Christ), "no wonder," says he, "for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light." He means that, in the scripture which records the fall, Satan pretends to be a messenger from God; for to that scripture he had just before referred, comparing the Church at Corinth to Eve beguiled by the serpent. (2 Cor. xi. 3, 13-15.) This is the Apostle's exposition.

I. OBSERVE HOW THIS AGREES WITH THE MOSAIC HISTORY.

Many critics have agreed that the first verse may be translated, "Now a certain serpent was more subtle:" that is, Now there was a serpent more subtle than any beast of the field of what-

ever kind. The serpent of the field, in fact, is not more subtle than many others. This serpent was no creature either of heaven or earth; these were all subject to man, those were all loyal to God. Again, the fifth verse may be translated, "For God causes you to know," or makes known to you. See this use of the verb in Hiph. sense, Job xxxviii. 12; Judg. viii. 16: intimating that, when he said, "Ye shall not surely die," it was because by him God now made known to them that, on the contrary, they should derive much benefit from the fruit of that tree; thereby virtually revoking his own command.

II. OBSERVE HOW THIS EXPOSITION ILLUSTRATES THE MOSAIC HISTORY.

(1). *It explains the subtlety of Satan.* For where was the subtlety, or how could Eve have listened for a moment to any creature who should have dared blasphemously to contradict the truth and the command of God the Creator? But he did not contradict it. We are not to take for granted that when Satan approached Eve He knew of that command; he might or he might not, for we are not informed. We read that he began with asking, "Is it certain that God said ye shall not eat of any tree in the garden?" (This seems to imply a previous conversation.) "No," says Eve, "directly the reverse; we may eat of all but one." If Satan knew of the command, he showed his subtlety by a leading question, to which he might immediately reply, "And I am now authorised to make known to you that henceforth you may eat even of that." If the command was not known to Satan, he showed not only his subtlety, but his quickness in conceiving such a lie.

(2). *It explains the curse of Satan.* In the language of the inspired historian, the term "seraph" is used to denote either an angel or a serpent, it being descriptive of their refulgence, as if burnished. Num. xxi. 6, 8; Isa. vi. 2; xiv. 29; xxx. 6. Satan had pretended to come as a seraph from before the throne of God; in memorial, therefore, of his fraud, he is stigmatised, by the sentence of his Judge, as no seraph, but a serpent; he should crawl and lick the dust as a serpent, and, as the head of a serpent is crushed, such should be his degradation and destruction. The sentence is prophetic. As there would be a great antipathy in men, become mortal, to the poisonous race of serpents (though no greater than to any other poison known to be as active), so He, by His grace, would excite in men redeemed a moral antipathy to Satan's evil.

The narrative is a history, and no allegory; but as infidels of old, puzzled by the existence of physical and moral evil, invented the hypothesis of two independent principles of good and evil, Moses, whose history was designed to maintain the sole supremacy of God the Creator, antici-

pates that error in the very beginning by recording at once the stigma of Satan's curse; and in his own early age his style was probably well understood.

The moral of this narrative is most important.

(1). *To beware of false Apostles.* The mortal sin was not completed till Adam ate of the forbidden fruit. He had the direct command from God himself (Gen. ii. 16, 17). Yet he disobeyed, at the suggestion of his wife, deceived by a pretended angel of light, who produced no credentials of his commission. This was making light of the law of God. There was long after a similar case, that of the prophet of Judah deceived by the lying prophet of Israel: that also related to a command about food; the temptation and the punishment were similar (1 Kings xiii. 15-22). So at present some will tell us that tradition without evidence is equal, if not superior, to the Holy Scriptures; and others, that the Bible was good philosophy enough for the time past, but now we have changed all that. Alas, poor men!

(2). *To hold fast the Gospel;* remembering the earnest and repeated imprecation of the Apostle (Gal. iii. 8, 9). Sin and death are the works of the Devil, and their destruction by the righteousness and resurrection of God our Saviour was the first, and is the everlasting, Gospel.

For this exposition, see Dr. Thomas Burnett's Boyle Lectures, 1725 (not the celebrated Master of the Charter-house), and Bishop Sherlock's Use and Intent of Prophecy, Discourse 3.

H. GIRDLESTONE.

Exodus xii. 40.—Now the sojourning of the Children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years. Vol. IV. 46.

The immigration of Jacob and his family into Egypt occurred B.C. 1837, A.M. 2299: this was the third year of the famine. The true date of the Exodus is B.C. 1620, A.M. 2516; consequently the Children of Israel sojourned in Egypt 217 years. For further observations I would refer J. C. R. to my remarks on Gal. iii. 17, vol. IV. 86. Torquay.

F. Fysh.

Numbers i. 52; ii. 2.—There appears to be a strange analogy, possibly only accidental, between some, if not all, of the signs of the zodiac and the armorial standards of the Twelve Tribes of Israel mentioned in these passages.

The zodiac is equally divided by the same signs which the four principal tribes bore on their standards:—

First. Judah; Leo (Gen. xlix. 9), situate on the east of the camp (Numb. ii. 3—9).

Second. Reuben, Aquarius (Gen. xlix. 4), on the south (Numb. ii. 10—16).

Third. Ephraim, Taurus (Deut. xxxiii. 17), on the west (Numb. ii. 18—24).

Fourth. Dan, Scorpio (Gen. xlix. 17), on the north (Numb. ii. 25—31). E. and C.

Isaiah liii. 8.—Who shall declare his generation?

Until I looked at the Hebrew I had altogether a wrong conception of this passage, and I suppose that most English readers have somewhat the same. Some think that it relates to "the genealogy" of the Lord Jesus, others to his "eternal generation." The Hebrew has nothing whatever to do with either. It is **אֵת דְּרוֹרִי**, the invariable and only meaning of which in numerous examples is "his contemporaries, the generation among whom he lived," of whom He himself said, "A wicked and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign," &c.; and of whom His Apostle said, "Save yourselves from amongst the number of this untoward generation." Caben's* French translation is, I conclude, nearly the right one. "Et parmi ces contemporains, qui est-ce qui en parle?" He takes **אֵת דְּרוֹרִי** as an accus. abs. I would only propose a slight change in this. The word, **לְשׁוֹחַח**, from **שָׁחַח**, has a stronger sense than Caben here gives it, and means "to muse," or "think," in Pahl. Compare Ps. cxliii. 5, the only other place where it occurs in that conjugation. In Kal it is "meditate," "commune," "speak," "talk," &c. The meaning therefore will be, "Amongst his contemporaries, who thinks, or meditates, upon him?" a most affecting addition to the many others of this wonderful prophecy; and, what is remarkable, the French translation is by an Israelite, a bitter opponent of Jesus, the Messiah and the Lamb of God; and not only an opponent of Christ and of the Gospel, but deeply tainted, as are a large part of the French Jews, with Rationalism and Neology.

Nice.

β. β.

Psal. cxviii. 6.—God is mine; I have no fear."

And are we to be told that this is not the language of "the Spirit of adoption?" What can be stronger as a spiritual glorying in God? (Rom. v. 11). "God is mine (**לִי הוּא**); my own, my portion, my possession (Psa. lxxiii. 25). I have no fear, therefore. God being not only for me, but mine, who and what can be against me to harm me? (Rom. viii. 31). I defy men, the world, the flesh, and Satan and his hosts!" Here is the calming and triumphant power of faith in God! (Isa. xxvi. 3). And how can any of the fallen children of Adam so lay claim to God as

their own property, portion and all? Only in one way: "Ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's. My Father, therefore your Father" (1 Cor. iii. 23; John xx. 17). Away with systems! Here is the reality of adoption unto God!

Bexley.

T. H.

Mark xi. 13.

(A) And seeing a fig-tree afar off, having leaves, he came, if haply he might find any thing thereon:

(B) And when he came to it, he found nothing but leaves;

(C) For the time of figs was not (yet).

Almost every attentive reader of the Scriptures is aware of the difficulties which have been found in this passage, and perhaps of some of the unsatisfactory solutions which have been suggested. The matter is, however, exceedingly simple after all. There is no absolute novelty in what will here be said, but I may perhaps succeed in arranging the subject in a clearer method. For this purpose I subjoin another passage from St. Mark's Gospel, in which the same construction occurs, but where the sense easily carries the reader over the difficulty caused by that construction.

Mark xvi. 3, 4.

(A) And they said among themselves, Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre?

(B) And when they looked they saw that the stone was rolled away:

(C) For it was great.

Now here it is abundantly evident that the clause (C) assigns a reason, not for what is affirmed in clause (B), or that next immediately preceding it, but for what is affirmed in the antepenultimate clause (A): in other words, it gives us the reason why the women said among themselves, Who shall roll away the stone for us? For it was a stone of very great size, beyond the strength of women to roll away; not the reason why when they looked they saw that it was rolled away already. Just so in chap. xi. 13, clause (C) assigns a reason, not for what is affirmed in clause (B), or that next immediately preceding it, but for what is affirmed in the antepenultimate clause (A); in other words, it gives the reason why the Lord, perceiving a fig-tree afar off, which was already covered with leaves, went up to it to see, *α α α*, if there might not possibly be some few early ripened figs upon it, for it was not yet fig-season; not the reason why the tree was barren, so that when he came to it he found nothing but leaves upon it, and no fruit whatever.

And what makes the matter still plainer and simpler is, that there are fig-trees, I believe, which retain all through the winter some of the fruit which had not time to ripen in the autumn;

G 2

* A translation of the Old Testament in about 20 vols. octavo; Hebrew and French on opposite pages; and with critical notes.

so that some of these imperfect figs ripen at a very early period in the following spring.

Nice.

β. β.

Luke xvi. 9. Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness.

Every explanation that I have seen of the above text has appeared to me more or less forced and unnatural.

I beg to inquire of any Correspondent who has a critical knowledge of Greek, whether it would be allowable to translate *Ποιησατε εαυτοις φιλους εκ του μαμωνα της αδικιας* thus: "Make to yourselves friends apart from, beyond, or above the mammon of unrighteousness."

The lexicons tell me that the Greek preposition *εκ* is sometimes thus rendered, and indeed give these and analogous words as expressing its radical signification; but whether the above rendering is compatible with the construction of the sentence and the connection with the preceding verb *ποιησατε* I am not competent to decide.

Such a translation, if admissible, would surely render the whole perfectly clear, simple, and harmonious.

As the unjust steward provided for himself by fraud and dishonesty friends who should receive him into their houses when deprived of his stewardship, so (*mutatis mutandis*) the children of light are counselled by our blessed Lord, with like providence but not with like dishonesty, to make to themselves friends beyond those of this world, friends who may receive them not into perishable but into everlasting habitations.

As an illustration of the various and even opposite meanings given to the same preposition *εκ*, I would refer to James ii. 8, where the same words twice occurring (*εκ των εργαων σου*) are translated in the first place "without thy works," and in the second "by thy works." I am aware that some MSS. and editions change the preposition in the first clause from *εκ* to *χωρις*, but apparently upon inferior authority.

T. G. DARTON.

ROME AND ISRAEL.

Romans xi. 17—26. The warnings here addressed to the Gentile Church in general have especial point when applied to the Church of Rome in particular, to whom the Apostle first directed this Epistle. They thus become prophetic allusions to some of the features of the apostacy which was afterwards developed in that Church; and they bear especially on her hostility to the Jews, her exclusive pretensions to the Divine favour, and her arrogant assumption of being the root, the mother, and mistress of churches.

First, with respect to her hostility to the Jews; the daughter of Babylon seems to have an here-

ditary dislike to the daughter of Jerusalem and triumphs in her fall; witness her persecutions of the Jews, the ignominious Ghetto, in which they are confined in Rome, and the boastful and insulting inscription on the church facing the Ghetto. In opposition to all this the Apostle here raises his monitory voice, "Boast not against the branches," that is, of the Jewish olive-tree, though broken and scattered.

Rome's claim to be the mother and mistress of churches is refuted by anticipation in the same verse: "Thou bearest not the root, but the root thee." The Jewish church is the root. Jerusalem, and not Rome, is yet to be the ecclesiastical metropolis of the world.

The verses 21—23 contain a threatening of extinction to Rome and a promise of restoration to Israel, on the contingency of Rome's not continuing in goodness and Israel's not continuing in unbelief. We know that the former contingency has been already fulfilled, and the latter is assured by verse 26; so that now it may be expressed, not in the language of supposition, but of certainty: "Thou (addressing the Church of Rome) shalt be cut off, and Israel shall be grafted in again."

The Jews seem aware that the restoration of Jerusalem is connected with the ruin of Rome; as Rabbi Kimchi has said, "When Rome shall be desolated there shall be the redemption of Israel."

Knypersley Parsonage.

P. DOWE.

Ephesians ii. 3. All were by nature the children of wrath.

Is there not often a mistake entertained as to the meaning of this expression? At Vol. III. 347, is this sentence, "We are reckoned by God, and treated, as in fact guilty persons before we do anything personally to involve us in guilt." Is not the same mistake involved in that sentence? The mistake is, I think, this:—that every person at the very moment of birth incurs God's anger and wrath; previous of course to the commission of actual sin. This mistaken idea is connected with the erroneous notion that original sin is, as it were, a load of sin and consequent guilt on the soul, with which every one is born. I have alluded to this last Vol. III. 348.

I incline to the idea that the expression "children of wrath" means merely, that every person is by nature born into the world with such a "corruption of nature," such a strong tendency to sin, that he will sin at the earliest dawn of his natural powers; and hence will thereby at that earliest dawn incur God's wrath. Infants who die before the commission of sin are subject to death, not because they are "reckoned by God, and treated, as in fact guilty persons;" but because they inherit from Adam bodies which are

mortal, in the same way that they inherit from him souls, which have the same "fault and corruption of nature" which Adam had after his fall.
F. L. W.

CONSCIENCE.

A very common way of speaking of conscience is as if it were synonymous with "personal convictions." Some writers talk of such being "very sacred," and of their being "the echo of the Creator's voice addressing His creature man."

The proper meaning of the word is Conscientiousness. In Legh's *Critica Sacra* it is said of *οὐν* and *εἰδω*, as *conscientia à con et scire*. It seems as much as "*cordis scientia*," saith Bernard; as "*scientia cum alio*," saith Aquinas.

Dr. Wells says, "*Συνειδήσις*, conscience, according to the literal import of the word, denotes a man's being conscious, or knowing within himself, that he has done or has not done what he is obliged by some law."

Agreeably to this interpretation, the whole of the passages in the New Testament may, and ought to, be translated:—

Jno. viii. 9, convicted by their own [conscientiousness].

Acts xxiii. 1, I have lived in all good [conscientiousness].

Acts xxiv. 16, a [conscientiousness] void of offence.

Rom. ii. 15, their [conscientiousness] also bearing witness.

Rom. ix. 1, . . . my [conscientiousness].

Rom. xiii. 5, but also for [conscientiousness] sake, *i. e.* that your brother stumbles at your act.

1 Cor. viii. 7, [conscientiousness] of the idols, their [conscientiousness] being weak.

1 Cor. viii. 10, shall not the [conscientiousness].

1 Cor. viii. 12, their weak [conscientiousness].

1 Cor. x. 25, . . . no question for [conscientiousness] sake.

1 Cor. x. 28, eat not . . . for [conscientiousness] sake; . . . [conscientiousness] . . . not thine own.

1 Cor. x. 29, . . . of another man's [conscientiousness].

2 Cor. i. 12, . . . testimony of our [conscientiousness].

2 Cor. iv. 2, . . . to every man's [conscientiousness].

2 Cor. v. 11, . . . made manifest in your [conscientiousness].

2 Tim. i. 5, . . . out of a good [conscientiousness].

2 Tim. i. 19, faith and a good [conscientiousness].

2 Tim. iii. 9, . . . in a pure [conscientiousness].

2 Tim. iv. 2, having the [conscientiousness] seared.

2 Tim. iv. 2, God whom I serve with a pure [conscientiousness].

Tit. i. 15, . . . [conscientiousness] is defiled.

Heb. ix. 9, could not make him . . . perfect as pertaining to the [conscientiousness].

Heb. ix. 14, purge your [conscientiousness].

Heb. x. 2, . . . no more [conscientiousness] of sins.

Heb. x. 22, hearts sprinkled from an evil [conscientiousness].

Heb. xiii. 18, we have a good [conscientiousness].

1 Pet. ii. 19, . . . [conscientiousness] towards God.

1 Pet. iii. 16, having a good [conscientiousness].

1 Pet. iii. 21, the answer of a good [conscientiousness].

These passages prove that *conscientiousness* of obedience to God's authority is what is meant, and corresponds with what is said by St. John (iii. 21), . . . If our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence towards God.

R. BETA BETA.

VERACITY OF SCRIPTURE—THE POOL OF BETHESDA.

Permit me to join with VIGILANS (Vol. IV. 53) in putting the unsuspecting reader on his guard. I had just closed the "Later Biblical Researches" of Dr. Robinson," recently published by Mr. Murray, when my eye fell on the warning note touching the earlier volumes of the same author. What will grave Christian men say, when I tell them that this American scholar and divine is bold enough to affirm that, in certain particulars in John v. (the angelic troubling of the waters, and the cure of the first comer, whatever his disease,) "we have the unerring marks of a current popular belief; which the evangelist has chosen to make the basis of his representation"? And what follows is, if possible, worse. "The same was sometimes done by an authority higher than John." A footnote is subjoined to this effect: "See especially our Lord's parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, founded on the Jewish popular belief as to Hades and the state of the dead; Luke xvi. 19, sq. Comp. Luke xxiii. 39, sq." Need I prove how fallacious it is to draw an argument as to an historical fact—so at least St. John states it—from the pictorial imagery of a parable? In the Lord's language to the converted thief I utterly deny that there is the smallest semblance of a popular legend. It is evident that Dr. Robinson denies any thing supernatural in the troubling of, and healing by, the pool. But, not content therewith, he appeals to our Lord's authority on two separate occasions, as if He sanctioned the principle and the practice of "pious frauds" no less than the Apostle John! If Dr. Robinson does not mean this, language and logic have lost their customary force: if he does, his imputation upon the Lord, and the Holy Ghost who inspired John, is hardly short of blasphemy. This is strong language, I know; but is there not the gravest cause? It is not charity but latitudinarianism to palliate such unworthy dealing with Christ and His Word, were it in an angel from heaven.

WILLIAM KELLY.

The Replicant.

Numbers xxii. 22. Vol. III. 166.—In the absence of any good Hebraist's opinion on the point mooted by Mr. ROBERTS, let me refer him to Noldius's Concordance—no mean authority on such matters. He translates בִּיהָלֵךְ הוּא quum irret ille, "when," not "because."

C. E. STUART.

Psalms xvii. 14. Vol. III. 13.—Your Correspondent Mr. CHILD suggests a different interpretation of the Hebrew word צִפְיִן from that given by our translators. They render it "hid treasure," in the sense of worldly wealth. He suggests the very different meaning of "the fearful wrath of God—an evil hidden from and for the ungodly," and refers to Rom. ii. 5, as, in this sense, parallel. Soon after I had read his observations, having occasion to refer to Augustin's Epistles, I was struck by finding there a similar interpretation to that of Mr. CHILD. It seems that a bishop of some note in Church history, Paulinus of Nola, had, in a very humble mode, proposed nine Scripture difficulties to Augustin for solution, and among them is the whole paragraph in Psalm xvii. In replying to his friend's difficulties in respect to this particular phrase, Augustin explains it as meaning "occulta Dei judicia." But it is not this phrase only, but the whole context, of which Paulinus begs an explanation; and the correspondence affords a really ludicrous example of the unsuitness of even eminent fathers of the Church to be authoritative exponents of the Bible, especially of the Old Testament. Paulinus, ignorant it seems of any other language than the Latin, is puzzled by finding in his Psalter "Saturati sunt porcina;" but he hears, as he says, that it stands in other Psalters "Saturati sunt filii." Augustin consults manuscripts, and is inclined to believe that "Saturati sunt filii" is the most correct rendering. The editor observes in his margin that certain Greek codices appear to have read *υαν* instead of *υαν*; and hence the ludicrous embarrassment of these two fathers, which a little knowledge of the Hebrew text would have spared them at once. Inclining therefore to believe that "Saturati sunt filii"—"they are full of children"—is the more correct rendering, Augustin gravely tells his friend, who had consulted him as a master in Israel, that by children are meant fruits or works—"Hoc est fructibus, quod evidentiis dicitur, operibus suis." Surely they are in no enviable case who hang upon the Fathers as oracular interpreters. The letter of Augustin's to which I refer is Epist. LVIII.

Woodrising Rectory. ARTHUR ROBERTS.

Matthew xvi. 18. Vol. III. 314; IV. 29.—I have heard Eph. ii. 20 quoted, as an authority in support of the idea that it was on Peter himself that our Lord intended to build His Church. But surely Eph. ii. 20, proves that if Matt. xvi. 18, at all refers to Peter as a "foundation," it is not as a single and special foundation, but in a sense in which others were equally a foundation with himself. It may also be well argued from the word "prophets," taken in connection with the context as to "the commonwealth of Israel," that Old Testament prophets are alluded to as well as those of the New: hence that "the Church" is partly built on them also as a foundation. This of course is a view some Correspondents of THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR will not adopt. See my Query, Vol. IV. p. 15, and some other papers at pp. 8, 9, 26, 27. F. L. W.

Mark iv. 31, 32. Vol. IV. 29.—There appear to be two main points in the parable of the Mustard-Seed—

1. The smallness of the seed, whereby to denote the small and lowly beginnings of the kingdom of God in Gospel times, which resulted from the preaching of a despised Nazarene and a few followers, the Founder himself dying an ignominious death.

2. In opposition to the extreme smallness of the seed, i.e. the means used, is contrasted its marvellous and extensive growth—the far-spreading boundary of the kingdom, which is to be limited only by the earth's expanse—"for the glory of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters do the sea;" and the "stone . . . cut out without hands . . . became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth" (Dan. ii. 34, 35). There is a prophecy in Ezek. xvii. 22, 23, much to the same effect. The Church is compared to a goodly cedar-tree, and "under it shall dwell all fowl of every wing." The portion of the parable which has allusion to its natural history is verified by the statements of Eastern and other modern travellers; and birds are said to be very partial to the seeds of the mustard-tree, and flock together in such numbers as even to break down a branch. When the grain of mustard-seed is said to be "less than the least of all seeds," our Saviour only made use of a proverbial expression common amongst the Jews, "small as a grain of mustard-seed," when they wished to denote anything very minute. Words so employed would be understood by his hearers, and so all conjectures and objections whether the mustard-seed is the smallest of all seeds vanish to the winds. Your Correspondent remarks that no fruit is mentioned in the parable; but surely, as the herbal-tree is described as flourishing, it implies seed or fruit. However, the point of the parable is not the fruit or seed that the mustard-tree produces, but the

far-spreading, over-shadowing nature of the branches, implying the influence and power of a widely-extended kingdom; for in trees of any size we do not so much look for seed or fruit as for strong limbs and luxuriant foliage for shelter, which may be a reason why fruit is not mentioned in the parable.

E. RYLEY.

Luke xviii. 13. Vol. IV. 42.—However precious the doctrine and fact of the atonement is, it seems to me hardly warrantable to say with your Correspondent, Mr. TRACY, that *ἵλασθητι μοι* means, "Be merciful to me for the sake of an atonement." Will he pardon me for suggesting whether this be not a straining of the Greek word: for, in 2 Kings v. 18, the LXX use the same verb to represent the Hebrew word, *חָלַם*, which certainly contains no idea of atonement: and Christ may have employed a corresponding Aramaic word (as does the Syriac version in this place), which had no connection with atonement, and yet might be represented by the *ἵλασθητι* of the Greeks? Certainly, the publican could not obtain mercy without an atonement; but it is quite another thing to say that *ἵλασθητι* must express the idea of an atonement.

Bexley.

T. H.

Acts xxi. 4. After these things were ended, Paul purposed in the (his) spirit . . . to go to Jerusalem, saying, "After I have been there I must also see Rome" (Acts xix. 21): "And now, behold, I go bound in the (my) spirit to Jerusalem, not knowing the things that shall befall me there: save that the Holy Ghost witnesseth in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me" (Acts xx. 22, 23).

Vol. IV. 62.

Although in both these passages the expression *τῷ πνεύματι*, according to New Testament usage (see Luke i. 47; Acts xvii. 16; Rom. i. 9; viii. 16; xii. 11; 1 Cor. ii. 11, &c.) refers most probably not to the Holy Spirit but to St. Paul's own spirit, yet I think we are entitled to argue that it was the Holy Spirit who inspired him with the design of undertaking this journey to Jerusalem. What else can be the meaning of the expressions, *δεῖ με καὶ τὴν Ῥώμην ἰδεῖν—δεδεμένος τῷ πνεύματι*? Whence this necessity, this constraint, acting like a fetter upon the Apostle's mind and driving him to Jerusalem, save from the irresistible promptings of the Holy Spirit? How could he have known that he "must" (notice here the word *δεῖ* so often used by our Lord himself to express the necessity of his fulfilling his divinely-appointed course) "also see Rome," except by special revelation? Last of all, notice the remarkable passage in Acts xvi. 7, "After they were come to Mysia they essayed to go into Bithynia, but the Spirit suffered them not:" what other conclusion can be drawn from this but that the Apostle was not

free to go whithersoever he would, but his every step was pre-ordained in Heaven—he was led by the Spirit? Such being the case, it is plain that we must take such a qualified view of the passage quoted by "Beth" as will involve no contradiction with the above (for, had there been such a contradiction, we could not have conceived St. Paul recognising, as he does in the second of the passages which I commenced by quoting, that these disciples really spoke by inspiration of the Holy Spirit, that being to conceive the Holy Spirit giving utterance to two mutually exclusive propositions, the one prompting, the other forbidding, the journey, and St. Paul failing to perceive their contradiction). Such a view would be something like the following: we must suppose that the Holy Spirit moved these disciples to say what they did, not in order to dissuade St. Paul from going up to Jerusalem, but only to set before him the perils which awaited him there, and that by way (1) of trying his own faith and courage (and what a trial it was we may gather from his own touching words, "What mean ye by weeping and crushing (*συνθρυπτοντες*) my heart?" ver. 13); and (2) by way of confirming the faith and courage of those who beheld this martyr enabled, as it were, to run and meet his fate with resolute heart and unswerving steps; whilst from the inmost depths of his gushing heart a voice divine inspired the words, "I am ready, not to be bound only, but also to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus." That it had such an effect upon them is manifest from the words which follow: "And when he would not be persuaded, we ceased, saying, 'The will of the Lord be done:'" words especially valuable as showing that they perceived no contradiction between the utterances of their spirit and his.

GEORGE MACKNESS (B.A. Oxon.)

Rom. v. 12, 21. Vol. IV. 37, 44, 74, 75.—I have always thought this portion of Scripture hard to be understood, but it is made much harder by the attempts of some Correspondents to explain it. The difficulty is not to be overcome by laboured, and, as they appear to me, untenable distinctions between "the many" and "all men,"—phrases which, however capable of being employed differently, are in the present context manifestly co-extensive. It is sufficient to compare verses 15 and 18 to see this—"through the offence of one the many be dead"—by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation. Surely these expressions are equivalent.

The words *ἐφ' ᾧ* in ver. 12, have, I think, been unhappily rendered "for that." There is here a relative *ᾧ* to which the proper antecedent is *ἀνθρώπων* in the same verse. The marginal reading "in whom," which is more correct, throws

light on the whole argument, the scope of which is to draw a parallel between the one man Adam and the one man Christ as regards the consequences entailed upon the human race by the respective acts of these two federal heads. So full is the Apostle's mind of this great doctrine, that having said "in whom all have sinned," he is carried away without finishing his sentence or drawing the conclusion to which his previous words tended, to prove that all sinned in Adam, "For," says he, "until the law sin was in the world," that is, the sin of which he had been speaking, sin bringing death in its train. That such death-bearing sin was in the world, was indisputable from the fact of men's dying before the Mosaic law. But "sin," he observes, "is not imputed where there is no law." "Nevertheless," fully admitting that proposition, "death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression." The reasoning is this: since there was death, there must have been sin causing that death, and since there was sin attended with death, there must have been a law affecting men by annexing that penalty to that sin. But what law? not the law of Moses, which had not been enacted. It must have been a prior law, that which brought death into the world. Neither was it to the personal sins of men that their death was to be attributed, inasmuch as they had not sinned like Adam. Where was the difference? Adam was not liable to death until he had committed the distinct act of disobedience against which death was denounced. But the descendants of Adam did not personally stand in the like position. It could not be said of them they were not liable to death unless they committed some distinct act of disobedience against which death was denounced. They all came into the world mortal, not naturally immortal like Adam, which shews that, as their mortality was to be traced up to him, so "in him" they must have sinned, for it was by such sin that death entered, and so passed upon all men. No doubt there was abundance of sin in the world in addition to the original sin, and against some particular sins, as murder, death was specifically denounced; but, whatever might be said of those sins, death reigned not only over those who committed them, but over all others, adults as well as infants, whose sins could not be said to stand upon the same footing as Adam's, the peculiarity of which consisted in drawing upon him death to which otherwise he was not subject. Having thus shewn how all men sinned in the loins of Adam, the Apostle remarks that he was "the figure of him that was to come."

This link carries on the argument from Adam to Christ, and the Apostle proceeds to draw a comparison between imputation bringing death from the one, and imputation bringing recovery

from the other. He assigns the superiority to grace, first, because "if through the offence of one the many be dead, much more," or, *a fortiori*, is it agreeable to the divine goodness, in which mercy rejoiceth against judgment, that grace by one man should abound unto the same parties—the many; and secondly, "the judgment was by one (offence) to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification."

Reiterating this idea under other forms, he arrives at the general conclusion, "For as by one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall the many be made righteous." As to the law (which, despite the argument of Macknight and Middleton, appears by the context to be the law of Moses), the Apostle tells us that it "entered that the offence might abound," an expression signifying not that God thereby increased sin, but that He brought it home to men more clearly by more specific denunciations against it. For this sense I refer to the parallels, John xv. 22; Rom. iii. 20; iv. 7, 8; Gal. iii. 19, 23.

The chief difficulty of the passage is to understand how the Apostle comes to represent the advantage of imputation from the righteousness of Christ to be greater than the evil of imputation from the transgression of Adam, since we know that though all men die through Adam, all will not be saved through Christ. But the Apostle appears to be treating, not of the consequences which individuals experience, but rather of the theoretic or doctrinal power of imputation in the one case, as compared with its power in the other. The power of Christ's merits to save is as great or greater than the power of Adam's sin to condemn. St. Paul elsewhere expressed the same idea in the most general terms, "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." And St. John, in the like spirit, declares, "He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world." The Communion Service of the Church of England adopts the same doctrine: "Who by his one oblation of himself once offered made a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world." Why then are not all saved? Not through any defect of Christ's power, but through their own fault. Faith is the medium through which the benefit is to be obtained; and the fault of unbelief is throughout Scripture laid upon the unbeliever. This may be applied even to the heathen in the following words, which I quote from Macknight:—

Faith does not consist in the belief of particular doctrines (see Rom. iii. 28, note 1), far less in the belief of doctrines which men never had an opportunity of knowing, but in such an earnest desire to know and do the will of God, as leads them conscientiously to use such

means as they have for gaining the knowledge of his will, and for doing it when found. Of this kind was Abraham's faith (see Rom. iv. 3, note 1). And inasmuch as the influences of the Spirit of God are not confined to them who enjoy revelation, but are promised in the gracious covenant made with mankind at the fall to all who are sincere, a heathen by these influences may attain the faith just now described, and thereby may please God.

I doubt if any passage in the New Testament is more susceptible than this portion of the Epistle to the Romans of the application of the law of Hebrew parallelism as explained by Bishop Jebb. Perhaps some Correspondent will try to exhibit the Apostle's view more clearly by reducing his language to strict parallel form.

Fitz Rectory, Salop.

DANIEL NIHILL.

Romans vi. 3, 4. Vol. IV. 62.—The typical meaning of the ordinance of baptism is death and resurrection; and it will be necessary to explain this point before its proper bearing on the text can be fully understood. This may be done from various passages of the New Testament, as well as from the simple meaning of βαπτίζω, to dip, or immerse; immersion being significant of death, and emersion of resurrection.

In 1 Peter iii. 20, 21, the meaning of which I have never yet seen properly explained, the deluge is set forth as the type of baptism; it is called "the like figure," the antitype (αντιτυπον). We read, "eight persons were saved by water" (ὀ ἑπτὰρες): let these words be properly understood; it does not mean, saved by means of water, but saved in the ark through water. Water was death to everything outside the ark, and Noah was saved just because he was within the ark, which there typified Christ and His resurrection from the dead, and the Church in Him. A further reference will make it still plainer; "the world being overflowed with water perished" (ἠπώλετο), 2 Pet. iii. 16; that is, perished by means of water. Now, as St. Peter, in the former text, connects the deluge with baptism and the resurrection of Christ, "the like figure whereunto baptism doth now save us, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ," let us see what St. Paul says on death, resurrection, and baptism, in relation to Christ's resurrection:—"If Christ be not raised . . . then they which are fallen asleep (dead) in Christ are perished" (ἠπώλοντο), "what shall they do which are baptised for the dead, if the dead rise not?" 1 Cor. xv. 17, 18, 29. It will be seen that St. Paul uses the same word, "perished," in relation to death, as St. Peter does, to the destructiveness of water; and both, in connection with baptism and the resurrection. The ark and its rising saving from death, in the former, and Christ and His resurrection, in the latter. From this, it is clear,

to go no further, that water in the ordinance of baptism, is not the emblem of the Holy Spirit, "the Lord and Giver of Life," but of death. If the ark had perished in the waters, Noah would have perished in it with the rest; in like manner, if Christ had perished in death, the dead in Christ would have perished with Him. St. Paul argues the latter very closely.

We are now somewhat prepared, without much further comment, to enter into the meaning of the words in the text, "Were baptised into Jesus Christ," and "are buried with him by baptism into death;" also (Col. ii. 12), "Buried with him by baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him." Notice the words, "wherein ye are risen with Him," and also in connection, "the ark . . . wherein eight souls were saved through water." When all this is carefully considered, and more might be adduced, it seems to me impossible to understand the meaning of the text in question, in relation to baptism (and it certainly does relate to baptism), unless we take water as the emblem of death, as I have shown above, and immersion as the mode.

Bootle.

J. WORTHINGTON.

1 Corinthians i. 30. Vol. IV. p. 3. — Having always attached a value to the above passage, in a sense rather different from that which T. H. gives to it in Vol. IV. 3, I was glad to find the authority of Mr. Alford on the side of "regarding the whole four substantives in the above passage as co-ordinate, and not the last three as merely explicative of σοφία." Mr. Alford reads the verse thus: "But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who was to us from God, Wisdom and Righteousness, and Sanctification and Redemption." This does not differ materially from our version, and taking it as a correct translation, we have Christ Jesus set forth from God to us in four relations. 1st, Wisdom. He brought Wisdom (see Prov. viii.) into connection and union with our humanity, and in our behalf and in our stead, perfect wisdom and understanding were displayed in all his words and actions. 2nd, Righteousness. Christ was righteous in himself, yet for us he fulfilled all righteousness (see Matt. iii. 15). Also when God charged upon him the sins of the whole world, and he sunk under the curse of the imputation, yet retaining his righteousness, God justified him in raising him from the dead; having atoned for sin, yet retained his righteousness, God imputed it to all them that believe. He was thus in the relation of righteousness from God to all who are "in Him," righteousness—the declaration of the righteousness of God—in the setting them free from the penalty of the curse of the law, and also righteousness in that active obedience to and fulfilment of the law, in which as in a seamless robe a believer may challenge the eye of

a holy God. 3rd, Sanctification. Christ had no need of sanctification for himself, yet (see John xvii. 19) he sanctified himself for us, that we in him might have sanctification. 4th, Redemption. If righteousness includes the pardon of sin through the sacrifice of Christ, redemption, as T. H. observes, will be the full and complete redemption of body and soul at the resurrection of the just, of which redemption Christ was the first-fruits and earnest when he ascended to the Father.

The whole passage seems to carry us back to dwell and expatiate on these four blessed relations in which Christ stood towards us whilst he was achieving our salvation, and also is a guarantee and warrant for all those who are trusting "in him," that they may go and draw supplies adequate to their felt necessities. I say advisedly, felt necessities, for a believer "in Christ," a member of his body, is without doubt, in the eye of God, now a sharer of that blissful estate to which Christ, his head, has attained. He is complete in Him (Col. ii. 10-12). But though to the eye of faith this is true, yet in the daily conflict with blindness, and unbelief, and sin, it is an unspeakable blessing that what he was for us he still is, a living fountain wherefrom we may draw perennial supplies of wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.

ROBERT M. NORMAN.

Colossians i. 18. Vol. IV. 9, 27, 59.—I think, even if Mr. BROOKE's remarks are so far modified as to allow the distinct groups of glory (Heb. xii. 23) as understood by Mr. W. KELLY, there yet remains much in them that is highly suggestive. Does not the expression (Heb. xi. 40) "that they without us should not be made perfect," seem to imply that the Christian Church under its glorified Head has some place to fill or part to perform in the work of making perfect the spirits of just men? "Without us" (Heb. xi. 40) is the same form of expression as that used (John xv. 5) "without me." The most limited conclusion that can be drawn from it is that that work would not be effected until the Christian Church was formed. Now, is Heb. xii. 23, to be strictly limited to the time of the resurrection, so that none of those spirits are perfected until then—Does it not seem more probable that it was complete at the time that Christ was glorified, and his Church formed on the day of Pentecost? That would be the earliest moment that Heb. xi. 40 would admit of.

In answer to Mr. BROOKE's query, I would suggest:—

1st. The Pentecostal gift, which we now receive, is described (2 Cor. v. 5) as the earnest of resurrection glory. If death does not incapacitate men for being raised in glory, still less need it do

so for receiving the earnest of that glory. It is certain, from such passages as Luke xiii. 28, that believers who lived and died under the old dispensation are entitled to partake of the glory; the presumption, therefore, is that they would partake of the earnest of it.

2nd. We may observe how much of the evil of death to the Jewish believer consisted in exclusion from the peculiar presence of God in his temple; as it was felt to be by Hezekiah (Isaiah xxxviii. 11), and by Jonah (ii. 4), &c. We may observe how entirely to the Christian the whole nature of death is changed; to die is gain, because it is to depart and be with Christ (Phil. i. 21-23); it is absence from the body and presence with the Lord (2 Cor. v. 8). Christ now hath abolished death (2 Tim. i. 10). May it not be this great change in the very nature of death which is alluded to in such passages as John viii. 51? and may not such passages as John xi. 25, 26, be intended to teach us that Old Testament saints, though dead, are benefited by that change exactly in the same way that Christians are now?

3rd. If Old Testament believers were in any sense of the term spiritually united to Christ, would not His incarnation and exaltation necessarily affect, perhaps change the very nature of that union?

That they were individually or in some sense of the term united to Christ I would conclude—

1st. From what is said of the disciples during our Saviour's life on earth in John xv. 4, 5.

2nd. From the cases of Enoch, Elijah, and Moses (if we may conclude from his presence at the transfiguration that he was then in his glorified body), taken in connection with 1 Cor. xv. May we not infer from that chapter that no man could have been so made alive except "in Christ" "the last Adam?"

3rd. Because that no man is now justified except "in Christ" (Rom. viii. 1; Phil. iii. 9, &c.), and, since there has been no change in the way of justification, we must infer that every justified man in every age of the world was so "in Christ."

Carlisle.

WILLIAM BROWNE.

2 Thessalonians ii. 2. Vol. IV. 45.—The view which Mr. NORMAN takes appears certainly, at first sight, to lessen some of the difficulties which are naturally suggested in thinking of all the circumstances which are revealed by God to take place before the second coming of Christ; but it involves another, namely, that if all His saints, living and dead, are to join Christ in the air, before the judgments connected with "Jacob's trouble" take place, what becomes of those martyrs who, during that "great tribulation," are to be "beheaded for the witness of Jesus," and are therefore believers in Him, and not merely Jews who refuse to join in the worship of the Anti-

christ? and when do they rise again "to live and reign with Christ," as Rev. xx. 4, expressly states they will do? There are surely not two resurrections of the saints, and Scripture clearly connects the reign of Antichrist (when he is to "make war with the saints and to overcome them") with "the time of Jacob's trouble." (Rev. xiii.; Dan. vii. xii.)

Perhaps a few remarks of the Rev. W. Burgh may be useful to some who are disposed to adopt the views of Mr. NORMAN:—

I agree not with an opinion recently advanced by some who have given attention to the subject of the Lord's coming, that the saints will be translated at, or prior to, the revelation of the Antichrist, so as to exempt them from all conflict or suffering from him, still less with the opinion which is connected with this as a necessary consequence, that a Jewish remnant have alone to do with Antichrist. I believe such an expectation to be contradicted at once by the analogy or type of Scripture, by the object for which Antichrist is revealed, and by the express testimony of the New Testament, and especially by this book of Revelation I think I see the device of the enemy coming in by means of the opinion I have thus briefly touched upon, to endeavour to hinder the practical results to the Church of our day, and of this dispensation, which were to be anticipated from the revived preaching of the coming of Antichrist as well as of Christ, as though he said "Do not be alarmed, this is not for you, but for the Jews: you have suffered enough, and yours shall be the crown without the cross." He is using "the meeting of one extreme by another," between which the truth falls to the ground. For some few years ago the universal doctrine was, that the Apocalypse was altogether the book of the Gentile Church and now we are threatened with as great a prevalence of the opinion that the Gentiles have nothing to do with it.

I have extracted the above passages from amongst many. ψ. η. ζ.

2 Peter i. 2. Vol. IV. 79.—The passage in 2 Pet. i. 1 is a sufficient proof how groundless is the Socinian assertion, as stated by MR. DUNCAN.

Its literal and correct rendering undoubtedly is "of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ;" and why our version does not so give it is not apparent; especially when we consider how the exactly similar constructions found in chap. i. 11, iii. 18, of this same epistle are translated. In both these verses no one can deny that *του Κυριου ημων και σωτηρος* refers to *Ιησου Χριστου*, but substitute *Θεου* for *Κυριου*, and the Socinian sees a difficulty at once.

Although perhaps our translators have rendered this passage somewhat loosely, yet we can hardly suppose that they understood *του Θεου ημων και σωτηρος* of two distinct persons, any more than they could have meant in Eph. v. 20, where they translate "unto God and the Father," to indicate any change of person.

If the Apostle Peter had intended to mark a

change of person, the article must needs have been repeated before *σωτηρος* (cf. Acts xxvi. 30; 1 John ii. 21.). Its absence clearly proves that the whole passage is to be understood of Christ alone (cf. ii. 20; iii. 2), in accordance with the usage of the language. The rule is, that where "two or more attributives joined by a copulative or copulatives are assumed of the same person or thing the article is inserted before the first attributive, but omitted before the remaining ones."

Titus ii. 13, is another strong and decisive proof of our Lord's divinity. In this case also the absence of the article before *σωτηρος* supports and justifies its being rendered thus, "Our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ." Independently of this, it is worthy of remark that the word *εμφανεια*, when referring, as in this instance, to the Day of Judgment, or the Second Advent, is invariably used of Christ.

The only difference between this passage and the one in St. Peter is the position of *ημων*, which however does not affect the sense of the passage, as it is quite unimportant after which noun it is placed.

A LAYMAN.

Not having seen the pamphlet to which your Correspondent, Mr. DUNCAN, refers, I am unable to form any opinion of its title to be considered as "clever;" but I doubt not it bears the "image and superscription" which are impressed on all similar productions. To those who deny the Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ nothing is more easy than to extract passages from the Word having relation to His humanity, and urge them as arguments against His divinity; but I am surprised that your Correspondent can quote nothing more from the two Epistles of St. Peter to show that he was not an Unitarian than the first verse of his second Epistle. That the words *του Θεου ημων και σωτηρος* *Ιησου Χριστου* ought to be rendered "of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ," there would seem to be little doubt; but it is of no avail to argue with Unitarians upon the authority of disputed or doubtful readings. Prejudice is not so easily overcome; and unless something more clear can be urged from the two Epistles of St. Peter than the passage referred to, I fear the Unitarian will consider that he has the best of the argument. A diligent and unprejudiced reader of the two Epistles cannot fail however to discover the hollowness of the assertion that St. Peter does not in either of them speak of Christ as God. Let me ask, could the Apostle have regarded Christ as a mere man, when he tells us that the Spirit of Christ was in the Prophets—a statement which, if he was not then in being, is without meaning and would be little less than blasphemy? The word which the Apostle preached was, he tells us, "the word of the Lord, which endures

for ever" (ch. i. 25), and this word he exhorts those to whom he writes, to desire, if so be they have tasted that the Lord is gracious (ch. ii. 2, 3). Now as no being can be "gracious," or has grace to bestow, but God, it follows that Christ has this attribute of God, "He is gracious;" and that the Apostle speaks this of Christ, is apparent from the fourth verse, "To whom coming as unto a living stone," &c. Again, Christ is said to be "a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence" to the disobedient (ch. ii. 8); the Apostle there referring to Isa. viii. 14, and upon looking at the thirteenth verse of that chapter, it will be seen that He who is the "stone of stumbling" is no other than "the Lord of Hosts."

Again, in the twenty-fourth verse of the second chapter, the Apostle speaking of the atonement which Christ had made for his people (what does the Unitarian say to this and the passage chap. i. 18, 19?), he tells them in the twenty-fifth verse that they are now returned to the Shepherd and Bishop of their souls, thereby plainly referring to Christ; but if Christ be a mere man, of what advantage is it to His people that He is their Shepherd and Bishop, if he have not the attributes of Deity (ubiquity, omnipotence, &c.) by which to sustain and keep them? Moreover, how could the Apostle, who must have heard from our Lord's lips the description which he gave (Matt. xxv.) of His coming to judgment (the whole of which, unless he possess all the essential attributes of God, is shocking blasphemy) have believed our Lord to be a mere man, when he tells us (ch. iv. ver. 5) that we shall give account to Him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead? In the second Epistle, chapter i. the Apostle prays that grace and peace may be multiplied unto them through the knowledge of God and of Jesus our Lord, according as His divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain to life and godliness, through the knowledge of Him (that is Christ, see the eighth verse) who has called us to glory and virtue; and then, after exhorting believers to give all diligence, &c., he adds, "for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." Now, it may reasonably be asked, if the Apostle believed that Christ has an everlasting kingdom, did he not also believe that He was a King? Can any creature have a heavenly kingdom? Has Moses, has Gabriel, have the angels a kingdom? Further, let me ask is it not evident that the Apostle speaks of Christ in the third chapter (second Epistle), from verse 2 to the sixteenth? Does he not speak of Him as the Lord "with whom a thousand years are but as one day?" Is not the day of His appearing called "the day of God?" and is it not His long suffering that is accounted salvation? and what shall we—what does the Unitarian say in his

pamphlet to the ascription of "glory now and for ever" to our blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ? Alas for Unitarianism if Peter be one of its witnesses! But apart from his two Epistles was he a Unitarian when, before selecting a successor to Judas, he joined the other Apostles in prayer to Christ (Acts i. 24, 25), saying, "Thou Lord which knowest the hearts of all men shew whether of these two thou hast chosen," &c., or when he told the high priest that Christ was exalted to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins which none but God could give (Acts v. 31, 32)? But I am exceeding the limits you allow. Permit me, however, to add that I should not have said so much had I not thought that your Correspondent takes it for granted that St. Peter's Epistles have nothing more to oppose to the flimsy assertions of the Unitarian than the verse to which he refers.

Lincoln's Inn.

J. R.

Greek Testaments. Vol. IV. 16, 57.—Professor TISCHENDORF's letter is so moderate as to call for few remarks. Textual critics have to beware of confounding their own private judgment about readings with God's authority in His Word. For instance, Professor TISCHENDORF's seventh edition acknowledges much to be Scripture which his previous editions had hesitated about or discarded. Of course I am rejoiced at a change for the better; but, where such changing is habitual and extensive, it is impossible to reconcile it with the respect which is due to God's Word. It is not true that we have to choose only between the authority of Rome and the vacillations or the systems of particular critics. The Roman, Greek, and other churches have handed down certain writings as divinely inspired; they have not been as faithful keepers of holy writ as became them; they have admitted, accredited, and perpetuated mutilations, additions, and blemishes. The critics have undertaken to separate the wheat from the chaff, and they as a body have failed as egregiously, and more daringly, than the churches of the West and East as to the sacred deposit. I do not therefore allow the force of the Professor's dilemma, because I believe not merely in Providence (not at all in critical infallibility), but in the guidance of the Holy Ghost, who is not unfrequently forgotten, and especially, I must say, by editors. Few have followed in the path of that godly pioneer, Bengelius.

As to Mr. WILKINSON, I regret that he should have put so exaggerated a construction upon my opinion of his book. I in no way supposed, or meant to convey, that his confidence is not in the Lord Jesus Christ. But his "University Sermons," kindly forwarded to remove my impression, leaves no doubt on my mind that he does not understand the hope of the Christian and the

Church as set forth in the New Testament. The very text (Phil. i. 23) on which his discourse on hope is founded shows this, and it is proved throughout by all that follows. I deny that our hope is to depart and to be with Christ. It is a blessed truth and comfort doubtless, but our hope is the exact converse: it is Christ's coming for us, that we, body, soul, and spirit, may be ever with Him. Scripture lays the utmost stress on the return and presence of the Lord as the proper hope of the Church. If we are unclothed and absent from the body, to join the Lord, it is far better; but till Christ comes, and whether here or in heaven, we have not our hope in possession, but wait for it. The "millennial earthly reign" is not the Church's hope any more than the disembodied state. Both views, I am persuaded, impair and obscure the truth; both are substitutions for the proper hope of the heavenly saints. Of course no Christian denies the Lord personally to be our hope; but the question at issue recurs—Does not God's Word uniformly present as the hope Christ's coming, and not our going individually in the separate state? If Mr. WILKINSON persists in regarding this as a mere "accident," or temporary mode and circumstance, my conviction is that such a reply justifies my accusation. The true and apostolic hope is not found, but another which is not another—a blessed spring of joy to the departing or anticipating spirit beyond question, but as truly an usurper, if it supersedes the scriptural hope, as are the sacraments when Rome puts them in lieu of simple living faith for justifying a sinner. When we reject sacramentalism as false, they charge us with calumny, and maintain that they too hold justification by faith. But not more surely does the Romanist darken and virtually deny the justification of the ungodly by faith, than does Mr. WILKINSON's system set aside our true and proper hope, by putting in its room the intermediate presence of departed saints with the Lord. I do not forget that it is an error which began early enough, and which is held alas! by the mass of professing and by many real Christians. But God's Word is so express that we owe it to Him to state boldly what we know is the truth, and what we know is not, especially if we are looking for the Saviour from heaven, as the scripturally proximate no less than proper hope of the Church.

WILLIAM KELLY.

Gehenna. Vol. IV. 25.—In Mr. HARRISON's paper on Acts ii. 27, the following sentence occurs: "No doubt Hades includes both Paradise, or Abraham's bosom, and *γεέννα* the place of torment." This statement is not correct, I think, for Hades is always represented as the abode of disembodied souls, whereas Gehenna is always used to designate the place where the

bodies of the wicked again united to their souls shall be punished after the day of judgment. See Matthew v. 29, 30, and particularly Matthew x. 28, "Fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in Gehenna." See also Luke xii. 4, 5, and Mark ix. 43, &c.

Manchester.

WILLIAM CAINE.

The Lord's Supper. Vol. III. 91, 409, 452.—The observation at p. 410, that the washing of the disciples' feet took place after supper, is based on the incorrect translation in John xiii. 2, of "supper being ended." "Being begun" would be more correct. In addition to what I have written at p. 92, it may be observed that throughout John's gospel there is evident attention given to the order of time in which the events occurred.

P. L. W.

On the Lord's Supper. Vol. IV. p. 15.

The answer to this Query seems plain:—

1. The Lord's Supper is exclusively for the Lord's people.

2. There can be no doubt that some who are the Lord's people are not fully assured of being so. They are fully assured of one thing—that they love Christ.

3. Shall they, then, when their Lord says to them, "If ye love me, keep my commandments," be deprived of the privilege of obeying His dying command, "Do this, in remembrance of me," because they are not yet fully assured of their acceptance "in the beloved?"

Whatever the advocates of "close communion" may advance, most faithful ministers of Christ, I take it, would shrink from the responsibility of saying "nay" in such a case.

Crookes Parsonage.

C. G. COOMBE.

The Church.—F. L. W. asks that certain views, as to what "the Church" consists of, should be clearly stated. I cannot better fulfil this request than by giving the following extracts from a writer deeply versed in these subjects.

The Word of God presents to us a Church formed on earth by the power of the Holy Ghost come down from heaven when the Son of God sat down there in glory, having accomplished the work of redemption. This Church is one with its Head; it is the body whereof Christ, ascended on high and seated at the right hand of God, is the Head. (Eph. i. 20-23; ii. 14-22; iii. 5, 6; iv. 4-16; 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13; John xii. 32; xi. 52.) This same Spirit who, by the means of those whom God chose, had called sinners and communicated life to them, has also united them in one body, whose Head is the glorified Christ, and of which the Spirit Himself is the bond with Christ, and in which He serves as the bond between the members one with another. . . . The Church, then, is a body subsisting in unity here below, formed by the power of God, who gathers His children in union with Christ its Head; a

body which derives its existence and unity from the work and presence of the Holy Ghost come down from heaven as the consequence of the ascension of Jesus. What is described in Ephesians, and defined as the Church, is a state of things impossible to exist before the death and resurrection of Christ as its basis, and the presence of the Holy Ghost as its formative and maintaining power. Any definition we could give of it, according to Ephesians, supposes these two things. The Spirit of God, there, treats Jews and Gentiles as alike children of wrath, speaks of the middle wall of partition broken down by the cross of Jesus, the actual exaltation of Jesus above all principality and power, and us raised and exalted with Him; and both Jew and Gentile reconciled in one new man, in one body by the cross, and builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit; so that there is one body and one Spirit. It is declared, consequently, that "now unto principalities and powers in heavenly places is made known by the Church the manifold wisdom of God." There are two great truths dependent on this doctrine: the Church united to Christ in glory accomplished hereafter; and meanwhile, as far as existing or developed on earth, the habitation of God through the Spirit. This is its calling, of which it is to walk worthy; a calling clearly impossible from its very nature, till the descent of the Holy Ghost made it such an habitation.

That the saints will all be gathered into everlasting blessedness as partaking of Christ as their life, and redeemed by His blood, according to the counsels of God, and conformed to the image of His Son, is owned. They are all redeemed by blood, and all quickened by divine life. But the doctrine insisted on is this: that, Christ having broken down the middle wall of partition by His death, and ascended up on high, and sat down on the right hand of God, and thus presented the full efficacy of His work in the presence of God, the Holy Ghost has come down and united believers in one body, thus united to Christ as one body; which body is in Scripture designated the Church, or assembly of God, and is His habitation through the Spirit. In this, as founded on the risen and exalted Saviour, and united to Him, as seen on high, by the Holy Ghost, there is neither Jew nor Greek. Christ, as exalted, is entirely above these distinctions; Jew or Greek are alike brought nigh, as having been children of wrath, by the blood of that cross by which the middle wall of partition has been broken down. Hitherto God had saved souls. At Pentecost He gathered His children into the assembly on earth; He added daily to the Church such as should be saved. It is no longer salvation merely, nor even the kingdom. God begins to form His Church here below (Acts ii).

To make the Church a company of believing Jews, with Gentiles added to them, and Abraham's seed their proper definition, entirely shuts out this divine teaching, because the position given to the Church in Ephesians entirely precludes their being looked at as Jews; and the character of "Abraham's seed" comes in merely to shew they are true heirs of promise, because they are Christ's, who is the seed of Abraham and Heir of the promises. But, most clearly, this is altogether the lower ground on which to speak of Christ, in comparison with His glorious exaltation at the right hand of God, on which the Church as such is founded. No one

can read the Ephesians attentively without seeing that the Church, as one body existing on earth, though heavenly in privilege and character, takes its place consequent on the work of the cross, the exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of God, and the coming down of the Holy Ghost. Hence to give any definition of the Church which implies its existence (other than in the counsels of God), which speaks of its existence on earth (e. g. during the life of Christ on earth, or previous to His exaltation and the descent of the Holy Ghost), denies its nature, and sets aside its character. Those who compose the Church have other relationships besides. They are children of Abraham. But these latter characters do not weaken what has been stated, much less do they annul it. 1 Cor. xii. describes the Church as one body on earth. So Eph. i. 4, Col. i. iii. While then one would sympathise with the godly dread some may feel at anything which seems to affect the salvation of all saints from the beginning, and the electing love of God in respect of them, it is well, on the other hand, to call things by their right, i. e. scriptural, names. The Spirit of God is infinitely wiser than man, and our business is to see, follow, and admire His wisdom, as in other matters, so here. He has restricted the title "Church of God," in a New Testament sense, to those who are baptised with the Holy Ghost.

Such is a brief exposition of the views in question, which, to my mind, carry scriptural proof along with them. But what I contend is, that the view which makes the Church of God embrace believers in all dispensations is wholly devoid of such proof. F. L. W. considers that the quotations made (Vol. III. p. 149) on Eph. iv. 4, have never been answered. Mr. BICKERSTAFF there states as the grounds for his opinion, that "all saints are equally and similarly justified by faith alike called saints the names of all written in one book, the Book of Life." These similarities, which are not denied, are by no means inconsistent with the place of the Church as the body and bride of Christ. But when Mr. B. pronounces that "the new Covenant Church" (a term not found in Scripture) "has no higher place assigned it than participating in the blessings of faithful Abraham," he sets aside the entire teaching of Scripture, above referred to (in Eph. Col. &c.); and the statement that all "are joint partakers in the blessings, &c." is what F. L. W. terms "mere assertion." When Mr. B. writes, "till we all come to the general assembly, &c." he attempts to mix two unconnected passages. As to Heb. xii. 22, 23, Dr. Bloomfield adopts, with the best critics from Bengel to Vater, Kuinoel, and Scholz, the punctuation *καὶ μυρισσιν, ἀγγέλων πανηγυρεῖ, καὶ ἐκκλησία κ.τ.λ.* He says, "This is required by the structure of the whole portion, of which each paragraph is commenced by *καὶ*, &c." So that the attempt to make this passage shew "the general assembly" and "the Church" as identical is a failure. F. L. W. says that he reads of

"the Church in the Wilderness." But *ἐκκλησία* simply means an "assembly" or "congregation." In Acts xix. 32, 39, 41, the confused meeting of the Ephesians cannot mean the Church of God, yet it is called *ἡ ἐκκλησία*. So "the Church in the Wilderness" ought rather to have been "the assembly" there. It means, unquestionably, not the Church of God, but the congregation of Israel, almost all of whose carcasses fell in the wilderness, and to whom God swore that they should not enter into His rest. F. L. W. says, "Besides, He was slain from the foundation of the world." A comparison of this passage (Rev. xiii. 8) with Rev. xvii. 8, where the same persons and circumstances are referred to, makes it evident that "from the foundation of the world" should be connected, not with "the Lamb slain," but with "the names written in the Book of Life." I think I have thus shewn that the arguments, whether of Mr. BICKERSTAFF or F. L. W., have no weight when examined. And yet they are among the principal ones against the views which, in my opinion, Scripture so plainly sets forth, viz. that the body of believers, gathered from the day of Pentecost until the time when Christ shall come to take his heavenly people to Himself, has, while sharing many fundamental blessings with all the redeemed, a distinct calling and privileges of its own, and alone has the title assigned to it of "the Church of God." G. W. GIPPS.

Hymn. Why do you weep. Vol. III. 102, 147, 343, 408.

I hear that Miss Emily Robertson's volume of Hymns, &c. is reprinting by Messrs. Nisbet, but I cannot vouch for the correctness of the report. F. L. W.

The Querist.

Ezekiel xlv. 15.—And one lamb out of the flock, out of two hundred, out of the fat pastures of Israel; for a meat-offering, and for a burnt-offering, and for peace-offerings, to make reconciliation for them, saith the Lord God.

It certainly seems most natural to explain these chapters relating to the temple, in their literal sense; but how do those who take this view explain this passage, in which it is declared that the sacrifices are offered "to make reconciliation" (see also verse 17)? It appears from chapter xlv. 9, that no uncircumcised person shall enter into God's "sanctuary." Is this sanctuary a particular part of the temple?

F. P., Trinity College, Cambridge.

Acts xxiii. 3-5.—Is there not an apparent contradiction in St. Paul's conduct when he reviles Ananias as his judge (and acknowledges him to

be such in verse 3), yet says as his apology that had he known who he was he would not have done so? St. Paul quotes Exod. xxii. 28, which refers to temporal "gods" (or "judges," margin). How was it that St. Paul did not know the high priest?

Some commentators render the word "wist" "considered," so that the passage would read thus: "I considered not" (being carried away by my anger) "that he was the high priest." I should be glad to know if this reading is admissible? S. A. D.

1 Corinthians xiv. 22, 24. But prophesying serveth not for them that believe not, but for them which believe (v. 22). But if all prophesy, and there come in one that believeth not, or one unlearned, he is convinced of all, he is judged of all (v. 24).

Will some of your readers kindly endeavour to reconcile the above two passages? Commentators generally do not appear to me to do so. Poole says, on 22nd verse, "the meaning is, not only for them that believe not." If the word "only" may be understood, the sense is clear. But Chrysostom, perhaps, gives a better sense—the word "serveth" not being in the original, he interprets it thus: "Prophesying is not for a sign (as the unknown tongue) to them that believe not."

Liverpool.

C. GROVE.

2 Corinthians iii. 17. Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.

What does this mean? I cannot help thinking there are some who are truly "born of God," who are yet in miserable bondage, continually doubting their acceptance. If this be so, I cannot have understood the above passage of the word, and desire to be helped. It stands in my mind in connection with the positive declaration, "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His." LERL.

Revelation ix. 4. *Καὶ οἱ τινες οὐ προσεκύνησαν τὴν θηρίῳ οὔτε τῇ εἰκονὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἔλαβον τὸ χάραγμα ἐπὶ τὸ μέτωπον αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτῶν.*

ALFORD says, Vol. II. 73, "the use of *οἱ τινες*, instead of *οἱ*, occurs when the clause introduced by it contains a further explanation of the position or classification of the person or persons alluded to." Is *οἱ τινες* so used in this verse (Rev. xx. 4)? Are they who had not worshipped the beast nor his image, and had not received the mark upon their forehead and upon their hand, the same persons as those who were beheaded for the witness of Jesus? According to the use of *οἱ τινες*, alluded to by ALFORD, it would appear that they were the same, and that the clause introduced by *οἱ τινες* contains a further explanation

of the position of the persons alluded to in the former part of the verse. In Rev. ii. 24, we have *οσοι ουκ εχουσι την διδαχην ταυτην, και ουτινες ουκ εγνωσαν τα βαθα του Σαρανα*. The clause introduced by *και ουτινες* contains a further explanation of the position of the persons mentioned before "who have not this doctrine." Mr. KELLY, KNYPERSLEY, and Mr. WORTHINGTON, in Vol. II. 126, 127, think that there are two classes mentioned, "one beheaded for the witness of Jesus and for the word of God, the other refusing the worship and the mark of the beast." Is their explanation correct? W. CAINE.

The Critic.

The Worth of the Soul; a Sermon, &c. By the Rev. Henry Woodward. Oakey.

The worth of the Soul, as compared with the whole world, is well and strongly put in this sermon. But there is a great want in it also. We doubt not, from its whole tenor, that Mr. Woodward is in the habit of preaching Christ to perishing sinners, as the only way of salvation. In this discourse, however, while every effort is made to rouse sinners from the lethargy into which they may have fallen, the Lamb of God is not pointed out to them with sufficient distinctness. We think no address to sinners ought ever to close without a clear state-

ment—and there are many ways of making it—of what the sinner, if touched by grace, has to do—"to repent and believe the Gospel"—to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and he shall be saved. We say this, because we are often grieved at hearing an able sermon lacking in this one point.

Notices to Correspondents.

All Correspondents writing for the "ANNOTATOR" or "REPLICANT" must send us their real names; not necessarily for publication, but for our own information and safeguard. *Papers not thus authenticated will be invariably laid aside.* We allow more latitude in the "QUERIST" department.

Every paper should commence with the text or subject commented upon, written distinctly at the head of the article. Reference should then be made to the page or pages where the subject has been before noticed, and to which the reply, if it be one, is sent. Queries should have the text prefixed from the Authorised Version, or else should have such a heading as the Replicants can with ease refer to.

Every separate article should be written on a separate piece of paper, to allow of our arranging them in Scripture sequence.

We cannot return manuscripts sent to us for publication.

Just Published, Vol. III. well bound in cloth. Price 9s.

Vols. I., II., and III. Price 26s. 6d.

Published this day, Quarterly Part XIII. containing Nos. 91 to 96, neatly stitched in a wrapper. Price 1s. 6d.

All Communications to be addressed to THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN ANNOTATOR, care of Messrs. NISBET and Co. 21, Berners Street, Oxford Street.

All communications respecting the supply of the ANNOTATOR, as well as all Post-office Orders, or enclosures of Stamps, to be addressed to the publishers, Messrs. NISBET and Co. 21, Berners Street, Oxford Street.

Now ready, Eighth Thousand, small crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. cloth.

MEMORIALS OF CAPTAIN HEDLEY VICARS, 97th Regiment. By the Author of "The Victory Won." London: JAMES NISBET & Co. 21, Berners Street.

Nearly ready, Third Edition, crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

A MEMOIR of the Rev. J. J. WEITBRECHT, late Missionary of the Church Missionary Society in Bengal. Compiled by His Widow, from his Journals and Letters. With a Preface, by the Rev. H. VENN, M.A. London: JAMES NISBET & Co. 21, Berners Street.

Recently published, Third Edition, crown 8vo. 6s. cloth.

INCIDENTS in the LIFE of our SAVIOUR: Illustrative of His Divine Character and Mission. By the Rev. A. L. E. FOOTE, Brechin. London: JAMES NISBET & Co. 21, Berners Street.

This day is published, Third Edition, crown 8vo. 5s. cloth.

THE FOOTSTEPS OF ST. PAUL: being a Life of the Apostle, designed for Youth. By the Author of "The Faithful Promiser," &c. With many Illustrations. London: JAMES NISBET & Co. 21, Berners Street.

This day, Eighth Edition, 12mo. 6s. 6d. cloth.

BASKETS OF FRAGMENTS; or, Notes from Sermons preached by the Rev. Thomas Jones, of Crenton. By Miss PLUMPTRE. London: JAMES NISBET & Co. 21, Berners Street.

Second Edition, 18mo. 1s. cloth.

LITTLE CHILD'S BOOK of DIVINITY: or, Grandmamma's Stories about Bible Doctrines. By the Author of "The Faithful Promiser." London: JAMES NISBET & Co. 21, Berners Street.

Twenty-second Edition, fcap. 5s. cloth.

THE RETROSPECT; or, a Review of Providential Mercies. With Anecdotes of Various Characters, and an Address to Naval Officers. By the Rev. RICHARD MARKS. London: JAMES NISBET & Co. 21, Berners Street.

This day is published, price 6d.

A CONSPECTUS of the VARIOUS EVIDENCE CONFIRMING the DIVINE AUTHORITY of the GOSPEL: with an Attempt to Assign the True Place to the Inquirer and the Inquiry. By D. WALTER. London: JAMES NISBET & Co. 21, Berners Street.

This day is published, price 8d.

THE APPLE OF DISCORD: is the Christian Sabbath an Ecclesiastical or Divine Record? Being the Arguments (put against) of the most celebrated Controversialists on the subject. Condensed by an M.A. of Cambridge.

London: JAMES NISBET & Co. 21, Berners Street.

This day is published, price 1s. 6d. a cheap Edition of

MEMORIALS of CAPTAIN HEDLEY VICARS, of the 97th Regiment. London: JAMES NISBET & Co. and all Booksellers.

This day is published, crown 8vo. 5s. cloth.

A MEMOIR of the late CAPTAIN ALLEN GARDINER, R.N. By the Rev. J. W. MARSH, Vicar of Bleasly, Notts. London: JAMES NISBET & Co. 21, Berners Street.

Just Published, demy 8vo. in a nont cover, Price 3s.

SKETCH of a COPTIC GRAMMAR, adapted for Self-Tuition. By W. B. MACDONALD, of Rammerscales. Edinburgh: W. H. LIZARS. London: GEORGE PHILIP & SON, 32, Fleet Street: and all Booksellers.

INDEX TO VOLUME IV.

INDEX OF SIGNATURES AND SUBJECTS.

PAGE		PAGE		PAGE	
A.		C		D.	
A. (C.) On Early Missionary		C. (F. T.) Isaiah liii. 6	54	Darton (T. G.) Luke xvi. 9	100
Movements	63	Cabul, Land of	20	Dawson (J.) Rev. xxii. 3, 39	88
Aleph. On Justification,		Caine (Rev. W.) Esau	79	Dell (R.) Gen. xxii. 10—13	33
2 Cor. v. 21	94	Gehenna	109	Dibdin (Rev. R. W.) Justi-	
Antichrist, The	77	Visit of the Magi	80	fication	2
Αρχηστος. Rom. v. 15	92	Gen. xv. 2	95	Acts xxvi. 18	44
		Deut. xxvii. 2—4	29	Difference between John's and	
		Deut. xxviii. 68	89	Christ's baptism	47, 58
B.		1 Chron. v. 2	62	Divinity of Christ	20
B. On Hymnology	79	Prov. xiv. 24	90	Dowe (Rev. P.) Rome and	
β.β. On Isaiah liii. 8	99	Isaiah x. 27	62	Israel. Rom. xi 17—26	100
Mark xi. 13	100	Rev. xvi. 12	63	Dream, Jacob's	19
Mark xvi. 3, 4	100	Rev. xx. 4	112	Duncan (Rev. J.) 2 Peter i. 1	79
B. (P. G. D.) On 2 Cor. x.		Rev. xxi. 8	31		
7—18	68	Calling, Heavenly	87	E.	
B. (T. R.) On 2 Cor. iii. 16	19	Calvin and Servetus	39	E. and C. Numbers i. 52	99
Bagge (Rev. H. T.) On Jus-		Cashel (Bishop of) Acts ii. 27	7	Numbers, ii. 2	99
tification,		Christ, Divinity of	20	Isaiah, i. 6	84
2 Cor. v. 21, 26	53	— Righteousness of	79	Jerem. xlix. 23	95
Rom. v. 12—21	75	Child (Rev. J. Glyn)		Early Missionary Movements	63
2 Cor. iii. 16	57	Psalms xvii. 14	13	Echlin (Rev. J. R.) Rev. viii.	
Baldey (Rev. F.) On Bengel's		Church, The 15, 49, 59, 109		13	30
Gnomon	14	Of God	47	Editor's Notes—	
Baptism, The difference be-		Conscience	101	Bengel's Gnomon	14
tween John's and Christ's	58	Coombe (Rev. G. C.) Greek		Matt. xii. 8	4
Baylee (Rev. Josh.) On Jowett		Testament	15	John xviii. 15	14
on the Epistles	34	The literal Interpretation of		Edwards (Rev. Z. J.)	
On Proverbs, xiv. 24	54	Unfulfilled Prophecy	61	Matt. xi. 28	90
Beddy (Rev. J. F.) On Hone		The Lord's Supper	109	Matt. xiii. 24, &c.	14
the Bookseller	47	Mark i. 24	55	John v. 32—47	37
Deut. xxviii. 68	12	Critic (The)—Books noticed—		Eph. iv. 19	76
1 Tim. i. 13	46	Abuse of the Decalogue	16	1 Tim. v. 24, 25	27
Beta (R. Beta.) On Con-		Bible Treasury	16	Ellis (C.) The Lord's Supper	45
science	101	Christ is all, by Archdeacon		Esau	79
Dan. ix. 27, 28	13	Law	16	Eternal Death	46
Matt. xvi. 18	29	The Friends of Christ in the			
Beth. Acts, xxi. 4	62	New Testament	16		
Col. i. 13	77	The Worth of the Soul, by			
Bengel's Gnomon	14, 28	Rev. H. Woodward	112	F.	
Biblicus. On Son of God and		Cross, Sayings on the	21	F. (T.) On Zech. xiii. 8, 9	62
Son of Man	45	— The	60	Fall of Man	97
Bonar Horatius. On Stran-				Fasting	60
gers	65	D.		Finlayson (Rev. J.) On Tem-	
Rom. xvi. 4	18	D. (A. S.) Acts xxiii. 3—5	111	ple of Janus	77
Brooke (Rev. H. E.) Col. i. 18	9	D. (S. T. C. D.) Kai	63	Fysh (Rev. F.) On Gen. 1, 2	70
Browne (Wm.) Col. i. 13	30	1 Thess. iv. 1, 2	14	On Gen. xii. 10	5
Col. i. 18	106	D. (W.) Matt. vii. 8	4	On Prov. xiv. 24	41
Buckton (T. J.) The Cross	60	Luke vi. 36—39	25	On Matt. xii. 40	90, 98
Luke ii. 40	25				

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Fysh (Rev. F.) On Gal. iii. 17	86	Inspiration	69	M. (Hy.) On Matt. xiii.	14
On Hebrews, xi. 24	41	Israel and Rome	100	McGhee (Rev. R. J.) On the Lord of Glory	1
		J.		Macness (Rev. Geo.) On Isaiah i. 13	79
G.		J. (M. C.) On Rom. vi. 3, 4	63	On Matt. xi. 13	62
Gamma. On the Lord's Supper	15	J. (M. S.) On Lookings	4	On Matt. xiii. 24	23
Gehenna	109	On Sayings on the Cross, Luke xxiii.	21	On Acts xxi. 4	103
Gipps (G. W.) On the Church	111	On Psalm cx. 1; 1 Cor. xv. 26 and Rev. xx. 14	13	Madden (S.) On the Times of the Gentiles	2
The Son of God and Son of Man	27	On John x. 10	67	Magi, The Visit of	79
Girdlestone (Rev. Henry) On the Atonement	12	On Rom. ix. 6	86	McIlwaine (Rev. W.) On Ps. xvi.	35
On Jacob's Dream	20	Jacob's Dream	19	Man, Son of, and Son of God	27, 45
On Gen. iii. 1	98	Janus, The Temple of	31, 77	Man, The Fall of	97
On Matt. viii. 23—34	50	Jesus, The Testimony of	37	Miller (Jas. N.) On Rom. iii. 30	52
On Rom. ix. 27—29	76	Jews, The Restoration of	46	Missionary Movements, Early	63
On Rev. xviii. 1—3	31	Johnston (R.) On Matt. xvi. 18	85	Myers (Rev. T.) On the Land of Cabul, 1 Kings ix. 13	10
On Rev. xx. 9	95	On Mark i. 24	74	On Gen. xii. 10	89
Greek Testament	15, 28, 57, 108	On Romans v. 15—17	44	On Heb. xi. 21	10
Grove (C.) On 1 Cor. xiv. 22—24	111	On Romans vi. 2—5	68		
H. (T.) On the Power of the Hebrew Tenses	35	On James i. 17	45		
On Deut. xxviii. 68	22	Jowett on the Epistles	33		
On Exodus v. 9	51	Justification	2, 25, 44		
On Psalm xvii. 14	40			N.	
On Psalm lxviii. 9, 10	51	K.		Nihill (Rev. D.) On Matt. xvi. 28	5
On Psalm lxxx. 10	20	Kai	63	On Luke xxii. 36	6
On Psalm cviii. 1, 2	83	K. (R.) On Matt. xvi. 25, 26	5	On Rom. v. 12—21	104
On Psalm cviii. 6	99	Kelly (W.) On the Atonement	11	Norman (Robt. N.) On Matt. xiii. 24	91
On Matt. xxiv. 3	14	On the Greek Testament	29, 101	On 1 Cor. i. 30	106
On Luke xviii. 13	103	On the Church	59	On 2 Thess. ii. 2	45
On John viii. 51, 52, and xi. 26	74	On the Heavenly Calling	87		
On 1 Cor. i. 30	3	On the Veracity of Scripture	101	O.	
On 1 Cor. xv. 29	8	On Dan. ix. 27	71	Ω. On Hab. ii. 4	14
On Eph. iii. 15	9	On Matt. xiii.	72		
On 1 Tim. i. 1	69	On Romans v. 12—21	38		
Hall (Arthur.) On Psalm cx. 1; 1 Cor. xv. 26; and Rev. xx. 14	53	On 2 Cor. v. 9	8	P.	
On Dan. vii. 11	13	On Rev. v. 9, 10	11	P. (D. J.) On Rom. viii. 29, 31	55
Harrison (Rev. J.) On Matt. xvi. 18	54			P. (F.) On the literal Interpretation of Unfulfilled Prophecy	15
On Acts ii. 27	25	L.		On Eze. xlv. 15	111
On Romans vi. 3, 4	93	L. (C. R.) On Romans ix. and Gal. iv.	55	P. (H.) On Gen. i. 2	88
Heavenly Calling, The	87	Land of Cabul, The	20	P. (J. R.) On John, xviii. 15	62
Hebrew Tenses, The Power of the	35	Layman (A.) On the Atonement	11	Φιλος. On Gen. iv.	83
Highfield. On Mark iv. 31, 32	29	On Fasting	61	On 1 Sam. vi. 19	95
Hiles (J.) On Bengel's Gnomon	28	On Acts ii. 27	44	On Phil. iii. 13	95
On the Syriac Grammar	79	On 2 Peter, i. 2	107	Presbutes. On Mark iv. 31, 32	55
Hone, the Bookseller	46	Leel. On 2 Cor. iii. 17	111	Preston (Rev. Thos.) On the difference between John's and Christ's Baptism	58
Hymnology	79	Literal Interpretation of Unfulfilled Prophecy	15, 61, 78	On Acts xxvi. 18	21
Hymns	111	Lookings, On	4, 52	Proper Names in Scripture, On	4
		Lord of Glory, The	1		
		Lord's Supper, The	15, 45, 77, 109		
I.				R.	
I. (J. C.) On Mark i. 24	14			R. (J. G.) On Eternal Death	46
On John xv. 39	14	M.		On Exodus xii. 40	46
On John xviii. 15	14	M. (Hy.) On the Church of God	47		
Imputation	53				

iii

INDEX OF TEXTS.

Genesis, Book of, i. 2	70, 88	Psalms, xiv. 3	95	Isaiah, liii. 8	99
ii. 24	22	xvi. 34	34	lxiv. 4	84
iii. 1	97	xvii. 14	12, 40, 102	Jeremiah, xlix. 23	95
iv. 7	81	xxv. 6, 7	35	Ezekiel, xlv. 15	111
xii. 40	50	lxxx. 10	20	Daniel, vii. 2	13
xv. 2	95	lxxxviii. 9, 10	51	vii. 11	70
xxii. 10—13	33	xcix. 6	70	vii. 23	35
xxviii. 3	50	cx. 1	13, 22, 40, 53	ix. 27, 28	13, 71, 89
xxviii. 10—15	19	cxvii. 1, 2	83	Habakkuk, ii. 4	13
Exodus, v. 9	51	cxviii. 6	99	Zechariah, xiii. 8, 9	62
xii. 40	46, 70, 98	cxxxv. 15	41	Matthew, vii. 8	4
Numbers, i. 52	98	cxxxvi. 15	13	viii. 23—34	49
ii. 2	98	Proverbs, xiv. 24	3, 41, 54, 89	xi. 13	62, 90
xxii. 22	102	xxxi. 10	66	xi. 28	90
Deuteronomy, xxvii. 2—4	29	Ecclesiastes, iv. 9, 10	13	xii. 40	90
xxviii. 68	12, 22, 89	Isaiah, i. 6	83	xiii.	14, 41, 71
1 Samuel, vi. 19	95	i. 13	79	xiii. 24	14, 23, 90
1 Kings, ix. 13	20	x. 27	62	xvi. 18	29, 54, 85, 102
1 Chronicles, v. 2	61	liii. 6	23, 54	xvi. 25, 26	

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Matthew, xvi. 28	5	Romans, iii. 36	51	Ephesians iii. 15	8, 26
xxiv. 3	14, 23	v. 12—21	37, 74	iv. 19, 29	76
xxiv. 15	35, 72	v. 15—17	44, 94	Philippians, iii. 13	63, 94
xxiv. 34	62	v. 18—19	75	Collossians, i. 13	29, 57, 77
Mark, i. 24	14, 55, 73	vi. 2—5	67	i. 18	9, 27, 106
ii. 5—12	20	vi. 3, 4	63, 92	ii. 12	86
iv. 31	22, 29, 55, 102	vii. and viii.	38	1 Thessalonians, iv. 1, 2	14
xi. 13	99	viii. 19—22	7	2 Thessalonians, ii. 2	45, 106
xvi. 3, 4	99	ix. 6	86	1 Timothy, i. 1	68
Luke, ii. 40	24	ix. 24—26	15	i. 13	46
v. 36—39	25	ix. 27—29	76	v. 24, 25	27
vii. 28	74	ix.	56	vi. 17—19	69
xvi. 9	100	xv. 1—4	17	Hebrews, ii. 11	9
xviii. 13	42, 103	1 Corinthians, i. 30	3, 105	iii.	87
xxii. 36	5	xiv. 22—24	111	xi. 21	10
xxii. 44	6	xv. 1—3	93	xi. 24	21, 58
xxiii. 34	21	xv. 26	13, 53	xiii. 2	57
John, v. 32—47	37	xv. 51	86	James, i. 17	45
v. 39	14	xv. 29	8	2 Peter, i. 1	79
viii. 51, 52	46, 74	xv. 55	63	Revelations, v. 9, 10	11
x. 10	66	2 Corinthians, iii. 7—18	68	viii, 13	30
xi. 21—26	46, 74	iii. 16	18, 56	xii. 17 to xiii. 6	52
xviii. 15	14, 62	iii. 17	111	xiii. 1—3	30
xx. 19—26	74	v. 9	8	xvi. 12	63
Acts, ii. 17	6	v. 21—25	94	xx. 4	111
ii. 27	25, 42, 109	Galatians, iii. 17	86	xx. 9	95
xxi. 4	62, 103	iv. 27	56	xx. 14	13, 53
xxiii. 3—5	111	vi. 16	95	xxi. 8	31
xxvi. 18—21	44	Ephesians, ii. 3	100	xxii. 3	39