ARTICLE V.

A QUESTION OF INTERPRETATION.

BY THE REV. J. M. STIFLER, D. D.

THE question is not about a single text nor a group of texts on a single subject. It is broad and underlies the whole Bible, a question that confronted Paul in every synagogue from Antioch to Rome: *Does Christianity displace and take the place of Judaism?* Was Judaism the egg from which the bird having been hatched, the shell has served its final purpose, and must now mingle with the soil and disappear? Or if this antithesis is too sharp, was Judaism the draft of the great temple of Christianity, so that the temple having now been erected, the draft serves only to explain and illustrate it? To one who reads the Epistle to the Ephesians, and especially the Epistle to the Galatians and the Epistle to the Hebrews, the affirmative would appear to be the only possible answer. The Epistle to the Hebrews seems to be decisive. "In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old, is ready to vanish away" (Heb. viii. 13). The shell must perish after the bird is hatched. Again we read in Hebrews, "For the priesthood being changed," changed from the order of Aaron to that of Melchisedec, "there is made of necessity a change also in the law" (Heb. vii. 12). The outline draft in Moses may seem to illustrate and explain the new, but the new is said to supersede it. The Aaronic law was suited only to the Aaronic priesthood, and Jesus did not belong to that descent, but to a higher and better.

Digitized by Google

But while Christianity sprang from Judaism, there are such radical differences between the two that there can hardly be said to be an evolution. They have the same God, the same means of approach to him, faith in the Messiah, and certainly in the first days of the church the same Bible, though each party contended that the other misread the sacred rolls. But beyond this there were striking differences. Judaism was the religion of a nation. Christianity was the religion of all nations or rather of none. It made a new nation in which "there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is no male and female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal. iii. 28). Nationality was vital in Judaism; it could not be tolerated in Christianity. In the former blood was everything; in the latter nothing.

Again, the constituents of Judaism were determined by birth. All who were born in the line of Isaac belonged to the kingdom. In Christianity the constituency is determined by a divine election. Judaism was an oak growing from the ground, thrusting out its limbs from the parent trunk. Election was repugnant to its idea. Christianity was a temple built of selected stones with no natural and necessary relation before they were laid.

Again, the Old Testament everywhere gave Judaism supremacy among the nations. It had promise of headship. When Messiah came he was to deliver the Jew from all his enemies. With this in mind the apostles, even after the resurrection, ask Jesus: "Wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" The church was given no such charter. Rather, like its Founder, it was to be the servant of all, and to be a suffering church. Jesus taught the apostles: "If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you" (John xv. 20); "If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more them of his household" (Matt. x. 25). But the church, aside from its character as a suffering church, and its lack of a promise of world supremacy,

Digitized by Google

had this fundamental principle of election in its constitution which made its universal sway impossible. There could be election *from* the world, but how can an elect church ever take in the world?

A fourth distinction might be named. Judaism was connected with a particular land which it hoped to possess. "Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth." The church has no promise of inheriting any land. Its reward is in heaven. But I cannot consider this line any further than to say that Dr. David Brown, of Aberdeen, in a masterly monograph, "The Restoration of the Jews," a book little known, declares that every argument for their restoration at all is also an argument for their restoration to their own country.

Now the sign of nationality and of birthright was circumcision. And the pledge of supremacy over the nations and of the lordship of the earth appeared to the Jew to be recorded on every page of his Bible. And around these points the opposition finally gathered, finally, for it was different at first. Persecution was slow in getting a foothold. It was limited at the beginning to the sect of the Sadducees. They were "grieved" because the apostles preached in Jesus the resurrection of the dead. But beyond a subsequent beating the apostles never had any serious trouble in Jerusalem. Even when Stephen was stoned and the church temporarily scattered, the twelve did not have to leave the city. Indeed the Sanhedrim seems to have lost its power to do anything against the church, for, after the first outbreak over Stephen's speech, there never was any trouble from the council again. It was about fifteen years after the ascension when James was beheaded, but his death was compassed, not by the Sanhedrim, but by the state: "Herod killed James the brother of John with the sword." For more than a quarter of a century, with these two exceptions in Stephen and James, the church lived peaceably in Jerusalem and Judæa, growing to

Digitized by Google

tens of thousands in numbers, with the chief of the apostles going and coming at his will, and with the first Christian council meeting within the walls about the year 50, and deliberating with as much composure as any similar body would find in any city of Christendom to-day.

But in the year 58 there came a violent outbreak. For the first time the Roman government must notice the new faith, and its soldiers, horse and foot (Acts xxiii. 23), are called out to reëstablish peace, and maintain it. The occasion was Paul's last visit to Judæa's capital. By this time the church, having spread over the Roman Empire, had developed into two different sections. The church in Jerusalem and in Judæa was composed of nothing but Jews. Everywhere else it was made up of men without any regard to nationality. James the Elder was the representative of the Jewish section, Paul the representative and apostle of the mixed or Gentile section. He comes to Jerusalem to visit James, and the record makes it very clear that the two men saw eye to eye. There was no antagonism between the leader of the Jewish Christians and the leader of the Gentiles. They would have answered our question, Does Christianity displace and take the place of Judaism?—this question they would have answered in the negative. For here was a Christian body in Jerusalem tens of thousands in number, and all zealous of the law, and there was the other section of which James at this very time said, "As touching the Gentiles which believe, we have written and concluded that they observe no such thing." The chiefs of the two extremes were in harmony, though one stood for pure Judaism and the other for that which "observed no such thing."

And yet this harmony did not touch the question before us. It was the harmony of compromise, the harmony of charity, and this harmony and this charity did not exist in the nation. Judaism as such was no party to it. It belonged wholly to the two wings of the church. It brought it to

Digitized by Google

pass that a Jew without surrendering anything that belonged outwardly to Judaism could be a Christian, and that a Gentile without becoming a Jew could be a Christian too. They agreed on the common platform of faith in Jesus as the Messiah, and that this faith need not affect or alter their previous national standing or connection. The Jew could remain a Jew, and the Gentile a Gentile, in the bounds of Christianity. Paul wrote very explicitly: "As the Lord hath called every one, so let him walk, . . . Is any man called being circumcised? let him not become uncircumcised. Is any called in uncircumcision? let him not be circumcised" (1 Cor. vii. 17, 18).

The relation of Jew and Gentile was the burning question in all the early years of the apostolic church, indeed down to the year 50 A.D. The Messiahship of Jesus hung on it. The unbelieving Jew seemed to think that he lost everything in embracing Christianity, and therefore Jesus could not be the promised one. The majority rejected him on this ground. And in due time the trouble arose in the church. As long as the church was confined to Jerusalem and Judæa there was peace; but when it spread abroad, and Gentiles in great numbers came, even the Jew in the church made a stand. The opposition took formal shape first in Antioch of Syria —no salvation outside of Judaism—circumcision absolutely necessary. The weight of this position and the force of its proposition is seen in the fact that Paul and Barnabas could not silence their opponents there. They all resort to Jerusalem, and here it was not readily adjusted. It was only after there had been much "discussion" that Peter arose and took up the debate. It is striking that he does not quote a word of Scripture. His argument was rather that, in spite of Scripture which could be freely quoted on the opposite side, God had indicated his will by what he had already done among them. He had accepted the Gentile household of Cornelius without circumcision. Barnabas and

Digitized by Google

Saul backed this up by relating what God had *done* with them in their recent and first missionary tour. And James followed with an interpretation of Peter and a quotation from Scripture—the first on this side in the council. James declared that the point of Peter's speech was that God had visited the Gentiles, not to take the whole of them, but an elect number "out of them" as a people for his name, and with this, he says, agree the words of the prophets; that is, the prophets agree with such an election. For it is "after this" that Judaism is to come to the front, and *all* the Gentiles are to seek after the Lord.

Now this did not settle the question in dispute. They reached a *modus vivendi*. The substance of it was that a Jew could remain a Jew, and a Gentile could remain a Gentile, for the present in the church. It was on the platform of this compromise that Paul and James came together in harmony eight years later in Jerusalem, one the leader of the Jews and the other the leader of the Gentiles, with no difference between them. The compromise still stood. James declared it stood. It stands to-day. We have never got beyond it. Pure Jewish churches might be organized to-day. And they do exist in a very limited number. There is no reason why a Jew on becoming a Christian should cease to be a Jew. Circumcision, the seventh day, the distinction in meats, have not been abolished for him. He scrupulously observed these things at the beginning of Christianity. There is no reason why he might not observe them now. The one only authoritative council which the church has ever had, met to consider this question, and it did not abolish Judaism for the Jew.

But while this compromise held in the church, those outside could not, and did not, accept it. Paul had no difference with James; but as soon as the city found out that the Apostle to the Gentiles was within its gates, it was in an uproar against him. For the city, and even the believers in

Digitized by Google

it, had been made to think in some way that Paul taught all the Jews among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, to refuse to circumcise their children, or to walk after the customs (Acts xxi. 21). To dissipate this slander, Paul, at the suggestion of James, takes upon himself, along with four others, the severe Nazarite vow that, as James said, "all may know . . . that thou thyself walkest orderly, and keepest the law" (Acts xxi. 24). Nothing can be plainer than that Paul did not think nor teach that Christianity was inconsistent with a walk according to the. customs of Moses. He walked so himself. He taught the believing Jews so to walk.

Why then was the city so mad against the apostle? Because it could not accept the compromise which held in the church. It looked upon that compromise as a permanent surrender of the great Jewish privileges of nationality, birthright, and supremacy. This compromise seemed merely to retain the husk while surrendering the kernel. For while it allowed Judaism, it denied that it was the condition of salvation, and insisted that the exclusive condition was faith in Christ and faith in him as raised from the dead. Such faith was universal. It knew no distinctions. It excluded boasting. It brought all peoples in on the same level. There might be compromise as to how a man might live in this faith, whether he should live as a Jew or live as a Gentile; but as to the faith itself, the ground of salvation, there could be no compromise. The very unity of the Godhead was involved here. There could not be one way of saving the Jew and a different way of saving the Gentile while God was one (Rom. iii. 30). The Jew insisted that that way was circumcision, which would conserve his supremacy. The church, and preëminently Paul, insisted that the one only way was faith in the risen and enthroned Christ. There was no objection to circumcision as a mode of living, but this did not satisfy Judaism when faith usurped the sole prerogative of salvation.

Digitized by Google

Here was Paul's problem, to establish salvation by faith while preserving the nation's rights. It is easily solved today by saying hastily that the Jew has none, that he has forfeited whatever he had. But if this solution were correct, Paul would have known it, and resorted to it. But when he is carefully read, it is seen that he not only declines this method of answering the Jew, but denies its validity.

He begins, as John the Baptist began long before him, by showing the worthlessness of circumcision to produce a moral life. Only he goes further than John the Baptist or even Jesus went in this line. He declares, "circumcision indeed profits if thou doest the law; but if thou art a transgressor of law, thy circumcision has become uncircumcision. And if the uncircumcision keep the [moral] requirements of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be reckoned for circumcision?" And worse yet for the Jew—"shall not the uncircumcision that is by nature if it fulfill the law"—its moral demands—"judge thee, who with the letter and circumcision art a transgressor of the law?" The asking of these questions answers them.

It is unthinkable that, for a mere *opus operatum* in the flesh, God gives license to sin, while for the lack of it he will condemn a moral Gentile. Paul follows this up by declaring that, in the eye of truth, "he is not a Jew who is one outwardly, nor is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew, who is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of the heart, in spirit not in letter, whose praise is not from men, but from God." That is, he who is only a Jew outwardly is a heathen, while the good and faithful heathen is a true Jew. Thus Paul wipes out Judaism and transfers its privileges to believing heathendom. So far he has plain sailing; but now comes the real difficulty in the objector's question, "What then is the advantage of the Jew [as such], or what is the profit of circumcision?" That is, what advantage is left to the Jew nationally? Faith in Je-

Digitized by Google

sus blots out his nationality and birthright by elevating the believing Gentile to his level. Indeed it does more—faith puts the Jew at a disadvantage; for, to remain a Jew and to be saved, he must observe Moses in addition to believing, while the Gentile is exempt from Moses.

It is little comfort to tell the descendant of Abraham that he can live as a Jew, and circumcise his children, and observe the Mosaic customs, while the Gentile can neglect all this and still stand as high as his Jewish brother. Circumcision with all it implied came from God. He took the descendants of Abraham for his own people, with a promise of a world-wide inheritance, which they had never yet reached. Unselfishness might concede that the inheritance had gone to the church, but Paul did not claim it for the church. The church was a narrow and select body, having representatives in every nation, but supremacy in none. It looked as if faith not only deprived the Jew of his promise, but destroyed the promise itself. And so Paul answers the question, What advantage has the Jew? What is left to him? This he answers emphatically, "Much every way." Much advantage in any light you look at it. This cannot mean less than an advantage over the church, the mixed body of believers. When Paul wrote these words, Christian churches were established all over the Roman Empire, churches that had realized the blessedness of the forgiveness of sins and the presence of Christ among them. And yet Paul does not hesitate to say that the Jew has an advantage over them, even "much advantage every way." But since the Jew was still in unbelief and in sin, Paul must mean that it was an advantage not yet realized. But whatever the advantage was, it is easy to see that it could not be reached by the Jew's acceptance of Christianity, for in Christianity as a system his advantage disappeared. It knew no Jew. This indeed was the question in debate, What advantage does Christianity leave to Judaism? If Paul answers, Much every

Digitized by Google

way, then Judaism must look elsewhere than to the church for that advantage. Paul tells just what the advantage is: "First, indeed, that they were intrusted with the oracles of God." And he startles us by saying, that these oracles hold for them, even though they did not then believe them. "For what if some disbelieved? Shall their disbelief make void the faithfulness of God? God forbid. Let God be true and every man a liar." These "oracles" with which they were intrusted constitute the Old Testament scriptures. This does not need to be argued. He says the possession of these is Judaism's first or chief advantage. He does not here mention even a second. But much further along in the Epistle to the Romans (ix. 4) when he strikes this question from another point of view, he mentions seven things which are the Jews' own: "whose is the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service, and the promises, whose are the fathers, and of whom," —he does not now use the word "whose"—"*of* whom as to the flesh is Christ." That these seven are exclusively the Jews' own stands out in Paul's enumeration the clearer because he carefully discriminated when he comes to mention Christ. He is "of" the Jews, but not exclusively theirs. Among these seven particulars, three, perhaps four, go to make up the "oracles," the covenants, the giving of the law, the service, and the promises. We are wont to say that Israel's chief glory lies in giving the world a Saviour. But Paul says their chief advantage is in being intrusted with the oracles of God. What tremendous significance this gives to the Old Testament, which Paul calls the "holy" scriptures (Rom. i. 2) and Stephen the "living oracles" (Acts vii. 38).

That the Jews were "intrusted" with these oracles cannot possibly mean that they were made a mere Bible depository, to hand the holy rolls down through the centuries, and pass them over to the church, to be for the advantage of the latter. Paul is not mocking the Jew, for whose wel-

Digitized by Google

fare he could be "accursed." Besides, when he wrote that the Jew's great advantage lay in the fact that he was intrusted with these oracles, they were already in the hands of the churches all over the Roman world. The churches had the oracles, but the Jew had the advantage that he was "intrusted" with them. This can only mean that he alone was involved in their special promises. The Jews were the one nation with whom God made a world-embracing covenant, a covenant which God's faithfulness was pledged to make good, though for the present every man should prove unfaithful or a liar.

We have seen that the Jew himself could not possibly find his advantage in the church, for there he lost his specialties The same is true of his oracles. If the Old Testament is realized and exhausted in the church, if the promises and prophecies of the "living oracles" have completely come to pass in the church, then what did Paul mean when he said to the Jew, standing outside of the church, that he had an advantage in possessing these oracles? Could it be an advantage to see other people realize a covenant from which he was excluded? If Paul says that the Jew's advantage—his chief advantage consists in his being "intrusted" with the oracles of God, then the church is not intrusted with those oracles, or Paul's words are but wind. The Old Testament belongs to the Jew as such. The faith of the church is witnessed to by the law and prophets, but beyond this witness they belong to Israel, even when, as in Paul's day, Israel was in unbelief. Paul's defense of the church against the Jew is that the church has not usurped his place.

Now if the Jew must lose his advantage, and his peculiar rights by coming into the church then, so would he if he came now, so will he if he ever comes in. Since he has these oracles and God is faithful to them, at some time he will be saved. It is Paul's explicit prediction that "all Israel (the whole natural descent) shall be saved." But they will not be

Digitized by Google

saved in the church. They will accept Jesus as the Messiah, for there is "none other name" by which any one can be saved. It does not concern us now to say how or when; but it will be as Jews, and not as church-members. It will be a salvation that preserves, and does not extinguish either their oracles or their nationality.

It remains to look at the bearing of all this on the interpretation of the Scriptures New and Old. First, why did Paul write this to the Romans? They were Christians, rejoicing in the salvation in Christ—why trouble them with a question about the future of the Jews? As a means of defense against them. The Jews in their zeal for Judaism, and in their hatred of Paul, followed him everywhere. They were then, as to-day, subtile reasoners and skillful debaters. They did not hesitate to ply Jesus with adroit questions. They well-nigh wrecked the churches of Galatia. It was easy for them to say to the churches, Your faith is built on these ancient rolls. But now see here. They contain no direct promises, except to the circumcised. If you have a Bible religion, you must conform to the Bible. Paul could readily defend justification by faith from these scriptures. If election was not so clearly taught in the Old Testament, he could at least illustrate it and make it clear from the nature of God as sovereign; but what was he to say when he came to these promises of world supremacy for the Jew? Just what he did say. Hands off! The church has not touched your promises. They *were* yours; they *remain* yours; we have not invalidated them; they are "living oracles" and still hold, being pledged by the faithfulness of God.

It is a question still in debate, what was Paul's leading purpose in writing to the Romans. It may be he had more than one object in view. Certainly he warns them by the sad condition of the Jews, the fallen branches, broken off that the Gentile might be grafted in. "Boast not against the branches." "Because of unbelief they were broken off,

Digitized by Google

and thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded, but fear: for if God spared not the natural branches, neither will he spare thee. . . . For I do not wish you to be ignorant, brethren, of this mystery, lest you should be wise in your own conceits, that hardness has come upon Israel in part until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in. And so all Israel shall be saved." By these words Paul warns the Romans against unbelief, lest it go with them, as it had gone with Israel. He would also save the Gentiles from the arrogance of thinking that they were a finality in God's dealing with men in the world. Their place was subordinate. Israel is to be grafted in again, and once more to come to the front.

Secondly, how now shall we interpret the Epistle to the Galatians and the Epistle to the Hebrews, and similar matter in almost all the other Epistles? Must they not be explained in a manner that conserves the rights which Paul shows to belong to Judaism? Take Hebrews viii., where the writer describes the new covenant made with the house of Israel, and concludes thus: "In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old, is ready to vanish away." Can this possibly mean that the special promises to Israel are abrogated? Then the Jew has no advantage, and Paul's assertion that he has, falls to the ground. But the writer of the Hebrews does not touch the Jew's rights except to confirm them. His one object, from beginning to end, is to show that salvation is by faith. The Hebrews were about to relapse, to abjure Christ and to return to works. The writer shows them that true Judaism now required faith, that to go back to works would be going from Judaism rather than towards it. He does not say, he need not say, whether this new covenant embraced the church with its mixed membership, or whether it looked at a pure Hebrew church like those addressed, or whether it was applicable alone to the

Digitized by Google

nation of the Jews. Neither is he looking at it as a charter of rights and privileges, for the Hebrews were not concerned about these. The new covenant was just the new principle, to be heeded by any who would be saved, Jew or Gentile, church or nation, that a personal knowledge of God is necessary to salvation. The only thing that it abrogated and made to vanish away is the covenant or principle of works—"the man that doeth these things shall live by them" (Rom. x. 5). It did not abolish the works, but dependence upon them. It did not abrogate one right or privilege that was peculiarly Jewish. This new covenant was no more and no less than justification by faith, the fourth chapter of Romans in a nutshell.

When it is said that the Hebrews were in danger of relapsing to Judaism, this does not mean that they were going back to certain rites and ceremonies of Judaism. They had never abandoned these, and the writer of the Epistle does not in one line or word urge them to do so. When he says that "the priesthood having been changed," changed from the Jewish, Levitical priesthood to the Melchisedec priesthood of Jesus, "there is made of necessity a change also in the law," he is the furthest from saying that the law of ceremonies is dropped, that the law is changed to something else. That law formerly required the Levitical priesthood, but now that the true Priest has come, its types and shadows are seen to point to him. Paul declares it is a shadow of good things to come, but the body is Christ's (Col. ii. 17). No; the Hebrew's difficulty was this. He had not dropped the works of Judaism, but he had accepted Christ, and was under persecution in consequence. His danger was not in going back to works which he had never left, but of abandoning Christ, and relying on the works for salvation. The Galatian's peril was similar, adding works to the sacrifice of Christ, and hence Paul's vehement contention for faith as the sole condition of salvation.

Digitized by Google

Faith then touches the ceremonial law at just one point, and it touches it there as it does everything else in the world. It allows no other condition of justification. But when this is admitted, it permits absolutely everything else that is not sinful *per se*. The gospel forbids but ten things, reduced by Jesus to two. These observed, it is indifferent as to what a man eats or drinks, how he dresses, how he worships; it cares nothing for days or places, circumcision or uncircumcision, observance of ceremonies or neglect of them. When Israel as a nation is restored, it will be by accepting Jesus as the Messiah. This is absolutely essential, and obligatory, nothing else is. Without doubt they will observe the laws of Moses, circumcision, the seventh day, the distinction in foods, but they will not attend to these things as commending them to God. Why cannot they keep all these and be saved, when Paul, and Peter, and the churches of Judæa did?

There is nothing in the New Testament which conflicts with the Jew's privilege in living, or even with his observance of his ceremonial law. Some of it can be interpreted so; but if it is, we may be sure it is misinterpreted. The New Testament everywhere denies salvation by works, but it does not deny salvation to Jews as Jews.

Third and finally, since Paul's exposition of the church is that it is not a direct evolution from Judaism, but a wild olive branch brought from the outside and grafted on the Jewish stock, standing, as the Epistle to the Hebrews shows, on the covenant of faith; since the church is an elect body organized by the Holy Spirit in union with the raised Christ, for the present and in all its existence to suffer with him; and since it leaves to Judaism its oracles which are not exhausted in the church and not even applicable to it, do we not get a sure guide for interpreting the Old Testament, and a clear light on its pages? The view point is changed. If Paul asserts that the Jew's advantage is that he is intrusted

Digitized by Google

with the oracles of God, that these oracles belong to him and not to the church, must they not be left to him? If the Old Testament is read into the church, are we not clearly violating Paul's unmistakable concession to Judaism? All revelation falls under two grand topics: first, who or what God is; and, secondly, what will he do, what has he promised to sinful men. Our discussion is not concerned with the first. What God is, is taught both by nature and inspiration and is universal. And so far the Bible, like nature, belongs to all men everywhere and in all times. The church can learn, and must learn, much from the Old Testament about the nature and attributes of God. The condition of a sinner's acceptance with him springs out of his nature as a holy God; it, too, is always and everywhere the same. This falls under the first topic. But now comes the second, What will God do with men? How will he organize them after they have become his? In the New Testament there must be constant discrimination. A part of its matter applies solely to the unregenerate, a part to the regenerate, a part to church officers, a part to laymen, a part to men as men, a part to women, a part to slaves, a part to masters. And what confusion must ensue if the special reference in each case is not observed! The inquiring sinner, for instance, would undo himself if he took that section which belongs to saints and attempted to "*work* out his salvation." And no one would think it strange to say that one part of the Bible belongs wholly to the Jews—this is what Paul does say—and another part to the church—no one would think this strange but for the unproved and impossible presupposition that Judaism is displaced by Christianity. Grace changes absolutely nothing but the heart. It does not convert a male into a female; it does not turn a black man into a white man; it does not convert a foreigner to a native; it does not turn an Englishman to a Frenchman—the Englishman remains loyal to his flag, the Frenchman to his, and

Digitized by Google

certainly grace was never intended to reduce a Jew to a pork-eating Gentile. Judaism with its magnificent Mosaic code, land laws, sanitary laws, family laws, and perhaps ceremonial laws, *stands*. It is a permanent, national institution, better fixed than Magna Charta or the Constitution of the United States. If Judaism were a false religion like Mohammedanism, this could not be said. But it is not false. It came from God, and has credentials as clear as those of the church itself. Its permanency is everywhere recognized in the New Testament. Paul asks, "Has God cast away his people," the Jews, even in their unbelief? And he answers with the vehement "God forbid." And the terse Bengel says on this passage: "*Ipsa populi ejus appellatio rationem negandi continet*" (The very title, his people, contains the reason for denying it), denying that he has cast them away.

They have then their Scripture, peculiar to them. It is the Old Testament. This makes its interpretation comparatively easy and plain. First, it rescues the unfortunate adjective "old" from the sense of decrepit, or out of date. They are the "living oracles." Furthermore, innumerable passages like Zech. xiv.; Isa. ii., xi., lxi., and whole books, can be taken just as they read, applicable to the Jews in the time to come, and need not be twisted in violation of all principles of exegesis to make them apply to the church. The point of view being changed, the whole book changes, and becomes the plain utterance for the Jew which it surely was intended to be.

Digitized by Google