

**THE TEMPORAL PROSPECTS OF
ISRAEL UNSETTLED. IN
ANSWER TO THE "OBJECTIONS
OF EDWARD SWAINE"**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649718788

The Temporal Prospects of Israel Unsettled. In Answer to The "Objections of Edward Swaine"
by W. C. Yonge

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

W. C. YONGE

**THE TEMPORAL PROSPECTS OF
ISRAEL UNSETTLED. IN
ANSWER TO THE "OBJECTIONS
OF EDWARD SWAINE"**

THE
TEMPORAL PROSPECTS OF ISRAEL
UNSETTLED.

IN ANSWER TO THE
"OBJECTIONS OF EDWARD SWAINE."

BY W. C. YONGE, BRENTFORD.



LONDON:
G. J. YONGE, 3, UPPER CHARLES ST. PARLIAMENT ST.
AND
AYLOTT & JONES, 8, PATERNOSTER ROW.

1850.

THE
TEMPORAL PROSPECTS
OF
ISRAEL UNSETTLED.

REPLY.

LETTER I.

SUPPOSING it *not* to be held by a respondent that, on the restoration of the Jews to Palestine, there will be a confounding of things temporal with things spiritual: and supposing it *to be* held by him, that the spiritual things of the Jews will *not differ*, in kind, from those of the Gentiles, then possibly there is nothing in the first letter to which he has to reply, because it imputes the contrary: the book, however, allows of no modification. The letter may be open to the following

REMARKS.

(Page 2.) *Suitable* means, as implied in a quotation from Cromwell, do not find their

rule or warrant in *prophecy*, but in *precept*—
 “Go into all the world and preach the gospel
 “to every creature,” and the same principle
 applies to the matter of restoration, if it is
 to be.

Supposing the Jews, if restored, to have the
 peculiarities of a distinct nation, this would
 not make them God’s “peculiar” in the sense
 of distinctive spiritual property.

(p. 3.) The Jews as a people still have
 what was ascribed to them, after the Christian
 dispensation, in the sense in which it was then
 ascribed. (Romans ix. 4, 5.) And, for the
 Fathers’ sake, there is “a remnant,” should
 be added.

(p. 4.) There may be a difference between
 Jews and Gentiles in *some* sense, but not that
 which affects the *ground of* salvation.

May it not be asked—

(p. 5.) Was it quite so, that the Jews were
 not, in the New Testament, and in the first
 age, regarded as a people distinguished above
 other people on any account? And if they
 were then, on some account (short of that in
 which all are one) spoken of as superior, what
 terminated it?

(p. 6.) The expression by the author,

“*Above other nations,*” supposes it not to be incompatible that they should be a nation; this is alluded to in the summary reply at the beginning.

The writer assigns now the following distinction, “they are *rebellious children*, in a sense distinct from any in which the designation can be applicable to other people—because no other people have been similarly situated—‘as concerning the gospel, enemies for your sakes; but as touching the election, beloved for the Fathers’ sakes, for the gifts and callings of God are without repentance.’ The grounds, &c.”

Who are beloved for the Fathers’ sakes? *The Jews in general, or, the elect remnant?*

(p. 7) That they shall, in the author’s terms, “enjoy a national glory and distinction under the personal reign of Christ”—*if* intended in the sense of confounding temporal and spiritual things—it is *not* held.

“Whatever the restoration be,” the author says, “it is promised only on repentance.” But was there particular repentance, and of what kind, evangelical or legal—at the end of the seventy years in Babylon? Is it not unsettled whether a change in *temporal* mat-

ters require it? God is not bound where man is.

(p. 8.) The middle wall of partition was broken down, while, in the first age, the distinction, short of the ground of salvation, existed. (Ephesians ii.)

LETTER II.

If it be held, that *principles upon which there is no difference of opinion*, and circumstances that may arise *without miracle*—may of themselves produce on a localism, that which shall fulfil temporal promises and predictions, (supposing such to remain to be fulfilled) then there is nothing, it is presumed, controverting these things in this letter.

REMARKS.

(p. 10.) "The Christian *community*." In what sense used by the author? "*All shall know the Lord from the least unto the greatest*," is part of that covenant which is asserted by the author to apply without difference. In that case, how, according to him, does it prove the conversion of the Jews as such? Does it not now receive fulfilment in

every case in which the covenant is appropriated?

(p. 11.) "The temporal prospects," he says, "are unsupported by the New Testament." It is presumed this is as yet unsettled.

The author says, "The New Testament does not hint *in the remotest way* at a literal restoration of the Jews to the national possession and inheritance of their own land." This, as it is afterwards dealt with, is as yet unsettled.

Though "General harmony requires! New Testament writers *who were Jews* never confirming the prediction of the national restoration!

"Supposing this discrepancy!"

All these things argued afterwards—and therefore as yet unsettled. But, it may be remarked—of course inspired writers did not indulge their inclinations.

If the New Testament says that there is a sure word of prophecy to which we do well to take heed; and if it says that all Scripture was given by inspiration &c., though it should not repredict any thing, what want of harmony is there, or what discrepancy can there be?

(p. 13.) The dilemma he states to be, "No duties arising to Christians from predictions of the restoration of the Jews—or the New Testament is defective as a rule of Christian practice."

If the principle be admitted that it is precept, and not prediction, that is the rule of practice, no such dilemma exists.

(p. 14.) "The New Covenant," he says, "obviously means the Gospel dispensation, and consequently cannot be considered as having an *exclusive* application to the Jews." This it is hoped is settled with all. But, it is presumed to be taught to be a *new* covenant as in relation to the *old*. The old being the *dispensation of Moses*—not that which was older than Moses, *the dispensation to Abraham*, which the law, 400 years after, could not disannul. May it not be unsettled, whether the promise of the land to Abraham and his descendants has been repealed? Besides, the 11th of Hebrews, 10, 13, 14, 15, and 16th verses, quoted in proof, combine the literal fulfilment with the spiritual, without confounding them: Abraham had a higher inheritance, but he still expected and bequeathed the lower. Cannot that which is