



Library of The Theological Seminary

PRINCETON · NEW JERSEY



Gift
of
Samuel Agnew, Esq.
March 15, 1855

BS

2422

.8

T 37

DISSERTATIONS

INTRODUCTORY TO

THE STUDY AND RIGHT UNDERSTANDING
OF THE LANGUAGE, STRUCTURE,
AND CONTENTS

OF

THE APOCALYPSE.

//////
BY ALEXANDER TILLOCH, LL. D.

§c. §c. §c.

//////
Knowlege shall be increased.

DANIEL,

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR,

BY A. J. VALPY, RED LION COURT, FLEET STREET;

AND SOLD BY LONGMAN, HURST, REES, ORME, AND BROWN;

HARDING, MAVOR, AND LEPARD; OGLE AND DUNCAN;

SHERWOOD AND JONES; T. AND G. UNDERWOOD;

T. BOYS; AND H. FISHER.

1823.

CONTENTS.

DISSERTATION THE FIRST.

	Page.
<i>On the Opinions delivered by Ecclesiastical Writers, respecting the Date of the Apocalypse</i>	1
§ 1. Of traditionary Testimony respecting the Date of the Apocalypse	6
§ 2. Of the Arguments for a late Date, founded on the supposed State of the Asiatic Churches, when the Apocalypse was written	15
§ 3. Other Arguments, which have been adduced for and against a late Date to the Apocalypse, considered	37
CONCLUSION	43

DISSERTATION THE SECOND.

<i>On the Evidence furnished by the Epistles in the New Testament, respecting the time when the Apocalypse was written</i>	48
§ 1. Of Allusions to the Apocalypse found in the Epistle to the Hebrews	50
§ 2. Of Allusions to the Apocalypse found in the Epistles of Peter	59
§ 3. Of Evidence furnished by Paul's Epistle to Timothy, respecting the Date of the Apocalypse	73
§ 4. Of Allusions to the Apocalypse found in the Epistle to the Ephesians	76
§ 5. Of Allusions to the Apocalypse found in the Epistle to the Philippians	82
§ 6. Of Evidence respecting the Date of the Apocalypse furnished by the Epistle to the Colossians	88

	Page.
§ 7. Of Evidence furnished by the Epistle to the Romans	94
§ 8. Of Evidence furnished by the Epistles to the Corinthians	99
§ 9. The Apocalypse quoted in the Epistle of James	104
§ 10. Does the Epistle to the Galatians furnish any Evidence of its being of a later Date than the Apocalypse?	105
§ 11. Of Evidence furnished by the Epistles to the Thessalonians	110
§ 12. Of Evidence furnished by the Epistles of John, as to the priority of the Apocalypse	122
§ 13. Respecting the Epistles to Titus and Philemon, and the Epistle of Jude	125
§ 14. Of the Sealed Book which has been opened by the Apocalypse	126
CONCLUSION	138

DISSERTATION THE THIRD.

On the Language and Structure of the Apocalypse.

§ 1. Of the Verbal Language	141
§ 2. Of Symbolical or Hieroglyphical Language	160
§ 3. Of the Structure of the Apocalypse.	172
CONCLUSION	187

DISSERTATION THE FOURTH.

On various Names by which the Creator of the Universe is designated in the Scriptures, and the proper mode of translating them

§ 1. Of certain Attributive Nouns employed in the Old Testament to designate the Deity	191
§ 2. Of the Attributives or Epithets, אֱלֹהִים [<i>El</i>], אֱלֹהִים or אֱלֹהִים [<i>Eloah</i>], and אֱלֹהִים [<i>Elohim</i>], commonly rendered "God" in the English Translations of the Hebrew Scriptures	195

§ 3. Of the manner in which the word אֱלֹהִים [<i>Elo-</i> <i>him</i>] should be rendered in translating the Old Testament	218
CONCLUSION	225

DISSERTATION THE FIFTH.

On the Hebrew name JEHOVAH [יְהוָה] *and the Greek ex-*

<i>pression</i> ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ὁ ΘΕΟΣ [KYRIOS <i>the</i> THEOS], <i>commonly rendered</i> "the LORD God"	228
CONCLUSION	246

DISSERTATION THE SIXTH.

On certain Combinations of ὁ ΘΕΟΣ [THE OMNIPOTENT]

and ΚΥΡΙΟΣ [LORD] *with other nouns of per-*
sonal description, which are found in the *Epis-*
tales in the New Testament

CONCLUSION	301
----------------------	-----

DISSERTATION THE SEVENTH.

On certain Combinations of Nouns of personal descrip-
tion, which are found in the *Apocalypse*

§ 1. Of Definitions and Explanations of Terms, furnished by the Writer of the Apocalypse	306
§ 2. Of the Junction of Attributive Nouns with Sym- bolical Terms, and particularly with τὸ ἄρνιον, THE LAMB	312
§ 3. Of the Lamb in the midst of the Throne	317
§ 4. Of the Throne, the <i>Kathēmenos</i> , or Sitting One,— and the Book concerning the Right Hand of the <i>Kathēmenos</i>	323
§ 5. Of the Scene of the Vision	338
§ 6. Particulars respecting the <i>Kathēmenos</i> , or Sitting One	354
§ 7. Of the manner in which certain passages, where common Attributive Nouns are found joined to the Symbolical name "The Lamb," should be rendered in English, that they may exhibit the true sense of the Greek Text	360
CONCLUSION	374

Abbreviations sometimes used in the following Pages.

C. V. *Common Version* of the Scriptures.

Gr. *Greek*.

Heb. *Hebrew*.

MS. *Manuscript*.

MSS. *Manuscripts*.

v. *Verse*.

v. also *verse*: but when preceded by Ch. or the name of one of the books of Scripture then it means *Chapter fifth*.

ERRATA.

Page 3 line 5, read Nicolaitans.

39 — 3, for v. 17. read Ch. iii. 17.

89 — 4, for V. 13. read verse 13.

91 — 13, for v. 15. read Ch. i. 15.

103 — 13, read Revelation.

118 — 5, read Newcome.

127 — 6, read Revelation.

— — 13, read Thessalonica.

179 — 3, before Revelation insert the.

245 — 12, erase the turned commas at the beginning of the line.

247 — 14, insert a] after [Mat. xix. 17.

ADVERTISEMENT.

ABOUT forty years have elapsed since the attention of the Author of these Dissertations was first turned to the Revelation; and the contents of that wonderful book have, ever since, much occupied his thoughts. For some years, like many other persons, he received implicitly, the dicta of those critics who charge the original with solecisms; but, in his endeavors to gain from translations, and from authors who had written on the subject, some knowledge of the meaning of the prophecy, he found it necessary, occasionally, to have recourse to the original, and, after some time, with such a result, in one or two instances, as led him to question the propriety of submitting, without a rigid enquiry, to the decision of those who impute grammatical improprieties to the amanuensis of the Apocalypse. That the book might contain some Hebrew idioms, and also peculiar modes of construction, appeared to him not improbable; but the more he considered the subject the more reasonable, at length, it appeared to him, to believe it possible that critics might be mistaken, than that a work, written by an Apostle,—by one endowed with the gift of tongues, and writing under Divine inspiration,—should abound in anomalies.

Persuaded that he has discovered the nature of those peculiarities in the composition of the Apocalypse, which have perplexed men of incomparably higher attainments, and have led to the erroneous opinion, so generally entertained, respecting its style, he thinks that he but performs a duty to his fellow christians in giving publicity to that discovery; and the more so as, from the precarious state of his health, it is very probable that he may not live to finish a larger work,—devoted to the elucidation of the Apocalypse—with which he has been many years occupied:—but whether that work shall ever see the light or not, it is hoped that the other topics, connected with the subject, introduced into this volume, may also prove serviceable to persons engaged in the same pursuit.

Wherever the author has felt himself obliged, in the subjoined pages, to express his dissent from the opinions of previous writers, he hopes that he will be found not to have treated any one with personal disrespect. Should his language, in any instance, exhibit such a semblance, he begs to disavow the intention; for he can truly affirm, that he is grateful to every laborer who has preceded him in these inquiries.

Differing, as he does, from received opinions, respecting the style of the Apocalypse, the author is aware that he exposes himself to criticism: but if dispensed with candour *it shall be an excellent oil which shall not break his head*; for none will rejoice more than himself in the correction of any error into which he may have fallen; that truth, from whatever quarter it may come, may alone have that influence, which the interests of literature, of religion, and of society so universally deserve, and so imperiously demand.

DISSERTATION THE FIRST.

ON THE OPINIONS DELIVERED BY ECCLESIASTICAL
WRITERS RESPECTING THE DATE OF THE APO-
CALYPSE.

To ascertain the true date of the Apocalypse is, as will be shown hereafter, a subject of much greater importance than at first view most people may imagine. Critics are by no means agreed as to the time when it was written: indeed they differ so widely, that some make it one of the earliest, while others make it the last published book of the New Testament. Grotius and Sir Isaac Newton ascribe it to the reign of Claudius or of Nero. Mill, Lardner, Bengelius, Woodhouse and some other able critics contend that it was written in the reign of Domitian, A. D. 96 or 97. Michaelis believes

that it was written in the reign of Claudius,¹ who died A. D. 54. and appeals to Sir Isaac Newton, “that prodigy of learning,” whose arguments in favor of an early date he considers as generally unexceptionable, (excepting those drawn from allusions to the Revelation, alleged to be found in the first Epistle of Peter, and in the Epistle to the Hebrews.) “I have so high an opinion (says he) of the divine understanding of Newton, that I cannot flatter myself with having discovered a proof in his positions which was undiscovered by him. It is therefore with some diffidence that I lay before my readers some additional arguments for his opinion, that the Revelation was written so early as in the time of Claudius or Nero.” His additional arguments are:—1. That when the Apocalypse was written, the governors of the church were still called *Angels*, a name nowhere else applied to them in the New Testament or in the writings of the primitive fathers. In the Epistles they are called *Bishops* [ἐπίσκοποι]. “Is it probable (says he) that John would choose to be singular in calling those *Angels* [ἄγγελοι], who had, by custom, obtained a different title? May we

¹ Introductory Lectures 1761. 4to. p. 389. But in his 4th Edition (Marsh's Translation 1793. 8vo. Vol. 4.) he seems to hesitate, whether to ascribe it to the reign of Claudius or that of his successor Nero.

“not then conclude, that his Revelation was written before the title of *Bishops* was in use?”¹—2. That the Revelation mentions no heresy as flourishing at that time, except only the sect of the Nicolastans: “this sect existed long before Cerinthus, and as John wrote his Epistle and his Gospel against Cerinthus, between the years 65 and 68, the Revelation must have been written considerably earlier.” His third argument he rests on what is said respecting *Christ coming quickly*, (ch. xxii, 20) which he considers as not having reference to the second coming of Christ to the general Judgment, but to the judgment impending over Jerusalem: alleging that John so uses the phrase in his Gospel (ch. xxi, 22); that therefore, it seems probable, the same sense was intended in the Revelation; and that, “consequently, the Revelation must have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem.”—Of all the arguments adduced by Newton, none appears more cogent to Michaelis than that which is drawn from the Hebrew style of the Revelation; from which the former concludes, that John

¹ Michaelis is mistaken in his belief, that the term *Angel* is applied to the Presbyters in the Apocalypse only. It is Presbyters, and not spiritual beings, who are alluded to by that term in the Epistle to the Colossians ii. 18. He is right, however, in his general conclusion. The title of Bishop had come into general use long before the year 96.

must have written the book shortly after he left Palestine, because his style, in a later part of his life, was pure and fluent Greek.

Bishop Newton also thinks it more probable that John was banished to Patmos in the time of Nero, than in that of Domitian. Like Michaelis he rests his opinion chiefly on the evidence adduced by the great Newton, to whom he refers both in his text and notes. The style appears to him an unanswerable argument that the book was written soon after John had come out of Judea. He not only (contrary to the opinion of Michaelis on this point) considers the allusions to the Revelation in the Epistles of Peter, and in Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews, to which Sir Isaac had referred, as being correct, but answers a possible objection, 'that St. John 'might borrow from St. Peter and St. Paul, as well as St. Peter and St. Paul from St. John:?'— "If you will consider (says he) and compare "the passages together, you will find sufficient "reason to be convinced that St. Peter's and "St. Paul's are the copies, and St. John's the "original."

Lardner, on the contrary, opposes the arguments drawn by Sir Isaac Newton from the bearing of ancient testimony; and, taking it for granted that John had been banished, concludes, that he and other exiles did not return from

their banishment until after the death of Domitian, (who died in 96); which is the opinion of Basnage, and likewise of Cellarius and others; and that the Revelation was written in the year 95, 96, or 97.

From the best examination that I have been able to give to this question, I have arrived at a different conclusion from those who contend for a late date for the Apocalypse. I think with Grotius, and with Michaelis, (if that continued to be his opinion,) that it was written in the time of Claudius;—or, at all events, not later than the reign of Nero, as maintained by Sir Isaac Newton, Bishop Newton, and others.

Before submitting to the reader the evidence on which I have come to this conclusion, I shall state briefly the substance of Ecclesiastical tradition, respecting the time at which the Apocalypse was written;—and, secondly, the arguments which have been drawn from the supposed state of the Asiatic churches, with a view to the settlement of this question.

§ 1. *Of traditional Testimony respecting the Date of the Apocalypse.*

The opinion that the Apocalypse was written in the time of Domitian, was introduced by Irenæus; and, indeed, independent of the fact, that such is his testimony, all the other arguments that have been offered, for so late a date, may be considered as mere assumptions, resting on no conclusive evidence. Against the correctness of Irenæus it is alleged, that he postponed the dates of some other books, and, therefore, it is not impossible that he might be mistaken respecting the date of this, which he chose to place after them. Sir Isaac Newton thinks that he “might perhaps have heard from his master Polycarp, that he had received this book from John about the time of Domitian’s death; or, indeed, that John might himself at that time have made a new publication of it, whence Irenæus might imagine it was then but newly written.” If, however, there be any error in Irenæus, it is more likely that his work has suffered from the attempts of transcribers to make their copy conform to their own ideas of historical truth, than that there could be any new publication of a work already given to the churches. It has been suggested; and from the

facts to be submitted to the reader respecting the early date of the Apocalypse, the idea seems to be not void of all probability; “that as the name of Nero, before he was declared Cæsar and successor to Claudius, was Domitius, possibly Irenæus might have so written it; and that, by some fatality, this name was lengthened to Domitianus—the difference being only two letters.”¹

Eusebius follows Irenæus in his *Chronicle and Ecclesiastical history*, but in his *Evangelical Demonstrations* he says, “James, the Lord’s brother, was stoned, Peter was crucified at Rome with his head downward, and Paul was beheaded, and John banished into an island.” That is, as Sir Isaac understands him, “he conjoins the banishment of John into Patmos, with the deaths of Peter and Paul,” which happened in the reign of Nero. To which Lardner answers; “he (Eusebius) does not say that all these things happened in the time of one and the same Emperor—he is only enumerating persons who suffered.” Sir Isaac remarks that Tertullian also conjoins these events. “True (says Lardner), but he does not say that all happened in the same reign.”—Some, however, may think it not a little remarkable, if not extremely im-

¹ Bachmair on the Revelation.

probable, that both these writers should, by mere accident, have mentioned the death of Peter and Paul, and John's banishment together, without having any reference whatever to the same period.

Other early writers have also followed Irenæus; but as they refer to him, or to Eusebius who copied him, they are in fact the same authority, and therefore to quote what they say would be encroaching unnecessarily on the time of the reader.

Epiphanius twice names the reign of Claudius, as that during which the *Apocalypse* was written. In his *fifty-first Heresy* he speaks thus: "after his (John's) return from Patmos, under the Emperor Claudius;" and afterwards he says, "when John prophesied in the days of the Emperor Claudius, while he was in the island of Patmos." Lardner quotes, with approbation, the opinion of Blondel (who alleges that, "as Epiphanius is singular, he ought not be regarded,") and adds, in two or three pages after, "one would think Sir Isaac Newton had little reason to mention Epiphanius, when he does not follow him." But we might with equal justice say, "one would think Lardner had but little reason to mention either Epiphanius or Sir Isaac Newton, when he does not follow either of them:" for Sir Isaac in quoting Epi-

phanus is showing that, though many have followed the opinion of Irenæus, as expressed in our present copies, the testimony of antiquity, for a date so late as that of Domitian, is not so uniform as some would have it be believed : Nor is the argument drawn from numbers, against the testimony of one historian, so conclusive as Lardner and others have imagined ; for if a thousand should report the testimony of Irenæus, it is still but one testimony, and would only show that they preferred his authority, while Epiphanius followed some other now lost. But in fact Epiphanius is not “singular” in following some other authority than that of Irenæus. The commentator Arethas, who quotes Irenæus’ opinion, does not follow it. In his explanation of the sixth seal he applies it to the destruction of Jerusalem ; and he does so expressly on the authority of preceding interpreters. Lardner’s objection, that “Arethas seems to have been of opinion that things which had come to pass long before might be represented in the Revelation,” does not apply to the case before us : for Arethas says, and Lardner has himself quoted the words, that “The destruction caused by the Romans had not fallen upon the Jews, when the evangelist received these (Apocalyptic) instructions. Nor was he at Jerusalem, but in Ionia, where is Ephesus : for he stayed

“at Jerusalem no more than fourteen years—
“And, after the death of our Lord’s mother, he
“left Judea, and went to Ephesus, as tradition
“says : where also, as is said, he had the Reve-
“lation of future things.” These words are
quoted by Lardner for the purpose of assailing
them. “How can we rely (says he) on a writer
“of the sixth century for these particulars ; that
“John did not stay at Jerusalem more than
“fourteen years, that he left Judea upon the
“death of our Lord’s mother, and then went to
“Ephesus : when we can evidently perceive
“from the history in the Acts, that in the four-
“teenth year after our Lord’s ascension, there
“were no Christian converts at Ephesus : and
“that the church at Ephesus was not founded
“by St. Paul till several years afterwards ? What
“avails it to refer to such passages as these ?”—
What avails it ! To show that there were other
traditions besides that derived from Irenæus,
and that some preferred them to his. Nor is the
fact that others, before Arethas, believed the
Revelation to have been given prior to the de-
struction of Jerusalem, set aside or even weak-
ened by his running into the same sentence other
traditions, which might appear incredible to
Lardner, or which might even be false. Arethas
was not an original commentator, but exhibited
a synopsis of what had been advanced by An-

drew of Cæsarea (who lived about the year 500) and others ; and this very Andrew quotes, in his commentary, the same application of a passage in the Apocalypse to the destruction of Jerusalem, though he rejects it himself. The testimony of Arethas is offered—not as having authority, merely because it is his, but—as evidence, that the opinion which he delivers, was held by other commentators before his time. Michaelis remarks that “we know of no commentators before him but Andrew of Cæsarea, and Hippolytus, who lived at the end of the second century.” This, however, it must be allowed is no proof that his authority was Hippolytus : it might have been one later ;—but, it is also possible that it might have been one earlier ; for though Michaelis has here overlooked the fact, the Apocalypse was the subject of a treatise written by Melito, Bishop of Sardis, in the early part of the second century, of which nothing remains but its title, which is preserved in Eusebius.¹ I stop not to examine the other facts, which Lardner thinks cannot be true ; for, if false, it does not follow that the simple fact, of early commentators having held the opinion, that the Apocalypse was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, must also be false—any

¹ Hist. Eccles. iv. 26.

more than it will follow, if it can be proved that Irenæus is wrong, in ascribing the book to the reign of Domitian, that, *therefore*, his authority is to be questioned on all other points.—But why, after quoting the words of Arethas, has Lardner repeated them, with amplification? Arethas does not say that, *on* the death of our Lord's mother John left Judea *and THEN went to Ephesus*; but that, *after* that event he left Judea *and went to Ephesus*. It might be some time after. But what has Ephesus to do with the question? Could John by no possibility have visited Patmos, "*for the word of God,*" or to preach the gospel, till after he had taken up his residence at Ephesus?

I mean not, however, to enter into the question, how long John stayed at Jerusalem? for it is possible, though that city might for a long time be his usual place of residence, that, like the other Apostles, he sometimes travelled, preaching the glad news of salvation. Luke's history is confined chiefly to the travels of Paul, which accounts sufficiently for his recording nothing respecting those of John. It is therefore a mere assumption, that John could not be in Patmos before the reign of Domitian, and that he was *banished* to that island. Could it even be proved, that he was actually banished to Patmos by that Emperor, this would be no proof

whatever, that he had not been there before. Nay, more ; he must have been in that island long before, if the evidence, to be submitted hereafter to the reader, be well founded.

The title of the Syriac version of the Apocalypse has also been offered as an evidence for a date prior to the reign of Domitian. It runs thus : “ *The Revelation which was made to John the Evangelist, by God, in the island of Patmos, into which he was banished by Nero the Cæsar.*” To this evidence it is objected that the Apocalypse was not in the first Syriac Version, which was made very early. This may be true ; but it is equally true that Ephrem the Syrian, who lived about the year 370, several times quotes the Apocalypse in his *sermons*, which yields a strong argument (though not a positive proof) that a translation must then have been in existence, and known to the members of the Syrian congregations. But even had no translation existed prior to the Philoxenian version, which was made in the year 508, the argument remains, that the tradition of the Syrian churches ascribed the Apocalypse to the days of Nero ; and the presumption is, that the Greek manuscripts whence they made their version exhibited the above title.

I will not detain the reader longer on Ecclesiastical traditions respecting the time at which

the Apocalypse was written. (Those who wish for farther information on this subject should consult Lardner, who has collected the whole with great labor; also Michaelis' Introduction to the New Testament.) But it should be constantly recollected, that, however numerous the authors are, who ascribe it to the end of Domitian's reign, the testimony of all of them may be resolved into that of *one individual*, whom they copied, namely Irenæus; that another tradition placed the date in the reign of Nero; and another in that of Claudius: and hence it follows, that the true date, if it can be settled, must be ascertained on some other evidence. That is, their conflicting testimonies must, if possible, be tried by some standard on which reliance may be placed, to ascertain which of them should be received as true. It may be proper, however, to examine another argument against an early date, brought forward by Vitringa, also by Lenfant and Beausobre in their preface to the Revelation, and quoted with approbation by Lardner; and this shall be attempted in the next section.

I pass unnoticed a fourth tradition, which says that John was banished to Patmos in the reign of Trajan; and a fifth, which places his banishment in that of Hadrian; as both these necessarily pre-suppose that the Apocalypse was not written by the apostle John—a question

which has been so well treated of by Newton, Lardner, Woodhouse, and other British Critics, to say nothing of foreigners, that it does not deserve another moment's consideration.

§ 2. *Of the Arguments for a late Date, founded on the supposed State of the Asiatic Churches when the Apocalypse was written.*

Michaelis, alluding to the testimony of Epiphanius, who twice states the Apocalypse to have been written in the reign of Claudius, says:—"To this single testimony of a writer who lived three hundred years later than St. John, two very material objections have been made. [He means by Blondel, Lardner, and others.] In the first place no traces are to be discovered of any persecution of the Christians in the reign of Claudius: for though he commanded the Jews to quit Rome, yet this command did not affect the Jews who lived out of Italy, and still less the Christians."

This argument—often advanced by those who contend for a late date to the Apocalypse—assumes, as not to be questioned, that John's visit to Patmos was *by compulsion, in consequence of persecution*; but he himself does not say so; he only states that he was there, *διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ*, "*for the word of God*"—words which, taken

in their strict and proper sense, do not convey that idea; and shall we be content, on a question of this kind, to receive the traditions of men who would have us believe, without giving their authority, that John was cast by order of Nero or of Domitian into a vessel of boiling oil, and came out unhurt?

Michaelis thus states the second objection that had been made [viz. by Vitringa, Lenfant and Beausobre, and Lardner]: “That the seven “*flourishing* Christian communities at Ephesus, “Smyrna, &c. existed so early as the reign of “Claudius, is an opinion not easy to be reconciled with the history given, in the Acts of the “Apostles, of the first planting of Christianity “in Asia Minor. Besides it is hardly possible “that St. John resided at Ephesus, from which “place it is pre-supposed that he was sent into “banishment, so early as the time of Claudius: “for the account given, Acts xix, of St. Paul’s “stay and conduct at Ephesus, manifestly implies that no apostle had already founded and “governed a church there. And when St. Paul “left the place, the Ephesians had no Bishop: “for, in an Epistle to Timothy, written for that “purpose, he gave orders to regulate the church “at Ephesus, and to ordain bishops. This argument (he adds) may perhaps be strengthened “by observing, that the second Apocalyptical

“ Epistle, ch. ii. 1, is addressed to the angel of
“ the church of Ephesus, that is, as is commonly
“ understood, to the bishop.”

The objection just stated rests on mere assumptions and on false facts. It is first assumed that John was banished to Patmos; secondly, that he resided at Ephesus before his banishment; thirdly, that he could not have been in Patmos but in consequence of such banishment; fourthly, that there was no bishop (or elder) at Ephesus when Paul left that city; because, fifthly, an epistle was written to Timothy to ordain bishops there. Now it is singular enough, that so many facts should be assumed, without offering proof of the truth of any one of them: no, nor can any one of them be proved. We learn from the 18th chapter of the Acts, that when Paul left Athens he came to Corinth, and found there a certain Jew named Aquila; and that this was in the reign of Claudius,—a fact which deserves particular notice; for the decree of Claudius, which commanded all Jews to depart from Rome, and which was the cause of Aquila and his wife Priscilla leaving Italy and proceeding to Corinth (Acts xviii. 1, 2), was issued in the eleventh year of that Emperor's reign, answering to A. D. 51. We also learn from the Acts of the Apostles, that his stay at Corinth was one year and six months in all, (for the account of

the insurrection which dragged Paul before Gallio is only episodical,) and that immediately after this he sailed into Syria, with Priscilla and Aquila, and came to Ephesus, where he left them; but not till after he had *himself entered into the Synagogue and reasoned with the Jews.* Here we are made acquainted with the fact that the Apostle Paul himself had been preaching at Ephesus, some time before the events that are recorded in ch. xix. had taken place. How long this was I will not presume to decide positively: but thence he sailed to Cesarea (on his way to Jerusalem), after which he went down to Antioch, where he spent some time, and afterwards *went over all the country of Galatia and Phrygia in order, strengthening the disciples.* With these facts staring Michaelis in the face, it is difficult to imagine what could have led him to express himself as he has done in the foregoing quotation, when he says, that “the account given Acts xix. of Paul’s stay and conduct at Ephesus, manifestly implies that no Apostle had already founded and governed a church there; and that when St. Paul left the place the Ephesians had no bishop.” It is impossible to account for this inaccurate statement, but by ascribing it to mere inadvertence and haste. Paul’s visit to Ephesus, spoken of in Acts xix, was in fact his *second* visit to that city. When this

Apostle quitted Ephesus, after his first visit, he had left Aquila and Priscilla there; who of course did not remain idle, as we see by the care they took to instruct Apollos. But even had we not been informed that an Apostle had been at Ephesus,—and that Apostle Paul himself, before the visit mentioned in xix. 1,—the inference of Michaelis would be inadmissible; the presence of an Apostle not being necessary to the founding of a Church of Christ: for wherever men are congregated in his name, should there be only *two or three* of them, there is he *in the midst of them* (Mat. xviii. 20). When Paul came to Ephesus (Acts xix), instead of meeting no Christian converts *he found disciples* there (v. 1), and congregated together too—that is, they were a Christian church. The male members then amounted to twelve (v. 7): and they were a “*flourishing* Christian community” also, if we may judge from their being thought worthy to receive the miraculous gifts conferred by the Holy Spirit; of which visible manifestation of the divine power they had not even heard till Paul now visited them. When arrived at Ephesus this second time, he continued his visits to the Synagogue for *three months*, reasoning with the Jews *concerning the reign of God*; after which he *separated the disciples*—that is, organised them as a complete church—and continued at

Ephesus *two years* longer, disputing daily in the school of Tyrannus; SO THAT ALL THEY THAT DWELT IN ASIA HEARD THE WORD OF THE LORD. Paul himself, then, was the founder of the churches in Asia, as he was of a great number of other Gentile churches, and this too chiefly *in the reign of Claudius*. Michaelis's statement—and others have stated the same thing—that in his first epistle to Timothy, “he gave orders to him “to regulate the church at Ephesus, *and to ordain “bishops,”* is not warranted by any thing in that Epistle. Such an order is indeed stated respecting Titus, when left in Crete (Tit. i. 5); but the reason for Timothy being desired to abide, on some occasion, at Ephesus, is expressly stated to have been, that he might charge them to maintain the doctrine delivered to them by Paul (1 Tim. i. 3), in opposition to the fooleries of the Judaizing teachers; who began to trouble the churches almost as soon as they were established. The instructions given to Timothy (and by means of the Epistle addressed to him, to all Christian churches, in all ages), respecting the character that ought to be found in persons appointed to be bishops, offers no evidence that this was written with an eye to his appointing them for the first time at Ephesus. Timothy was in fact an Evangelist, and was often sent by Paul to assist in arranging matters in different

churches, as may be seen in the Acts and in the Epistles; and it was necessary that he should *know how to conduct himself among God's family, the church of the living God* (1 Tim. iii. 15), in what he was to teach them, respecting the characters that were to be appointed office-bearers in the churches, as well as in every thing respecting the common faith. I mean not to contend that Paul established a church at Ephesus on the first occasion on which he visited that city (Acts xviii. 19); or that the disciples whom he found there, on his second visit, (xix. 1), were in perfect church order; for I think the contrary is fairly inferable from the history: but I am decidedly of opinion that the notice taken of his "*separating the disciples*" (v. 9), is a plain intimation, that they were *then* put into an organised state, as a church of Christ. This event took place two years before the riot of the shrine-makers; which happened just at the time that he had *purposed to pass through Macedonia and Achaia, to go to Jerusalem* (v. 21). It would be of importance if the precise date could be ascertained; but as this is not indispensably necessary to the present inquiry, I shall only briefly notice, that chronologers have, in my opinion, generally allowed too great an interval between the period of Paul's departure from Athens (ch. xviii. 1), and his departure *from Ephesus to go in-*

to Macedonia (ch. xx. 1). The time that his journey from Athens to Corinth would occupy, could not be long. His whole stay at Corinth was *eighteen months* (xxviii. 11). The “*good while*,” of v. 18, has been by some considered not merely as subsequent to his appearance before Gallio, as was really the case, but as subsequent to the “*year and six months*” of v. 11, which is certainly not the fact. The “*insurrection*,” though mentioned after the length of his stay of “*a year and six months*,” happened “*a good while*” before the expiration of that term, which was the whole duration of his stay there: it is particularly noticed in the history, seemingly for the purpose of accounting for the quiet in which the Apostle was allowed to remain so long in that city. The unbelieving Jews here, as in other places, endeavoured to harass him with law proceedings, and carried him before Gallio; who finding that his accusers could lay no moral turpitude or breach of public law to his charge, did not even call on Paul for his defence, but sent them out of court with a reprimand. He would not allow “*a question of words and names*” to be construed into a civil offence and a breach of the laws. In this, though it is common with many, in their ill-judged declamations, to cry out against “*profane Gallios*,” he acted the part of an upright magistrate.

Paul's departure from Corinth was in the early part of the year, as is evident from the purpose of his journey being named: he wished *by all means to keep the approaching passover at Jerusalem*, v. 21. After being at Jerusalem he went to Antioch, where he spent some time, and then went over Galatia and Phrygia, and *having thus passed through the upper coasts, came again to Ephesus* (xix. 1). How long he stayed at Antioch after he had gone from Cesarea to Jerusalem and come thence to Antioch, is not stated, nor how long he was in passing through Galatia and Phrygia; but it seems obvious enough that all this was within a few months, for his journey was not intended to be lengthened, as is plain from his leaving Aquila and Priscilla at Ephesus, with a promise that he would return again (v. 21). Having returned accordingly, his whole stay there on this second visit was, as has been noticed, *three months* (xix. 8.) and *two years* (v. 9): nor did any farther time elapse before his departure for Macedonia; for the particulars related respecting the *vagabond exorcists*, the burning of foolish magical books, and the pretendedly religious uproar of Demetrius and his fellow craftsmen, though related after the duration of Paul's stay, belong to the same period. And, therefore, the whole time intervening between Paul's departure from Athens, and his subsequent departure

from Ephesus, could hardly exceed *four years*, if it were even so much. The Bible chronology places Paul's visit to Corinth in A. D. 54,—Macknight, Hales, and some others, with more reason, in the year 51. If to this date we add two of the above four years, this will bring us to the year 53, as that in which the believing Ephesians were put into full church order by Paul himself;—so that it is not impossible that, before the death of Claudius, this church might have so failed in love as to deserve the reproof given in Rev. ii. 1.—“What!” an objector may say, “while Paul himself was residing at Ephesus? for, if his visit to Corinth was not earlier than the year 51, he must have been in that city when the Apocalyptic Epistle was sent to the Ephesians—if sent in the reign of Claudius.” And why should this be impossible? Did not the conduct of all the churches, very soon after they were established, call for reproof?—and were they not reprov'd in the different Epistles of the New Testament, by the Apostles who founded them?—This naturally leads to the examination of another, and, indeed, what those who employ the argument consider as the principal objection against an early date to the Apocalypse:—

“It appears,” say they, “from the book itself, that there had been already churches for

“ a considerable time in Asia : for as much as
“ St. John, in the name of Christ, reproaches
“ faults that happen not but after a while. The
“ church of Ephesus *had left her first love*. That
“ of Sardis *had a name to live, but was dead*. The
“ church of Laodicea *was become lukewarm*.”
In brief, it has been objected that the state of
the churches in Asia, in the reign of Nero, was
different from that described in the second and
third chapter of the Apocalypse ; and, therefore,
the Revelation could not have been delivered
to John so early as that reign, and still less in
that of his predecessor. To this it has been
answered, “ What the state of the churches was
“ in the reign of Nero, can best be decided from
“ the writings of the Apostles ; for all their
“ epistles were written during the reigns of CLAU-
“ DIUS and NERO The state of the churches
“ as described in the Revelation is as follows :
“ The church of Ephesus is commended for
“ her *sufferings for the name of Christ*, for her
“ *patience, for her unweariness in tribulation*. She
“ *would not bear the wicked, and discovered those*
“ *that were false apostles ; she hated the Nico-*
“ *laitans, whom the Lord hated also ; but is*
“ charged with having departed from love and
“ charity, and is therefore called unto repentance.
“ —The church of Smyrna was pure, only pes-
“ tered with false apostles.—The church of Per-

“ gamos [*held fast the name of Christ and his faith*
 “ but] had such as held the doctrine of Balaam,
 “ seducing the people to eat such things as were
 “ sacrificed to idols, and to commit fornication;
 “ and had also such as adhered to the doctrine of
 “ the Nicolaitans.—The church of Thyatira is
 “ praised [*for charity, service, faith, patience, and*
 “ *good works*], but at the same time there was fault
 “ found with some of the congregation, for suffer-
 “ ing the woman Jezebel to teach and seduce
 “ the people to fornication, and to eat things
 “ sacrificed to idols.—The church of Sardis is
 “ greatly reprov'd, for having the name of being
 “ Christians while spiritually dead; [but even
 “ in her there were *a few names who had not de-*
 “ *filed their garments*].—The church of Phila-
 “ delphia was pure, and nothing laid to her
 “ charge.—The church of Laodicea was found
 “ lukewarm.

“ If we read the Epistles of the Apostles, we
 “ find the churches in general pestered with all
 “ these evils. St. PAUL wrote to the Corinthians
 “ about *eating those things which were sacrificed to*
 “ *idols*; St. PETER writes against those that held
 “ *the doctrine of Balaam*. St. JUDE did the same.
 “ St. JAMES, greatly incensed against those whose
 “ faith was *mere words, and their deeds wicked,*
 “ means the Nicolaitans, who afterwards took
 “ upon themselves the proud name of Gnostics,

“ that is, of wise men. And the false apostles
 “ made their appearance every where, and were
 “ complained of by all the Apostles. Love and
 “ charity slackened in many churches ; witness
 “ ch. xiii. of the *2d Epist. to the Corinthians*, and
 “ the whole *1st Epistle of JOHN* The
 “ *2d Epistle of PAUL to TIMOTHY*, who was
 “ then bishop of Ephesus, which was wrote in
 “ the year 67 is full of complaints against
 “ wicked Christians ; and he mentions the names
 “ of several of them, who were of the churches
 “ of Asia—**DEMAS**, **ALEXANDER** the smith, **HER-**
 “ **MOGENES**, **PHILETUS**, and others These
 “ evils were all in the churches when the Apos-
 “ tles wrote their epistles ; and they were all
 “ wrote during the reigns of **CLAUDIUS** and **NERO**.
 “ Who then will say, that the state of the churches
 “ in Asia, in the reign of **NERO**, was different
 “ from that described in the Revelation ?”¹

The objection to an early date, founded on the state of the churches in Asia at the time when the *Apocalypse* was written, and which has been met in the manner just quoted, has since been urged by Mr. Woodhouse (in his *Dissertation* prefixed to ‘ *The Apocalypse Translated*’) as strenuously as if it had never been before proposed or answered. As he is the last writer, I

¹ Bachmair on the Revelation.

believe, who has taken a part in this controversy, his reasoning—for he has produced no new facts—shall be briefly examined.

“ There is (says he) no appearance or probability that the seven churches had existence so early as in the reign of Claudius ; much less that they were in that established and flourishing state, which is described or inferred in the Saviour’s address to them. For Claudius died in the year 54, some years before the Apostle PAUL is supposed, by the best critics, to have written his Epistle to the Ephesians, and his first to TIMOTHY. But from these Epistles we collect, that the church of Ephesus was then in an infantine and unsettled state. Bishops were then first appointed there by St. PAUL’s order. But at the time when the *Apocalypse* was written, Ephesus, and her sister churches, appear to have been in a settled, and even flourishing state ; which could only be the work of time. There is, in the address of our Lord to them, a reference to their former conduct. Ephesus is represented as having forsaken her former love, or charity ; Sardis as having acquired a name, or reputation, which she had also forfeited ; Laodicea as become lukewarm, or indifferent. Now changes of this kind, in a whole body of Christians, must be gradual, and the

“ production of many years. Colosse and Hierapolis were churches of note in St. PAUL’S time ; but they are not mentioned in the *Apocalypse*, although they were situated in the same region of Proconsular Asia, to which it was addressed. They were probably become of less importance. All these changes require a lapse of time ; and we necessarily infer, that such had taken place between the publication of St. PAUL’S epistles and of the *Apocalypse*.” (p. 9).

“ From the time of CLAUDIUS to the end of NERO’S reign, we count only fourteen years. The date of the First Epistle to TIMOTHY is placed, by MICHAELIS, about ten years before NERO’S death ; by FABRICIUS, MILL, and other able critics, much later. The Epistle to the Ephesians has certainly a later date. So that it may still be doubted whether changes which appear to have taken place in the churches of Lesser Asia, between the date of these epistles and that of the *Apocalypse*, could well be brought about in so short a period of time, as must be allotted to them, if we suppose the *Apocalypse* to be written in the time of NERO. But suppose this argument not to be insisted upon, to what will the concession amount ? The question in favor of the *Apocalypse* having been written in NERO’S reign,

“ will gain no internal evidence *positively in its favor.*” (p. 13.)

Afterwards the same argument is thus repeated: “ In the three first [first three] chapters of the “ Apocalypse, the churches of Asia are described “ as being in that advanced and flourishing state “ of society and discipline reasonably to be ex- “ pected ; and to have undergone those changes “ in their faith and morals, which might have “ taken place in the time intervening between “ the publication of St. PAUL’S Epistles and the “ concluding years of DOMITIAN.” (p. 24.)

I will not attempt to discover what may be the precise ideas meant to be conveyed by this author, when he employs the terms, “ established “ and flourishing state,”—“ settled and even flourish- “ ing state,”—“ infantine and unsettled state,” “—churches of note,”—“ churches of less im- “ portance,”—“ advanced and flourishing state “ of society and discipline,” as applied to these churches; because they are relative terms, and he has given us no clew by which to discover the standard to which he refers them. The same remark applies, with equal force, to the indefinite way in which he speaks of time. His general inference, however, is intelligible; and it will be sufficient to show that it cannot be admitted.—His whole argument may be reduced to this—“ The “ churches of CHRIST could not, so early as the

“reign of NERO, depart in any measure from any
“of the institutions or doctrines delivered to them
“by the Apostles.” Why not so early? Why
should it be less possible that the seven churches
in Asia, mentioned in the Apocalypse, should
fall into errors and evil practices, than for those
churches which are reprov'd in the epistles
addressed to them for similar departures from
the truth, before the death of Nero? “Changes
“of this kind, in *a whole body* of Christians,
“must,” says Mr. Woodhouse, “be gradual,
“and the production of *many years.*”—That is,
before the death of Nero a sufficient number of
years had not elapsed for such changes;—yet
we see like changes in other churches, in the
life-time of Paul, who died before Nero! May
it not be asked too, why Mr. Woodhouse ex-
tends our Lord’s censures to the “*whole body,*”
marking the words also in Italics, to give them
greater force? Our Lord in fact commends
them for many things; but the *change*, to suit
Mr. Woodhouse’s argument, must be one that
would require “many years,” and therefore the
whole body of the believers in Asia must be ca-
lumniated.—“*Many years!*” How many would
this writer think sufficient for the establishment
of Christianity in the world? Few or *none* of
the Apostles, who effected this stupendous work,
except John, survived Nero.

“Colosse and Hierapolis,” says Mr. Woodhouse, “were churches of note in St. Paul’s time; but they are not mentioned in the Apocalypse They were probably become of “less importance.” Can no other reason be assigned for these Asiatic churches not being mentioned in the Apocalypse? How could they be named in a book written before they had existence? There were but *seven churches in Asia* at the time when the Revelation was given. The words ταῖς ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησίαις, ταῖς ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ—to the seven churches, to the [churches] in Asia (Rev. i. 4), by the common construction and usage of the Greek, includes every church in the district named. They are enumerated in the 11th verse; and, in the 20th, *the seven stars* are declared to be ἄγγελοι τῶν ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησιῶν—the Angels of the seven churches. These passages prove that the Apocalypse was written before there was a church at Colosse or at Hierapolis; for Mr. Woodhouse has not ventured to state that these churches had ceased to exist at the date he assigns to the Apocalypse.

As to these churches having “probably become of less importance,” Mr. Woodhouse must have been inconsiderate at the moment when he suggested this, as a reason for their not being named in the Apocalypse; for he cannot surely believe, that the great *shepherd and bishop*

of souls, looks on his churches with the same kind of eye with which the bishops of Antichristian churches look at theirs—disregarding any of them because of their insignificance! He acts far otherwise. Wherever there are even so few as *two or three congregated in his name*, to observe his ordinances, *there is HE in the midst of them*, of however little *importance* such a congregation may be held in the estimation of those worldly churches which some people would perhaps describe as in “a settled and flourishing state.”

That the Asiatic churches could not, so early as the reign of Nero, exhibit the character ascribed to them in the Apocalypse, is a mere assumption; for we have seen that other churches were equally censurable, at the time at which the different epistles, addressed to them, were written. Let us apply the same mode of enquiry into character, to the Asiatic churches, by examining the only Apostolic Epistle which we have, addressed to one of the Apocalyptic churches: I mean that sent to *the saints at Ephesus*.

Paul, in his Epistle to the Ephesians (ch. iii. 17, 19), prays that *Christ may dwell in their hearts by faith, that, being ROOTED AND GROUNDED IN LOVE, they might know the love of Christ, which excelleth knowlege of any other kind.* The

Apostle was ever earnest, in his prayers, that all the churches might *increase and abound in love* yet more and more; but in his subsequent exhortation he more than insinuates a reason for his particular anxiety, on this point, respecting the Ephesians:—" *I the prisoner of the Lord beseech you to walk worthy of your calling, with all lowliness and meekness, with* **LONG SUFFERING, FORBEARING (or bearing with) ONE ANOTHER IN LOVE**; earnestly endeavouring to **PRESERVE THE UNITY OF THE SPIRIT IN THE BOND OF PEACE**—*one body and one spirit*" (iv. 1—4). Does he not here plainly intimate, that they were now exhibiting a temper and conduct very different from that spirit of love by which Christians ought to be characterised? He goes on, in the fourth chapter, to remind them of the design of all **CHRIST'S** gifts to the church, namely, the edification and perfecting of the body of **CHRIST**, "*that we may no longer be children, tossed like waves, and carried about by every wind of doctrine, but speaking the truth* **IN LOVE** may grow up into **CHRIST** the head *This I say therefore and charge you in the Lord, that ye* **NO LONGER** walk as other gentiles walk, in the vanity of their mind *Put away lying, and speak every man truth to his neighbour: for we are members one of another.*

“**ARE YE ANGRY! AND WITHOUT
 “SIN?**” [impossible]. *Let not the sun go down
 “upon your wrath, nor [thus by your anger] give
 “place to the devil Let no corrupt communi-
 “cation proceed out of your mouth and grieve
 “not THE HOLY SPIRIT OF GOD Let all
 “BITTERNESS, and WRATH, and AN-
 “GER, and CLAMOR, and EVIL SPEAK-
 “ING be PUT AWAY FROM YOU, and
 “all MALICE: and BE YE KIND one to
 “another, TENDER-HEARTED, FORGIV-
 “ING one another, even as GOD for CHRIST’S
 “sake hath forgiven you. Be ye therefore imita-
 “tors of GOD as dear children, and WALK IN
 “LOVE as CHRIST hath loved us, and hath given
 “himself for us” (iv. v).*

A departure from their “FIRST LOVE,” is plainly inferable from the whole of this exhortation; nor can we longer doubt, that such a change in the conduct of some of the members of this church, as Mr. Woodhouse, and those whom he follows, maintain could not possibly take place before the reign of Domitian, had actually occurred before the date of this Epistle (A. D. 61

¹ “*Be ye angry and sin not,*” is worse than nonsense: ὀργίζεσθε, καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε; should be rendered interrogatively. The second person plural of the present imperative and of the present indicative having the same orthography perhaps contributed to this error.

according to the best critics); and, so far, their argument for a late date to the Apocalypse is unfounded. That they should have entirely overlooked the strong reproofs of the apostle to this church—reproofs which fix upon it the same character ascribed to it in the Apocalypse—is surprising; and it is still more surprising that Mr. Woodhouse should so strenuously maintain, and expand the argument, in the face of this direct testimony of Paul, that this church had actually *turned from her first love*, before he wrote this epistle.

The reproof to this church, in the Apocalypse, runs thus :

“ *I have against thee that* **THY LOVE** [*ἀγάπην*], “ **THY FIRST** [love], **THOU HAST LEFT**” [or forsaken]. Rev. ii. 4.

Paul, writing to Timothy, says:—

“ *I besought thee to abide at Ephesus that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other doctrine. Now the end* [or design] *of this charge is* **LOVE** [*ἀγάπῃ*], *out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned ;* **FROM WHICH SOME HAVING SWERVED, HAVE TURNED ASIDE TO VAIN JANGLING.**” 1 Tim. i. 5.

From this it appears not only possible, that the church at Ephesus could *depart from her first love*, so early as the time of Nero, but most certain

that this church had actually then *swerved from it and turned aside*. The whole argument, therefore, for a late date for the Apocalypse, drawn from the alleged state of the churches when the Revelation was written, falls to the ground; for here we have a church—one of the seven Apocalyptic churches too—reproved for the very fault laid to her charge in the Apocalypse, and that more than thirty years before the date which those who ascribe the book to the reign of Domitian would give to this prophecy.

§ 3. *Other Arguments, which have been adduced for and against a late date to the Apocalypse, considered.*

Another argument has been suggested for a late date to the Apocalypse, which may be briefly noticed. Laodicea was overthrown by an earthquake in the year of Rome 813 (A. D. 60), and the persecution under Nero began in the year of Rome 817 (A. D. 64). “It is not probable (says Lord Hales¹) that St. John would have addressed the Laodiceans as he does at ver. 17 (ch. iii) had their city been ruined about *five* years before. This may contribute to sup-

¹ Sir D. Dalrymple's *Inquiry into the secondary Causes assigned by Gibbon for the Rapid Growth of Christianity*, p. 41. note.

port the very ancient tradition, that the Apocalypse was published under the persecution by Domitian." His Lordship seems to have understood the verse referred to, literally; as meaning *temporal riches*—an increase of *worldly goods*; or why should he have offered in contrast, the ruined state of the city, after being visited by an earthquake? But assuredly the language is here figurative. The Laodiceans believed themselves rich in *spiritual attainments*. This is abundantly evident, from the nature of the remedy held out to them for the removal of the delusion under which they were laboring: "*Buy of me, &c. that thou mayest be rich—that thy nakedness do not appear; and anoint thine eyes that thou mayest see:*" that is, "that thou mayest see thine own *wretchedness, poverty and nakedness!*—how much thou hast mistaken thy true character!"—His Lordship cannot mean, that there was not time, in five years, to collect a church in the formerly ruined but then renovating city. Could this possibly be his meaning, it might be answered, that, "as there could be no church in Laodicea from A. D. 60 to A. D. 64, therefore the Apocalypse must have been written, not only before the Neronian persecution, but before the destruction of that city in the year 60."—And such I take to have been indeed the fact; though not for the reason just now suggested.

Sir David Dalrymple is, in general, such a close reasoner, that his remark occasions the more surprise : for if we take the passage in v. 17 as meaning, literally, the good things of the present life, and therefore allow that, in five years, they could not have acquired riches and wealth to boast of ; why pass on to the reign of Domitian, to allow them time to get *rich and increased in goods* ; when, by only going back a few years, we should reach the period in which Laodicea possessed the accumulated wealth of generations, undiminished by the calamity of the earthquake ?

Of the traditions respecting John one yet remains to be noticed, and which by some has been considered as demonstrative that his visit to Patmos—no matter how occasioned—and consequently his publication of the Apocalypse, must have been long prior to the period assumed by those who ascribe the book to the reign of Domitian. Eusebius (lib. iii. c. 23) relates out of Clemens Alexandrinus, that John, “ some “ time after his return to Ephesus out of the Isle “ of Patmos” [notice the statement—“ *after* his “ return from Patmos”] “ being requested, visited “ the countries adjoining, partly to consecrate “ bishops—partly to organise new churches,” &c. In this tour he committed a hopeful young man to the care of a certain bishop, who hereupon

received him into his house, brought him up, educated, instructed, and at length baptised him. The young man, it is stated, was for a time so diligent and serviceable that his master distinguished him by some kind of apparel as one of his family. In process of time, however, he became remarkably dissolute, perniciously associating himself with some idle, wicked and vicious young men of his own age, who first introduced him to bad company, and then induced him to steal and rob in the night. In a word (for it would occupy room unnecessarily to quote the whole passage from Eusebius), he became at length the captain of a gang of thieves and robbers who infested a neighbouring mountain and were the terror of all the country: and, saith Chrysostom, “he continued their captain a “long time.”¹ John, some time after, coming again to the church, to whose bishop he had committed the care of the young man, enquired after him, and being informed what had happened, called for a horse, and rode immediately to the place where he consorted with his associates: and when, out of reverence to his old master, the young man fled on seeing him, John pursued and overtook the fugitive, reclaimed and restored him to the church, &c. &c.

¹ Chrysost. ad Theodorum lapsum.

This is a story of many years ; but between the death of Domitian and that of John there were but two years and a half. In his latter years too, John was so very weak and infirm that with difficulty he could be carried to church, where he could hardly speak a few words to the people.¹ The inference seems obvious. His return from Patmos, after which the circumstances related respecting the young man are stated to have happened, must be referred to some earlier period than the reign of Domitian. For John died near 100 years old, and it seems physically impossible that, in his latter years, he could have mounted a horse and rode briskly after a young robber, even were we to suppose that he survived Domitian for a period long enough to have allowed these events to intervene before his own death.

The opinion that the Apocalypse was written very early is, to use the words of Sir Isaac Newton,² “confirmed by the many false Apocalypses, “as those of Peter, Paul, Thomas, Stephen, “Elias and Cerinthus, written in imitation of “the true one. For as the many false Gospels, “false Acts, and false Epistles were occasioned “by true ones ; and the writing many false

¹ Hieron. in Epist. ad Galat. l. iii. c. 6.

² Observ. upon Dan. and Apoc. p. 258.

“Apocalypses, and ascribing them to apostles
 “and prophets, argues that there was a true apos-
 “tolic one in great request with the first Chris-
 “tians: so this true one may well be supposed
 “to have been written early, that there may be
 “room in the Apostolic age for the writing of so
 “many false ones afterwards, and fathering them
 “upon Peter, Paul, Thomas, and others, who
 “were dead before John. Caius, who was con-
 “temporary with Tertullian, tells us that Ce-
 “rinthus wrote his Revelations as a great apostle,
 “and pretended the visions were shown him by
 “Angels, asserting a millenium of carnal plea-
 “sures at Jerusalem after the resurrection;’ so
 “that his Apocalypse was plainly written in
 “imitation of John’s: and yet he lived so early,
 “that he resisted the apostles at Jerusalem in
 “or before the first year of Claudius,² that is,
 “twenty-six years before the death of Nero, and
 “died before John.”³

This argument, which must strike every im-
 partial mind, as very powerful and conclusive
 against a late date, is generally passed over,
 without notice, by those who refer the book to
 the reign of Domitian; but silence will not set
 it aside. Cerinthus, who wrote a false Apoca-

¹ Apud Euseb. Eccl. Hist. l. iii. c. 28. Edit. Valesii.

² Epiphan. Hæres. 28. ³ Hieron. adv. Lucif.

lypse, borrowing, altering and corrupting passages from the genuine one, having died before John, it is impossible that John's Apocalypse could have been written so late as the time of the persecution by Domitian.

CONCLUSION.

The inference drawn from the state of the Asiatic churches at the time when the Apocalypse was written, as necessarily presupposing that a considerable time must have passed before there could be any such departure from the primitive faith and discipline as to call for the reproofs given to these churches, in the epistles addressed to them respectively in the Apocalypse, rests, as we have seen, on no tenable ground, and is indeed opposed by the evidence of facts. All the Epistles of Paul, James and Peter were written before the death of Nero. Before they were written, sufficient time had elapsed to introduce, among the different churches, addressed in these epistles, deviations from the purity and obedience required from Christians, and they are reproved accordingly; and yet it has been attempted to be argued, that, among the churches in Asia, no such defections could take place in the same period! Such an

argument carries its confutation along with it, to every one disposed to look at plain matters of fact.—And why was all this labor undertaken? Why were the Christians in Asia to be calumniated beyond the words of the text? Why were the virtues and graces for which they were praised by “him *who searches the hearts*” to be put out of sight?—Only for the purpose of supporting the tradition delivered by Irenæus for a late date to the Apocalypse, in opposition to other ancient traditions which assigned to it a much earlier origin. I say, only for the purpose of supporting his single testimony; for we have no other for the late date, however many subsequent writers may have repeated the statement, all of them having done so on his authority. Epiphanius, as we have seen, twice names the reign of Claudius as that during which the Apocalypse was written: Arethas also, who was not ignorant of Irenæus’s statement (for he quotes it), says, on the authority of other interpreters, that the sixth seal had its accomplishment in the destruction of Jerusalem, and of course those whom he followed held that the book was written some time before that period. And that Arethas did not speak without authority, however much Lardner and others might think they had a right to hold him cheap, is proved by the title

to the Syriac version of the Apocalypse; for the churches in Syria could not be ignorant of the date ascribed to this book by Irenæus, and yet they state, in their title, that the Revelation was given to John in the reign of Nero,—an evident proof that at least they had among them traditions to that effect, if not Greek manuscripts bearing the same title.—But on this I will not longer detain the reader. All that I aim at at present, is to show, that the historical evidence for a late date to the book, is by no means so conclusive as some have contended: and, indeed, when examined dispassionately, the weight of evidence would rather appear to be on the other side.

In one word:—neither Ecclesiastical tradition; nor the state of the churches in Asia, when the Apocalyptic Epistles were addressed to them; nor any thing recorded in history respecting their secular condition, furnishes any evidence that may be relied on, that the Book of the Revelation was written so late as the reign of Domitian.

But it may be asked, “What possible difference can it make, whether the Apocalypse was written at an early or late period of the apostolic ministration?” At first sight this subject may appear of trivial importance; and

indeed, if the book were really written late, and an opinion should, notwithstanding, be taken up, that it was written early, it may be granted that this mistake could not be followed by any injurious consequences. The case, however, is far otherwise, if the book was written early, and if, in opposition to this fact, a belief shall be entertained that it was written towards the close of John's life, who survived all the other apostles; for, being a direct revelation from the Head of the church, if written in the reign of Claudius, or early in that of his successor Nero, it must be considered as having been given for the instruction of the apostles themselves, as well as of the other members of Christ's body; and, if so, it must have been often the subject of their meditations; and, not unfrequently, its topics would furnish matter for allusion in their oral addresses, and, most probably, also in their epistles to the churches.—Such, *a priori*, might be expected as one of the natural consequences of the book having been written very early; but if, contrary to fact, it shall be believed that it was not communicated to the churches, till after all the Epistles of the New Testament, it is obvious that this very belief will, and must, operate to cause Christians to overlook entirely any allusions that may be found (if there be any such)

in these Epistles, to the Apocalypse; and consequently, however numerous such allusions, quotations, or references to the Apocalypse in the Epistles of the New Testament may actually be, they must, under such a belief, elude all observation, and be thus deprived of that elucidation which they would receive by reference to their prototype in the Revelation. It is evident then, that, if the book was the first, or one of the first written of the New Testament, the Christian church may suffer a real detriment by holding a directly contrary opinion; and therefore some pains should be taken to ascertain, precisely, how the fact stands. If passages can be found in the epistles and in the Apocalypse which the one must have copied from the other—and such it is certain may be found, as will be shown in the next dissertation—it will then only remain to ascertain which is the copy; and this it is believed will not be difficult, if the rules of sound criticism be closely adhered to.

DISSERTATION THE SECOND.

ON THE EVIDENCE FURNISHED BY THE EPISTLES IN
THE NEW TESTAMENT, RESPECTING THE TIME WHEN
THE APOCALYPSE WAS WRITTEN.

HAVING, in the preceding dissertation, bestowed on Ecclesiastical tradition, and the inferences thence drawn, respecting the period at which the Apocalypse was written, and also on the arguments founded on the supposed state of the churches at the period when the Revelation was given, as much notice as they seem to deserve; and shown that the whole reasoning, in favor of a late date, rests on unfounded assumptions, partly unsupported and partly contradicted by the real facts, I now proceed to enquire whether the writings of the Apostles furnish any internal evidence of their having been written later than the Apocalypse. If it can be shown that, when they wrote, they had

the *Apocalypse* in their hands, this evidence will completely decide, which of the ecclesiastical traditions, respecting the time at which this prophecy was written, is best entitled to credit: or rather, it will entirely discard tradition, as unworthy of regard.

It was noticed in the preceding dissertation, that this was one of the proofs suggested by Sir Isaac Newton for an early date to the *Apocalypse*; and that Bishop Newton was satisfied that the allusions to this prophecy, pointed out by Sir Isaac, in the *Epistles of Peter*, and the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, were conclusive. It were to be wished that the Bishop had given the public the particulars of his investigation, instead of the mere result; as a man of his learning would, no doubt, have done the subject more justice than it can receive from the individual who now presumes to pursue the inquiry. Michaelis, too, professes to have examined the allusions pointed out by Sir Isaac, but the result gave him no conviction. If, however, his inquiry was as superficial, and his decision as dogmatical, on this point, as on some others connected with the *Apocalypse*, his memory will suffer nothing from the suppression of the reasons which left him in doubt. What I particularly allude to is his statement, that—"The true and eternal
" Godhead of Christ is certainly not taught in

“the Apocalypse so clearly as in St. John’s “Gospel.”—This shows that, with all his critical skill, Michaelis could not rightly read the Apocalypse. In no book of the New Testament is the doctrine more explicitly declared than in the Revelation. Nay, more : were it necessary to say, that it is more clearly taught in any one book, than another, the Revelation is that book.

In examining the question before us, I shall, for the sake of perspicuity, lay before the reader the result furnished by an inspection of each of the Epistles, in separate sections.

§ 1. *Of allusions to the Apocalypse, found in the Epistle to the Hebrews.*

As Sir Isaac Newton was, I believe, the first who suggested this kind of evidence ; and as those who have controverted his historical testimonies, have, generally, passed over without notice all that he has advanced respecting scriptural proofs—the best of all evidence,—I shall enter on this inquiry by laying before the reader, in the first place, the observations offered by that great man, on the allusions to the Apocalypse, that are to be found in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

“The Apocalypse seems to be alluded to “(says he) in the Epistles of Peter and that to “the Hebrews; and, therefore, to have been writ-

“ ten before them. Such allusions, in the Epistle
“ to the Hebrews, I take to be, the discourse con-
“ cerning *the High Priest in the heavenly Taber-*
“ *nacle, who is both Priest and King, as was*
“ *Melchizedec ; and those concerning the Word*
“ *of God, with the sharp two-edged sword ; the*
“ *σαββατισμὸς, or millennial rest ; the earth whose*
“ *end is, to be burned, suppose by the lake of fire ;*
“ *the judgment and fiery indignation which shall*
“ *devour the adversaries ; the heavenly city which*
“ *hath foundations, whose builder and maker is*
“ *God ; the cloud of witnesses ; Mount Sion ;*
“ *heavenly Jerusalem ; general assembly ; spirits*
“ *of just men made perfect, viz. by the resurrection ;*
“ *and the shaking of heaven and earth, and re-*
“ *moving them, that the new heaven, new earth, and*
“ *new kingdom, which cannot be shaken, may re-*
“ *main.*”

“ The Epistle to the Hebrews, since it men-
“ tions Timothy as related to those Hebrews, must
“ have been written to them after their flight into
“ Asia, where Timothy was Bishop ; and by
“ consequence after the [Judaic] war began,
“ the Hebrews in Judea being strangers to
“ Timothy.”

Peter in his second Epistle mentions, “ that
“ Paul had writ of the same things to them, and
“ also in his other Epistles. Now as there is no
“ Epistle of Paul to these strangers besides that

“to the Hebrews, so in this Epistle (x. xi. xii.)
 “we find at large all those things of which
 “Peter had been speaking, and here refers to ;
 “particularly *the passing away of the old heavens*
 “*and earth, and establishing an inheritance im-*
 “*moveable, with an exhortation to grace, because*
 “*God is a consuming fire* (Heb. xii. 25—29).”

On the internal evidence to be found in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in proof of its being written after the Apocalypse, I shall say but little, in addition to what has been quoted, from Sir Isaac Newton, on the contents of that book.

In this Epistle, it is to be remarked, the Apostle seldom employs direct quotations from the Apocalypse, and, therefore, a cursory reader will not easily perceive some of his allusions. They are, however, very numerous ; but the language is often changed and adapted to the scope of the argument where he employs them. Let it be also recollected that, as will be shown in our progress, it was not then a question, at what time the Apocalypse was written ? or whether it was a divine work ? for if the book was already in the hands of the church, its topics, of course, were familiar to believers, and therefore close quotations were not necessary ; nor was this the general practice of the inspired penmen.

In Ch. x. 35, 36. he exhorts them to retain *their confidence, which hath great recompense of*

REWARD, having need of patience, that, after doing the will of GOD, they “*might receive* THE “PROMISE.” That *the promise* refers to *the inheritance*, promised by CHRIST, in the Apocalypse, is plain, from what he adds in v. 37. “*For in a very little while* ὁ ἐρχόμενος THE “COMING ONE *will come; yea he will not procrastinate.*”—“*The coming one*” was a name applied to the MESSIAH before he appeared on the earth, and is the term employed in Mat. xi. 3. “*Art thou The coming one?*” (Common version, *he that should come.*) But the Jews had lost all knowledge of the fact that he was to come *twice*: nor did even his disciples understand this, till after his ascension. That is, according to their belief, this appellation must have ceased to be any longer applicable to him, after he had once appeared on the earth. But it is again appropriated to him in the Apocalypse, in reference to his *second coming*. He is there called, ὁ ἄν, καὶ ὁ ἔν, ΚΑΙ Ὁ ἘΡΧΟΜΕΝΟΣ, and THE COMING ONE, (common version, “*him which is to come*”) Rev. i. 4. iv. 8; and it is from this second appropriation of this name that Paul employs it, in reference to *the promise* which will be performed when the MESSIAH comes again, to receive his people to himself. In one word, “*The coming one*” is *the Alpha and the Omega of the Revelation*, who says, “*Behold I come QUICKLY,*

“and my REWARD is with me ;” (Rev. xxii. 12.)
 “ I AM. ὁ ἐρχόμενος, THE COMING
 “ ONE.” Rev. i. 8.

In Heb. xi, 10. it is said that Abraham “looked
 “for a city which hath foundations ;” but the
 Greek runs thus : “ For he expected τὴν τοῦς
 “ ΘΕΜΕΛΙΟΥΣ ἔχουσαν πόλιν, THE city having
 “ THE FOUNDATIONS,”—exhibiting the ar-
 ticle both before “city,” and “foundations,”—
 which the writer could not possibly have done
 had “the city, having the foundations,” not been
 a subject familiar to those to whom he was
 writing.

I cannot find that the mode of speech em-
 ployed in this passage, which is deserving of
 particular attention, has been critically consi-
 dered by any of the commentators. They ge-
 nerally confine themselves to an exposition of
 the sense, which, according to some, has refe-
 rence only to the superior privileges which the
 church was to enjoy under the Messiah, when
 contrasted with those it possessed before his
 appearance on the earth ;—a view of the pas-
 sage which can hardly be conceived to apply
 fully to the case of Abraham or any of the
 Patriarchs. In anticipating the blessings se-
 cured to mankind by the coming of Christ,
 Abraham’s hopes certainly extended to things
 beyond the grave. Accordingly other exposi-

tors remark, that Abraham's views and hopes embraced that future state of peace and bliss which was comprehended in the fulness of the promise. "*In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed;*" and which, in the New Testament, is described under the notion of being admitted to participate in the privileges of the "*Heavenly Jerusalem,*"—"the Jerusalem that is above,"—and "*THE city having THE foundations :*" nor can this view of the passage be objected to. But whence did Paul derive the latter expression?

Bishop Middleton, in his learned work on the Greek article, has taken no notice of this passage. Dr. Macknight, one of our more recent commentators, though he introduces the first article in his version—"the city"—offers no remark on its appearance in the passage, but contents himself with stating that "the city which Abraham expected was that promised Gen. xxii. 17., *Thy seed shall possess the gate (the city) of his enemies.* Now as the promises had all a figurative, as well as a literal, meaning, the enemies of Abraham's seed were not the Canaanites alone, the enemies of his natural seed, whose cities were given them by this promise; but the enemies of his spiritual seed, the evil angels, by whose temptations sin and death have been introduced and continued

“ among mankind. If so, *the gate* or city of
 “ *their enemies*, which Abraham’s spiritual seed
 “ is to possess, stript of the metaphor, is the
 “ state and felicity from which the evil angels
 “ fell. This city is mentioned, Heb. xii. 22.,
 “ under the name of *the heavenly Jerusalem*: and
 “ by the description there given of it, we learn
 “ that believers, after the judgment, shall all be
 “ joined in one society or community with
 “ the angels, called *a city which hath foundations*
 “ because it is a community which is never to
 “ be dissolved.” The passage alluded to by
 Macknight in Ch. xii. 22., we shall have to no-
 tice hereafter. But here it may be asked, Why
 hath he, in the words just quoted, for “ *the city*,”
 which he rightly exhibits in his translation, sub-
 stituted “ *a city* ?”—for our present inquiry is
 not, Why the community of “ *believers, after the*
 “ *judgment*,” is called *a city which hath foundations*,
 but Why, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, it is
 called “ **THE** *city having THE foundations* ?”

Every one who has paid even the smallest
 degree of attention to the prophetic style, must
 be aware that with the prophets it was common
 to predict the stability and glory of the king-
 dom of the Messiah under the figure of a great
 and glorious city in which happiness and eter-
 nal peace were to be secured for the inhabitants;
 and all are agreed that the numerous blessings

promised to Jerusalem in the future age of which the prophets spoke, had reference to the good things which God hath provided for the family of which Christ is the elder brother. There is therefore nothing singular in the circumstance of the Christian church being described in the New Testament under the same figure; and but for the peculiar structure of Heb. xi, 10., the mere mention of *a city* in that passage would not call for any particular attention. But in the Prophets there is no passage to be found from which the mode of expression there employed could have been derived;—and that it had a prototype will be admitted by all who are acquainted with the laws which regulate the use of the Greek article. The only passage in the prophets that exhibits terms at all similar to the one under consideration is in Isaiah liv. 11, 12. “*I will lay thy stones with fair colors, and lay thy foundations with sapphires: and I will make thy windows of agates, and thy gates of carbuncles, and all thy borders of pleasant stones;*”—but the whole structure of these verses excludes the idea of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews having hence borrowed the terms he employs.

As has been already remarked, the expression in Heb. ix, 10. is very singular—*τὴν τοῦς θεμελίους ἔχουσαν πόλιν*—“*THE city having THE*

“*foundations*,”—a mode of speech which serves to intimate, very plainly, that the terms employed were familiar to those here addressed. In fact they are a quotation from the Apocalypse as close as the use to which they are applied in the passage before us could possibly admit of. The writer alludes directly to *the holy city, new Jerusalem* (Rev. xxi. 2),—to “*the wall τῆς πό-
“λεως ἔχον θεμελίους δώδεκα* of THE CITY HAVING
“FOUNDATIONS *twelve*” (v. 14). They must, therefore, have had the Apocalypse in their hands, and been well acquainted with its general topics, at the time when this epistle was written ;—so well acquainted with it, that the writer contents himself with a very brief quotation, but quite sufficient to serve as a general reference to the fuller description in the Apocalypse.

In this Epistle there is yet another passage which has every appearance of allusion to matters recorded in the Apocalypse. In Ch. xii. 22, 23. the writer tells the believing Hebrews, “*Ye are come to MOUNT SION, to THE CITY OF
“THE LIVING GOD, THE HEAVENLY JERUSALEM,
“and to an INNUMERABLE COMPANY OF ANGELS,
“to THE GENERAL assembly and CHURCH OF THE
“FIRST-BORN, WHICH ARE WRITTEN IN HEAVEN,*”
&c.—Have not these expressions direct reference to *the Lamb standing on MOUNT SION, with one hundred and forty-four thousand having*

his father's name written on their foreheads, Rev. xiv, 1—to the *great and high MOUNTAIN* the *GREAT CITY, THE HOLY JERUSALEM* DESCENDING OUT OF HEAVEN FROM GOD, Rev. xxi, 10—to THE BOOK OF LIFE IN WHICH ARE WRITTEN *the names of the redeemed,* Rev. iii, 5 : xx, 12 : xxi, 27, &c—to the MYRIADS OF MYRIADS OF ANGELS which surround the throne, Rev. v, 11—and to the INNUMERABLE MULTITUDE, *which have come out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb,* Rev. vii, 9, 14. ? Comparing the terms employed in the passage that has been quoted from the Epistle to the Hebrews with the passages just referred to in the Apocalypse I cannot entertain the slightest doubt, that the former were taken from the latter.

§ 2. *Of Allusions to the Apocalypse found in the Epistles of Peter.*

From Sir Isaac Newton I also copy the principal contents of the present section.—“ In the “ first Epistle of Peter occur these allusions to “ the Apocalypse: *The Revelation of Jesus “ Christ,*’ twice or thrice repeated; the *blood of*

¹ 1 Pet. i. 7, 13. iv. 13. and v. 1.

“ Christ as of a lamb ; fore-ordained before the
 “ foundation of the world;¹ the spiritual building
 “ in heaven,² 1 Pet. ii. 5. an inheritance incorrup-
 “ tible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away,
 “ reserved in heaven for us who are kept unto the
 “ salvation ready to be revealed in the last time,
 “ 1 Pet. i. 4, 5. the Royal Priesthood,³ the holy
 “ Priesthood,⁴ the judgment beginning at the
 “ house of God,⁵ and the church at Babylon.⁶—
 “ These are indeed obscurer allusions ; but the
 “ second Epistle, from the 19th verse of the
 “ first chapter to the end, seems to be a contin-
 “ ued commentary upon the *Apocalypse*. There,
 “ in writing to the Churches in Asia, to whom
 “ John was commanded to send this prophecy,
 “ he tells them, *they have a more sure word of*
 “ *prophecy to be heeded by them, as a light that*
 “ *shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn and the*
 “ *day-star arise in their hearts, that is, until they*
 “ *begin to understand it : for no prophecy, saith*
 “ *he, is of any private interpretation ; the Prophecy*
 “ *came not in old time by the will of man, but holy*
 “ *men of GOD spake as they were moved by the*
 “ *Holy Ghost. DANIEL himself professes, that he*
 “ *understood not his own prophecies;*⁷ and, there-
 “ fore, the churches were not to expect the inter-

¹ Rev. xiii. 8. ² Rev. xxi. ³ Rev. i. 6. and v. 10.

⁴ Rev. xx. 6. ⁵ Rev. xx. 4, 12. ⁶ Rev. xvii.

⁷ Dan. viii. 15, 16, 27. and xii. 8, 9.

“ pretation from their prophet JOHN, but to
 “ study the prophecies themselves. This is the
 “ substance of what PETER says in the first
 “ Chapter, and then, in the second, he proceeds
 “ to describe, out of this *sure word of Prophecy*,
 “ how there should be *false prophets* or *false*
 “ *teachers*, (expressed collectively in the *Apoca-*
 “ *lypse* by the name of *the false Prophet*); who
 “ should *bring in damnable heresies, even denying*
 “ *the LORD that bought them*, which is the cha-
 “ racter of *Antichrist* : *and many, saith he, shall*
 “ *follow their lusts*;¹ they that dwell on the earth²
 “ shall be deceived by the false prophet, and be
 “ made drunk with the wine of the whore’s for-
 “ nication, *by reason of whom the way of truth*
 “ *shall be blasphemed*; for the *Beast* is full of
 “ blasphemy :³ *and through covetousness shall they*
 “ *with feigned words make merchandise of you*; for
 “ these are the merchants of the earth,⁴ who
 “ trade with the great whore, and their merchan-
 “ dise is all things of price, with the bodies and
 “ souls of men :⁵ *whose judgment lingereth*
 “ *not, and their damnation slumbereth not*,⁶ but
 “ shall surely come upon them at the last day
 “ suddenly, as the flood upon *the old world*, and
 “ fire and brimstone upon *Sodom and Gomor-*

¹ ἀτελείας in many of the best Mss. ² Rev. xiii. 7, 12.

³ Rev. xiii. 1, 5, 6. ⁴ Rev. xviii. 11, 15, 23.

⁵ Rev. xviii. 12, 13. ⁶ Rev. xix. 20.

“ *rha*, when the just shall be delivered' like
 “ *Lot*; for the Lord knoweth how to deliver the
 “ godly out of temptations, and to reserve the
 “ unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished,
 “ in the lake of fire; but chiefly them that walk
 “ after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness, being
 “ made drunk with the wine of the whore's
 “ fornication; ² who despise dominion, and are not
 “ afraid to blaspheme glories; for the beast opened
 “ his mouth against God to blaspheme his name
 “ and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in
 “ heaven.³ These, as natural brute beasts, the
 “ ten-horned beast, and two-horned beast or
 “ false prophet, made to be taken and destroyed, in
 “ the lake of fire, blaspheme the things they un-
 “ derstand not:—they count it pleasure to riot in
 “ the day time . . . sporting themselves while
 “ they feast with you, having eyes full of an adul-
 “ tress [*μοιχαλίδος*]: for the kingdoms of the
 “ beast live deliciously with the great whore,
 “ and the nations are made drunk with the wine
 “ of her fornication. They are gone astray, fol-
 “ lowing the way of Balaam, the son of Beor, who
 “ loved the wages of unrighteousness, the false pro-
 “ phet who taught Balac to cast a stumbling-
 “ block before the children of Israel.⁴ These

¹ Rev. xxi. 3, 4.

² Rev. ix. 21. xvii. 2.

³ Rev. xiii. 6.

⁴ Rev. ii. 14.

“ are not fountains of living water, but *wells with-*
“ *out water clouds that are carried with a*
“ *tempest, &c.* Thus does the author of this
“ Epistle spend all the second chapter in des-
“ cribing the qualities of the Apocalyptic beasts
“ and false prophet : and then, in the third he
“ goes on to describe their destruction more
“ fully, and the future kingdom. He saith, that
“ because the coming of CHRIST should be long
“ deferred, they should scoff, saying, *where is the*
“ *promise of his coming ?* Then he describes the
“ sudden coming of the day of the Lord upon
“ them, *as a thief in the night*, which is the Apo-
“ calyptic phrase ; and the *millenium* or *thousand*
“ *years*, which are *with GOD but as a day*; the
“ *passing away of the old heavens* and earth, by a
“ conflagration in the lake of fire, and our *looking*
“ *for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth*
“ *righteousness.*”

“ PETER seems also to call Rome *Babylon*, as
“ well with respect to the war made upon Judea,
“ and the approaching captivity, like that under
“ old Babylon, as with respect to that name in
“ the *Apocalypse* : and in writing to *the strangers*
“ *scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia,*
“ *Asia and Bithynia*, he seems to intimate that
“ they were the strangers newly scattered by
“ the Roman wars ; for those were the only
“ strangers there belonging to his care.”

“ By the companions of Peter, mentioned in his first Epistle, we may know that he wrote from Rome; and the antients generally agree, that in this Epistle he understood *Rome* by *Babylon*.”

The reader will have noticed, that Sir Isaac, in reference to the allusions to the Apocalypse, found in the first Epistle of Peter, says, “ These indeed are obscure allusions.” To me they appear far otherwise, and I hope I shall make them appear very obvious to the reader; for the apostle, immediately after the benediction with which he begins the Epistle, (Ch. i.) blesses “ GOD, *even the father of our Lord JESUS CHRIST, who, according to his great mercy, hath begotten us again to a lively hope through the resurrection of JESUS CHRIST from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and unfading, reserved in heaven for us, who are guarded by the power of GOD, through faith unto salvation, prepared to be revealed in the last time.*” The inheritance here spoken of is said to be incorruptible—for “ *there shall be no more death*” in that inheritance which is described in Rev. xxi.; and those who are made partakers of life, through the resurrection of CHRIST, are “ *raised in incorruption*” (1 Cor. xv. 42), having “ *part in the first resurrection*” (Rev. xx. 6).—The Apostle having brought to their recollection the

“*abundant mercy*” of God in giving them this *lively, or living, hope*, respecting the salvation to be fully consummated “*in the last time,*” proceeds to exhort them to rejoice in the prospect before them, in spite of the afflictions brought on them by their profession; to love the Lord, and, believing in him, to rejoice, *with joy unspeakable and full of glory, receiving the end of their faith, the salvation of their souls.* The exhortation which he gives them deserves particular attention, in our present inquiry, because of the basis on which he makes it to rest. The sixth and seventh verses are thus rendered in the common version: “*Wherein ye greatly rejoice, though now for a season (if need be) ye are in heaviness through manifold temptations; that the trial of your faith, being much more precious than of gold which perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise, and honor, and glory, at the appearing of Jesus Christ.*” This version fails, however, in giving the true sense of the original. The passage should be thus rendered,—“*In which*” [last time, viz., for the pronoun is masculine, as is the time, but the salvation is feminine]—“*in which*” [last time] *exult ye (though for a short time, since it is necessary, suffering sorrow by divers trials, that the proving of your faith, more precious than of gold which perisheth, though proved by fire,*

“*may be found unto praise, and honor, and glory*) ἐν
 “ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, *through the Apocalypse*
 “*of JESUS CHRIST:*” that is, the Apocalypse being
 the cause of, or furnishing the cause for the ex-
 ultation, by what is therein stated respecting
the last time; for all the intermediate words are
 evidently a parenthesis, as I have marked them.
 The sense is:—*though now suffering sorrow by*
divers trials, this being necessary for the trial of
your faith, &c., rejoice greatly in the things brought
to your knowlege, respecting the last time, in (by
or through) the Apocalypse of JESUS CHRIST.
 Here then we have the book of the Revelation
 referred to by the very title which John himself
 has given it in Rev. i. 1.

That the foregoing presents the real sense of
 the passage will appear still more manifestly by
 attending to the remaining part of the Apostle’s
 exhortation in the same chapter. Having re-
 minded those whom he addresses of *the hope of*
life to which they were begotten by the resurrec-
tion of Christ, and of the incorruptible, unfading
inheritance connected with the future life, and
which was prepared to be revealed in the last time;
 and having exhorted them in reference to the
 hope afforded them respecting the salvation to
 be consummated in the last time, *to exult*
through the Apocalypse of Jesus Christ—he pro-
 ceeds thus: “*Whom having not seen, ye love;*” or

rather (for the orthography of the second person plural of the present indicative and imperative is the same) “ *Whom not having seen, love ye* [that is, *continue to love, notwithstanding the many trials to which your faith exposes you*]; *in whom, though not now seeing him, yet believing, rejoice ye with joy unspeakable and full of glory; receiving the end of your faith—the salvation of your souls. Of which salvation the prophets have enquired and searched diligently,*” &c. Considering the circumstances in which these believers were placed, “ *suffering sorrow by divers trials,*” it certainly appears more natural to view the Apostle as exhorting them not to be moved away from their hope, but to continue to love the Lord and to rejoice in him, than as predicating these qualities respecting those whom he addresses. Dr. Macknight has, as I have done, rendered ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, in verse 6, in the imperative; and he has—as indeed have all the Translators—with the common version, also rendered the verbs in ver. 13. in the imperative, “ *Gird up*”—“ *be sober*”—“ *hope (ye)* :” why then should the intermediate verbs “ *Love ye*”—“ *rejoice ye,*” which have the orthography proper to the imperative, have been rendered in a different mood, when the whole is one exhortation, only momentarily suspended, to inform those who are addressed, of the desire which the Prophets

had to understand *what the Spirit of Christ, speaking by them, did signify when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow?*

The 13th verse, in which the exhortation is resumed, is so striking as only to require to be exhibited in a true version to prove the general correctness of all the passages, alluded to by Sir Isaac Newton, as having reference to the Apocalypse. It is thus rendered in the common version (and indeed all the translations I have met with give the same sense): “*Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope to the end, for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ.*” This version, so far as respects the first three verbs is, as has been noticed above, quite correct; but that it does not, throughout, convey the true sense of the original a very little consideration will demonstrate. The word *φερομένην*, which is here rendered “*to be brought,*” as if it were the future infinitive passive of the verb, is the accusative singular of the present participle passive. Of this our Translators could not possibly be ignorant, and, therefore, the translation which they have given of this word must be ascribed to their missing the sense of some other term in the passage; in which, however, as already noticed, they have not stood alone. The present parti-

ciple, as every one knows, instead of having exclusively a *future* signification, embraces *present* and even *past* time; but the present time most prominently. Observe,—*the grace* spoken of in the text is not indefinite; it is not grace or favor generally that these believers are exhorted to hope for, but, specifically, **THE** *grace that comes to them* ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, in (by or through) *the Apocalypse of* **JESUS CHRIST**. The verb φέρω, whence the participle in the passage under consideration, means to *bear, bring, cause to come*, in almost any way that can be expressed; but the mode of *bringing* can be learnt only by the context. When it has reference to any communication received by the ear, or brought in writing, it means *to state, propose, relate, announce, &c.* but when used passively, in a forensic sense, which it frequently is, or technically in reference to any instrument or writing, then the verb intimates the thing spoken of to be *proved, recorded, published, declared, or announced, (&c.)* as the case may be. It is necessary to be thus particular respecting the varied applications of this verb that we may obtain the true sense of the passage before us. As already noticed, *the grace* exhorted to be *hoped for* is a specific grace announced in the **Apocalypse of Jesus Christ**,—that prophecy being the record in which it is declared and

described. In fact the Apostle is here following up the subject which he had introduced in ver. 3, namely, *the LIVELY (or living) HOPE of an incorruptible, undefiled and unfading inheritance, to which they were begotten by the resurrection of JESUS CHRIST from the dead. THIS INHERITANCE, reserved in heaven for those who are kept by the power of God through faith unto the salvation prepared to be revealed in the last time, is the specific grace, favor or gift which he exhorts them to hope for in ver. 13, which may be thus rendered:*

“Wherefore, girding up the loins of your mind, being vigilant, hope perfectly for the grace declared [stated, propounded, made known,] unto you, in the *Apocalypse of JESUS CHRIST;*”—that is, the *Apocalypse* being the Record or instrument by which *the gift* is secured, made over, or conveyed, to these believers, by the certainty of the events predicted therein, which were already in a train of fulfilment, and would ultimately be consummated in the giving them possession of the promised inheritance, when, having been made partakers of *the first resurrection* (Rev. xx. 5, 6), they should join that happy people where *God himself shall be with them—their God* (Rev. xxi. 3), and they shall *inherit all things* (xxi. 7).—The latter part of the verse may also be thus rendered—and some will think more closely to the original,—“*hope perfectly for the grace [or gift] that*

“*is now being brought to you by [or through] the “Revelation of JESUS CHRIST:”—the Record referred to, viz. the Apocalypse, being the instrument that secured to them the promised grace; for all the words of this prophecy “are “true and faithful” (Rev. xxi. 5).*”

I have insisted the more particularly on the declaration in ver. 13, not because it is more explicit than that in the 7th verse, when the latter is properly understood, but because, the construction, harmonizing perfectly with the English mode of speaking, it leaves no room whatever for doubt or cavil. It refers to a book by its own proper name—“*The Apocalypse of Jesus Christ,*” —as the instrument, bringing to them *the gift* for which they are exhorted to hope; it is ἐν, in, through, or by, this that *the grace* comes to them, and the existence of this Record is not only assumed as that which embraces the promised grace, but is assigned as the reason why they should gird up the loins of their mind, be vigilant, and hope perfectly for it.

Can any further evidence be possibly required to prove that Peter’s first Epistle was written subsequently to the Apocalypse,—a book to which he actually refers by name?

After so decided a testimony in favour of an early date to the Apocalypse, to say more on the subject may, to some, appear unnecessary;

but this fact deserves the more notice, as it serves to render certain, what, to many, might appear only plausible, that, as stated by Sir Isaac Newton, Peter's second Epistle absolutely presents a commentary on a number of the statements in the Apocalypse.

To what Sir Isaac has said on the second Epistle, I mean to add but little, being persuaded that, when the reader shall have perused the following sections of this Dissertation, he will, probably, turn back to this, and examine carefully, the statements of that great man, comparing the passages which he has pointed out with the original texts.

Peter in this Epistle mentions that Paul had *written to them of the same things*; that is to the strangers (the believing Hebrews) scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, &c. by the Roman wars. Newton very naturally concluded, that, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, should be found something relating to the same topics (see the 1st section). But it appears to me that a farther use should be made of what Peter says; for he adds (ch. iii. 16) *that also IN ALL HIS EPISTLES HE SPEAKS OF THESE THINGS*. If, then, *the things* intended be those in the Apocalypse, we should be able to find at least some of them by examining his different writings. To this examination the following sections are devoted.

§ 3. *Of Evidence furnished by Paul's Epistle to Timothy, respecting the date of the Apocalypse.*

The first Epistle to Timothy exhibits abundant evidence of its having been written later than the Apocalypse. When the Apocalyptic Epistle was addressed to the church at Ephesus, *she had left her first love*; but she is praised for her works, labor and patience; for not enduring those that were evil: *she had tried those who pretended to be Apostles, not being so, and had proved them to be liars.*

When Paul wrote his first letter to Timothy it was, to request that he would still continue at Ephesus to *charge some to teach no other doctrine, nor to give heed to fables, &c.* The design of the charge was, to restore love from which some of them had swerved and turned aside to vain jangling; desiring to be teachers of the law.—That is, the Ephesians, at this time, were not only deficient in Christian love, as when the Revelation was written, but now suffered teachers of false doctrine to be among them—*Judaizing teachers*; whereas, when the Apocalyptic Epistle was addressed to them, they were praised for having hitherto effectually resisted these evil men. Two of the false teachers, whom Timothy was left at Ephesus to oppose, are mentioned by name

(ch. i. 20)—“*Hymeneus and Alexander,*” who, *desiring to be teachers of the law, but being altogether ignorant of its spiritual requirements (i. 7), had made shipwreck of the faith (i. 19).*

This fact settles the posteriority of the first Epistle to Timothy. But we have also in this Epistle (ch. vi. 14. 15), *the appearing of our Lord JESUS CHRIST, the blessed and only potentate—“THE KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS;”* borrowed from Rev. xix. 16.

In the second Epistle, Timothy is again admonished respecting false teachers:—*to charge the Ephesians, before THE LORD, not to strive about unprofitable words, tending only to subvert the hearers (ch. ii. 14); and to shun their profane vain babblings, which occasioned an increase of ungodliness (v. 16).* Among those whose word was *calculated to eat as a canker*, he again mentions *Hymeneus*, also one named *Philetus*; who maintained that the resurrection was already past: that is, as may be plainly inferred, they had endeavoured to set aside the plain import of the doctrine taught respecting the resurrection; maintaining that the term was to be taken in a figurative sense, in reference to conversion, as being a resurrection from their former death in trespasses and sins; and that no other was to be expected.

Where the Apostle charges Timothy (ch. iv. 1),

“before God and **THE LORD JESUS CHRIST**, who
“will judge the living and the dead, at his appearing
“and his kingdom,” I consider him as referring
to the sounding of the seventh trumpet, when the
sovereignty of the world becomes, exclusively, the
property of the Messiah, who will then take to him
his great power; for this is the period at which
he will judge the world (Rev. xi. 15, 17, 18. and
xx. 12). To this period I conceive him also to
refer by the expression εἰς ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν,
“against that day,” employed emphatically in
ch. i. 12, in which he introduces not only the
demonstrative pronoun ἐκείνην, but also the
article, though he had not before been speaking
of “that day;” a circumstance which tends to
prove that this expression had become colloquial
in the churches, in reference to Christ’s coming
to judgment, as taught at great length in the
Apocalypse. This period is again brought to
the recollection of Timothy, by the same form
of expression, in the 18th verse of this chapter,
and likewise in ch. iv. 8.—See also the same
words applied emphatically to the same period
in 2 Thess. i. 10, and what is there set forth in
the context, and it will hardly be possible, by
any rules of sound criticism, to avoid the infer-
ence, that, in all such passages, there is an allu-
sion to the particulars declared in the Revelation
respecting the day when those who obey not the
gospel of our Lord **JESUS CHRIST** shall be punished

with everlasting destruction—even that day when he shall come to be glorified in his saints. But on this I need not particularly to insist, as the numerous false teachers who infested the church in Ephesus, when Paul wrote this Epistle, affords sufficient evidence of the prior date of the Apocalypse; since, at the time when it was published, this church was praised for having hitherto withstood all such *evil men*.

§ 4. *Of allusions to the Apocalypse found in the Epistle to the Ephesians.*

In the preceding Dissertation I had occasion to allude to Paul's Epistle to the Church at Ephesus, one of the seven named in the Apocalypse; but, though the object in view was connected with the general question under discussion, I did not there examine how far any of the expressions to be found in this Epistle might be considered as direct allusions to the Revelation,—this being the proper place for such an inquiry.

In addressing the believers at Ephesus the Apostle says, *he had heard of their faith in the LORD JESUS, and love to all the saints; and that, from that moment, he ceased not to pray for them, that GOD might make them know the exceeding greatness of his power towards believers—the mighty*

power which he wrought in CHRIST, when he raised him from the dead and set him at his own right hand IN THE HEAVENLY [i. e. in the attributes of sovereignty], far above all principality and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this age but in that to come; and put all [these] under his feet, and gave him to be head over all, to the church which is his body (ch. 1. 15—23).

The description of the sovereignty and dominion ascribed to CHRIST, in this passage, appears to be drawn from such passages as the following in the Revelation:—“*To him who hath made us kings and priests to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever,*” Rev. i. 6. —“*Thou art worthy to receive glory, and honor, yea POWER: for thou hast created all things,*” ch. iv. 11.—“*Worthy is THE LAMB to receive POWER; even riches and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing, and every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, even all that are in them,*” ch. v. 12, 13. And it is also deserving of notice that the term “*the heavenly*” (Ephes. i. 20. ii. 6.), is used by the Apostle in the Apocalyptic sense, for all the attributes of *Sovereignty*, and therefore requires no such supplement to be added as the word

“places,” exhibited in the common version, which tends to obscure the text.

In Ch. v. 3—6. of this Epistle, the Apostle thus addresses the Ephesians: “*But fornication, and all uncleanness, and covetousness, let them not even be named among you, as becometh saints: nor filthiness, nor foolish talking, nor jesting, which are not becoming; but rather giving of thanks. For this ye know, that no fornicator, nor unclean person, nor COVETOUS MAN, who is AN IDOLATER, hath any INHERITANCE in the kingdom of THE MESSIAH and GOD.*” These verses are neither more nor less than an accommodated transcript of Rev. xxi. 8. “*He that overcometh shall INHERIT ALL THINGS but the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and fornicators, and sorcerers and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their portion in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone.*” It deserves to be particularly noticed here; that Paul, in the passage before us, gives a comment on the word “*idolater,*” employing “*covetous man*” as an equivalent term; meeting, as it were, the evasion by which some of those, not chargeable, perhaps, with the other crimes enumerated in the passage which he had in his eye, might have otherwise soothed themselves into a belief that the implied censure had no relation to them.

Had he not, in this way, directed the term to their conscience, they might have said—"We are neither fornicators nor idolaters:"—ARE YOU COVETOUS MEN? If so you are excluded, as IDOLATERS, from *the inheritance in the kingdom of CHRIST*.—"Let no man deceive you (he adds) with vain words: for because of these things cometh ἡ ὀργὴ THE WRATH of GOD upon the children of disobedience,"—substituting "wrath" for destruction in *the lake of fire*; or, rather, having in his eye ἡ ἡμέρα τῆς ὀργῆς *the day of wrath* (Rev. vi. 17), when this destruction will come upon the wicked.—He tells them that *they knew already* the things of which he was treating—that is, they had in their hands some record, to the effect which he states, namely one which did not merely denounce punishment to such characters, but which directly excluded them from *the inheritance* secured for the righteous. It is this association of ideas and his commentary on the word "idolaters" that determines the particular source of the Apostle's admonition in this passage.

From this Epistle we learn also the same fact that is so plainly stated in the first Epistle to Timothy. The Ephesians had not only failed in Christian love, the only crime for which this church was censured in the Apocalypse [see the remarks on the character of this church in the preceding dissertation] but they were *now* suf-

fering among them false teachers, as is directly stated in the first Epistle to Timothy. It would appear they had been led into this by the respect they paid to those calling themselves *teachers* (of some description or other); relaxing in that vigilance and circumspection which led them, at a prior period, when the Apocalyptic epistle was sent to them, to examine the pretensions of all who came in that character, even if they assumed the title of Apostles. Paul reminds them of the end for which the head of the Church had sent forth *Apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers, in order to prepare the (other) saints for the work of the ministry, that the body of CHRIST (viz. the church) might be built up; and all attain to the unity of the faith—even of the knowlege of THE SON OF GOD, to a perfect man—the measure of the stature of the fulness of CHRIST, Ephes. iv. 11—13.*—In the 14th verse we learn the cause of this address—“*That we may no longer be children tossed about with every wind of doctrine by the sleight of men,—cunning craftiness whereby they lie in wait to deceive:*” —plainly intimating that had they, as at first, tried the pretensions of these crafty deceivers, comparing their doctrine with that delivered by the Apostles, they would, as then, *have found them liars* (Rev. ii. 2). When the Apocalypse was written we are informed, by one who could not be mis-

taken, that this church, instead of permitting among them teachers of false doctrine, *could not bear them who were evil*:—and the inevitable inference is, that, the Ephesians not being chargeable with this when the Apocalypse was written, Paul's Epistle to them must have been penned subsequently.

It is believed by many that Paul's first Epistle to Timothy, who, according to tradition, was one of the Elders at Ephesus, was written before this Epistle to the Ephesians. That Epistle, as has been shown, was written after the Apocalypse; a circumstance which tends to confirm the accuracy of the allusions which have been pointed out. In fact the Epistle to Timothy may be considered as one to the church in which he was a bishop; and the obvious inference from all that has been stated is, that Paul was urged, by the Apocalyptic address to this church, respecting her failure in love, and what he had learnt of the farther defection of some of her members from the way of truth, to leave Timothy at Ephesus, for the purpose of restoring her to her former purity.

§ 5. *Of Allusions to the Apocalypse found in the Epistle to the Philippians.*

In the second chapter of this Epistle there is a most remarkable passage, which, as bearing on the question now under discussion, deserves particular attention. The Apostle, speaking of the amazing condescension and humility of CHRIST JESUS, in making himself of no reputation, taking on him the form of a servant, and the likeness of men, and submitting to death, says, in verses 9, 10, 11, “*Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of JESUS every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.*” So runs the authorised version; but, for “*a name,*” which is the reading of the common Greek text, the best manuscripts read τὸ ὄνομα, “*the Name:*”—a mode of speech which instantly suggests the question, What name? and the text not only furnishes the answer, τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα, “*the one that is above every name;*” but states the design or purpose, for which “*the Name*” was given, viz. ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ, πᾶν γόνυ κάμψῃ ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων, “*in order that at the name of Jesus*

“ every knee should bend, of heavenly, and earthly, and subterrene (creatures).” Have we not in the words just quoted the *πάν κτίσμα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ ὑποκάτω τῆς γῆς*, “ every creature which is in heaven, and on earth, and under the earth,” which are ascribed to the Lamb, as his property, in Rev. v. 13. ? But what is “ THE NAME above every name,” which is given to JESUS CHRIST, in order that he should be thus worshipped ? “ *The name above every name*” is the name JEHOVAH : and therefore the Apostle proceeds,—“ and every tongue should confess ὅτι Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, THAT JESUS CHRIST IS JEHOVAH (common version *Lord*), to the glory of God the Father.” In this passage there appears to be a reference, in the first place, to Jer. xxiii. 5, 6. “ Behold the days come, saith JEHOVAH, when I will raise up unto David a RIGHTEOUS BRANCH, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in

’ In the common version—indeed in all the versions that I have examined—these creatures are made to ascribe to the Lamb the *blessing and honor*, &c. at the end of ver. 13 ; but the Greek text speaks otherwise. These creatures, as well as *the power and riches*, &c. of ver. 12, are enumerated among the things which the Lamb is worthy to receive. Those who speak in ver. 13 are still the “ many angels round about the throne ;” but there is an ellipsis in the verse.

“ *the earth : in his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell securely: and this is his name by which he shall be called, JEHOVAH OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.*” It was thus predicted that THE MESSIAH should be called “JEHOVAH;” and Paul says that to him is given “THE NAME *which is above every name.*” —“*The Name,*” was among the Jews a very usual substitute for “JEHOVAH,” both in speaking and writing; and when this term was used, it was always understood to mean JEHOVAH. The Book of *Ikkarim*, cited by Buxtorf under the article יהוה, (*Jehovah*) in reference to this very passage, says, “The scripture calls the *name of the MESSIAH, ‘JEHOVAH OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS,’* to intimate that he *will be a mediatorial God; by whose hand we shall obtain justification from THE NAME; wherefore it calls him by the name of THE NAME.*” The Jews held it unlawful to utter the word JEHOVAH, and for that name substituted *Adonai* (as is still their practice) when reading the scriptures; but, in comments or disquisitions, it was often necessary that they should make known, in some way, that the word יהוה occurred in the text, and in such cases they employed “THE NAME” as the substitute, sometimes adding, as Paul does in addressing the Philippians, “*which is above every*

“*name.*” Nor is it any objection to this view, that the Jews were superstitiously scrupulous in employing ‘THE NAME’ instead of ‘JEHOVAH,’ and therefore it is not to be supposed that Paul would, on any occasion, adopt the same mode of speech; for this was a manner of speaking acknowledged by the Old Testament scriptures, as may be seen in Levit. xxiv. 11, where mention is made of the son of an Israelitish woman who “*blasphemed THE NAME and cursed;*” and also in v. 16, where it is commanded that every man who “*blasphemeth THE NAME shall be put to death.*” In both of these verses our Translators have added, as a supplement, “*of the LORD,*” but in the Hebrew “THE NAME” alone is used. It was, probably, from this passage that Paul (as well as the Rabbins) took this mode of expression, and, having so used it here, I am led to conclude,—when he says, “and every tongue should confess *ὅτι Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς*”—that he uses the word *κύριος* not for *Adonai* (*lord*), but for JEHOVAH; conformable to John’s definition of *κύριος* when employed to represent this glorious name [see the Fifth Dissertation]. And here it deserves to be noticed, that the Apostle, writing in Greek, was laid under the necessity of adopting either some circumlocution to convey his intention, or a substitute in Greek for the Hebrew word JE-

HOVAH, owing to the difference of the alphabets of these two languages; and in fact he does both, employing, in the first place, an expression well known to the Helenists, and other converts from among the Jews, “*the Name which is above every name,*” and then the Greek term *κύριος* (*kyrios*), commonly employed not only by the authors of the Septuagint, to represent the name JEHOVAH, but also throughout the New Testament: thus the words with which the 110th Psalm commences, “*נאם יהוה לאדני*” “*JEHOVAH said unto Adonai,*” (c. v. *The LORD said unto my Lord*), are, in the septuagint, and in Mat. xxii. 44, rendered, *Εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου*. It may also be noticed, in passing, that where our Lord teaches his disciples to say “*Hallowed be thy Name,*” the *Name* meant is evidently JEHOVAH; and which Name is appropriated to THE LAMB in Rev. i. 8, by the Greek term *κύριος*, accompanied with a definition of its meaning—*past, present, and future existence*, [see Dissert. Seventh, § 6.]

The passage before us has also reference to Isai. xlv. 23. “*I have sworn by myself,* “*That unto ME every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear:*” where, let it be observed, the speaker is JEHOVAH; and the Septuagint renders the word *תשבוע* (*swear*), by *ἐξομολογήσεται*, the same word that occurs in Phil. ii. 11, and

which, in the common version, is rendered, and properly so, “*confess.*” This part of the passage having an evident reference to the words quoted from Isaiah, commentators have generally confined the reference to this prophet only; but it deserves to be particularly noticed that the text also presents, “*heavenly, and earthly, and subterrene creatures;*” nor can we find much difficulty in determining that the Apostle, in these words, had in his mind what is written in Rev. iv. 11. v. 12—14, &c. when we find afterwards, in this Epistle to the Philippians (ch. iv. 3), a direct allusion to the Apocalypse in the expression, “*ἃν τὰ ὀνόματα ἐν βίβλῳ ζωῆς, whose names [are] in the book of life.*” The book of which the Apostle speaks is τῷ βιβλίῳ τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ ἀρνίου “*the book of life of the Lamb,*” Rev. xxi. 27. Indeed “The book of life” is a term so perfectly Apocalyptic (see ch. iii. 5. xiii. 8. xvii. 8. xx. 12, 15. xxii. 19.) that, excepting this passage in the Epistle to the Philippians, it is found only in the Revelation. Can we doubt then whence Paul took the expression, especially when we find him, in other epistles, frequently quoting, or directly alluding to, the Apocalypse?

§ 6. *Of Evidence respecting the Date of the Apocalypse furnished by the Epistle to the Colossians.*

The Epistle to the Colossians presents such a torrent of internal evidence, of its having been written later than the Apocalypse, that it is wonderful critics should not have perceived it; nor can this be accounted for, but from the power of prejudice and prepossession. The basis of the Apostle's topics, arguments and illustrations, in his address to this Asiatic church, are wholly Apocalyptical.

In Ch. i. 12. he gives "*thanks to the FATHER, who hath made us meet to be partakers τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ φωτὶ, OF THE INHERITANCE OF THE SAINTS IN THE LIGHT:*"—having in his eye what is declared in Rev. ch. xxi. : "He that overcometh, κληρονομήσει πάντα SHALL INHERIT ALL THINGS." (v. 7). This inheritance is represented under the symbol of a city—the New Jerusalem. This city hath no need of the sun, or of the moon, to shine therein; "*for the glory of THE OMNIPOTENT, even the light (literally the lamp) thereof, THE LAMB, ENLIGHTENS it: and the nations of them who are saved shall walk in τῷ φωτὶ αὐτῆς THE LIGHT THEREOF*" (v. 23, 24). No night shall be there,

nor any need of a lamp, or of sun-light; because “JEHOVAH, the OMNIPOTENT, φωτιεῖ ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς WILL ENLIGHTEN THEM:” (Rev. xxii. 5).

V. 13. “*Who hath delivered us from ἐξουσίας τοῦ σκοτους THE POWER OF THE DARKNESS, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear son;*” —The saints having an inheritance in the light, are, of course, delivered from darkness; but the Apostle presses the contrast:—they are delivered from *the kingdom of the beast*, which has become ἐσκοτωμένη *darkened* (Rev. xvi. 10), and now belong “*to the kingdom of GOD’s dear son;*” —(*yea, they shall reign for ever and ever.*” Rev. xxii. 5.) For the convenience of comparison the following corresponding passages are placed in opposite columns :

COLOSSIANS.

APOCALYPSE.

I. 14 Through whom <i>we</i> have THE redemption, through his blood ¹ (the forgiveness of sins).	I. 5 To him who hath washed us from our sins in his own blood. v. 9 hast redeemed us to God by thy blood.
---	---

¹ The words, “Through his blood”—διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, are absent from some of the early versions and seven of the antient MSS., and have been thrown from the text into the margin by Griesbach. Some Critics think they were transcribed here from Ephes. i. 7. But in fact they found their way into both Epistles, from the Apocalypse being in

16 *For by him were created all things, those in the heavens, and those on the earth; the visible and the invisible; whether thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him and for him:* IV. 11 *For thou hast created all things.* X. 6 *who created the heaven and the things in it; also the earth and the things in it, likewise the sea and the things therein.*

17 *And he is before all things, and by him all things consist:* IV. 11 *Yea as they were made, so also they exist by thy will.*

18 *And he is the head of the body, the church; who is Chief [or Prince, 'APXH], the first-born from the dead, and the Chief [or Prince, 'APXΩN] of the Kings of the earth.* I. 5 *From Jesus Christ . . . the first-born from the dead, and the Chief [or Prince, 'APXΩN] of the Kings of the earth.*

In Ch. ii. 9, 10. we read, “*In him dwelleth all THE FULNESS OF THE GODHEAD BODILY; and ye are made complete by him who is the head of all PRINCIPALITY [APXHΣ Princship or Government] and Power.*” That is: to him belongs POWER, in all its forms and attributes, with all the glory that attaches thereto. When the

the mind of the writer when he penned them. The way in which “*the forgiveness of sins*” is introduced, probably led to their rejection by some early transcriber, who did not perceive that the latter words are explanatory of *the redemption through his blood*—literally *through the blood of him, who is the image of the invisible God*,—“*the forgiveness of sins*” being read in parenthesis.

reader shall have weighed what is stated in the Fifth Dissertation, respecting the radical sense of the word θεός [*Theos*] commonly rendered *God*, he will probably feel no difficulty in admitting that *the power, glory, &c.* ascribed to the Lamb, in the fifth chapter from the 12th verse to the end, and in other parts of the Apocalypse, explain fully what is meant by the fulness τῆς θεότητος (*Theotētos*) OF THE GODHEAD, *dwelling in him bodily*. In this place I need only remark that, in the Apocalypse, the radical sense of *Theos* is *Power*; and that, in the passage before us, Paul having (in v. 15) stated CHRIST JESUS to be *the image of the INVISIBLE GOD*—that is, *the image of THE INVISIBLE POWER*, informs them here, that THE BODILY MANIFESTATION of this POWER had its fulness in his person; which is precisely the same truth stated in other words.

The recurrence of the article, generally omitted by translators, in this passage, is too striking to be passed without notice: “THE *inheritance*,”—“THE *light*,”—“THE *darkness*,”—“THE *redemption*,” &c. refer emphatically, to matters not now laid before the Colossians for the first time, but with which they were already made acquainted, by him who is the head of all 'ΑΡΧΗΣ (*Archēs*), even by the 'ΑΡΧΩΝ (*Archoon*) himself. Is it possible to read, with any atten-

tion, such passages as have been quoted,—recollecting, at the same time, that they are found in an address to an *Asiatic church*, in fellowship with *the church at Laodicea*, which is also commanded to read this Epistle,—and not to perceive the basis on which the Apostle rests his address, and bespeaks, as it were, the particular attention of those to whom he writes ?

That the similarity observable in the contrasted passages is no way casual, depending on unwarrantable translation, will appear by comparing the texts as exhibited in the original :—

COLOSSIANS.

APOCALYPSE.

I. 14 Ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν

I. 5 τῷ λούσαντι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ

V. 9 ὅτι ἐσφάγης, καὶ ἠγόρασας τῷ Θεῷ ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ αἵματί σου

I. 16 Ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα, τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ ὄρατα καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται·

IV. 11 ὅτι σὺ ἔκτισας τὰ πάντα,

καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ ὄρατα καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται·

X. 6 ὅς ἐκτισε τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ, καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ

I. 17 αὐτός ἐστι πρὸ πάντων, καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν·

IV. 11 καὶ διὰ τὸ θέλημα σου ἦσαν, καὶ ἐκτίσθησαν

I. 18 ὅς ἐστιν ἌΡΧΗ πρῶτος·

I. 5 ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

τοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, ἵνα γέ- . . . ὁ πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νε-
νηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτὸς πρωτεύων. κρῶν, καὶ ὁ ἌΡΧΩΝ τῶν βα-
σιλέων τῆς γῆς.

These coincidences are too striking to require any acuteness to detect the resemblance, or argument to establish their correspondence; and too numerous to leave any reasonable doubt as to the cause. Several of the contrasted passages are nearly verbatim, or quite so; and where there is a verbal difference, as in Col. i. 17. and Rev. iv. 11. the sentiment is so precisely similar and so peculiarly marked in the copy, as to render its source not less conspicuous than if the identical words of the Apocalypse had been quoted.

That the latter is the primitive record is manifest from Paul amplifying, in verse 16, what he takes from Rev. iv. 11. and x. 6., telling the Colossians that the "ALL THINGS," created by THE SON OF GOD, include *the visible and the invisible, whether thrones, or dominions, &c. &c.* In cases like this, Critics find so little difficulty, that a bare statement is sufficient to command their assent: to enlarge on the fact would, therefore, be a waste of time.—Nor is this the only fact of the kind presented in Paul's Epistle to the Colossians. In the third chapter he makes the same use of the 21st chapter of the Apocalypse that he does when writing to the Ephesians; reminding them that *when CHRIST our*

life shall appear, they shall appear with him in glory, and enjoy the things that are above, where CHRIST sitteth on the Right-hand of GOD; and therefore he exhorts them, [from Rev. xxi. 8.] to mortify their members that are upon the earth; telling them that COVETOUSNESS IS IDOLATRY:—that is, he performs the office of an Expositor, showing them that idolatry includes covetousness, as one of the crimes for which ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ THE WRATH OF GOD cometh on the children of disobedience; evidently alluding to ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ ἀρνίου THE WRATH OF THE LAMB, Rev. vi. 16.

After what has been stated I should think it next to impossible that any one, whose judgment is not absolutely blinded by prejudice, could longer doubt that the Epistle to the Colossians was written after the Apocalypse.

§ 7. Of Evidence furnished by the Epistle to the Romans.

The Epistle to the Romans presents striking internal evidence of having been written after the Apocalypse. Several passages in this Epistle are literal quotations from that book, incorporated into the argument of the Apostle, in his address to the saints at Rome. He gives a double reason (ch. i.) for his not being ashamed of the Gospel of Christ—first “for therein is

the righteousness of GOD revealed," by which alone believers are justified and "*live by faith;*" glorious news, "*for,*" secondly, "*the wrath of*" GOD is revealed from heaven"—or rather, as the passage, from its peculiar turn of expression, strikes the author,—"*Apocalypsed is the wrath of GOD from heaven*"—Ἀποκαλύπτεται ὀργὴ Θεοῦ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ,—*against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men.* The Apostle having used the same word, ἀποκαλύπτεται, in the 17th verse, as to what was *apocalypsed* in the gospel respecting *the righteousness of GOD*, as bringing life to those who believe, recollects, as it were, the converse of his proposition, as having been *Apocalypsed* in the prophecy of John, denouncing a special revelation of wrath against the ungodly. I must not be understood to employ here the term "*Apocalypsed*" as a proper English word: it is used only for the purpose of conveying to the reader the way in which the Greek term is used; and I am the more confirmed in this view from the words that occur in chapter ii. 5. which are thus rendered in the common version: "*But, after thy hardness and impenitent heart, treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of GOD.*" The latter part of the verse is that to which I would call particular attention,—*treasurest up unto thyself ὀργὴν ἐν*

ἡμέρα ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως [καὶ] δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ Θεοῦ. By reference to Mill's and Griesbach's editions it will be seen that many manuscripts, antient versions and commentators insert καὶ before δικαιοκρισίας, consequently making ἡμέρα to govern all the three nouns which follow. The words may be then rendered—"wrath
 "against the day of WRATH, and of the APOCA-
 "LYPSE, and of the RIGHTEOUS JUDGMENT OF
 "GOD"—each of these three terms being employed to designate the same *day* or period. Though Griesbach has not admitted the second καὶ into his text, there is good reason for believing that it formed a part of the original autograph; for it may be easily seen that a transcriber, not perceiving that a book was here referred to by name, would find little difficulty in rejecting it as not only superfluous, but, according to his view, as injuring the sense: but it is impossible to assign any good reason why a transcriber should have here inserted καὶ, if he did not find it in his copy:—in a word nothing could (in my opinion) have induced him to retain it, but a strong sense of the duty imposed upon him to adhere strictly to his exemplar. "*The day of wrath*"—"the day
 "of the righteous judgment of GOD," is the day to which every thing treated of in the Apocalypse has reference, and therefore the Apostle here calls it, emphatically as it were, "*the day*

“of the *Apocalypse*,”—in the sixth chapter of which book, v. 17, it is called ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ μεγάλη τῆς ὀργῆς, “the great day of the wrath” of THE LAMB. That this is the fact, is rendered more evident from the concluding words of the passage under consideration—δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ Θεοῦ, “of the righteous judgment of God”—in which words we have a very singular, but obvious, allusion to Rev. xix. 2.—“True and δίκαιαι αἱ κρίσεις αὐτοῦ righteous his judgments;” for Paul actually forms a compound (δικαιοκρισίας) from the words δίκαιαι and κρίσεις, and for the pronoun αὐτοῦ puts the noun itself, τοῦ Θεοῦ: nor can his expression be taken otherwise than as such a direct allusion; for his next words, ὁς ἀποδώσει ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, who will “render to every one according to his works,” are evidently taken from these words in Rev. xxii. 12. “ἀποδοῦναι ἐκάστῳ ὡς τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ ἔσται—“to give to every one according as his work shall “be.” In Rev. xx. 12 we also meet with the words “κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν, according to their “works;” and in v. 13, we find ἕκαστος κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν, where it deserves perhaps to be noted, that several manuscripts for αὐτῶν have the singular pronoun αὐτοῦ, as exhibited by Paul in the passage before us.

There is another passage in this Epistle (xiv. 10) which may possibly have allusion to the

Apocalypse. I only say, possibly ; for had I not met with the preceding passages, which appear plainly to have been derived from that prophecy, I should hardly have considered this as bearing on the question. In the passage referred to, the Apostle exhorts the believing Romans not to judge or set at nought a brother, “*for,*” adds he, “*we shall all stand before the judgment-seat* [or tribunal, τῷ βήματι] *of Christ.*”—Has this no allusion to the “*great white seat*” of Rev. xx. 11 ? It is true that there θρόνος is employed, and here βῆμα : in the Apocalypse, however, the purpose of the seat or throne is explained in the context, but here the Apostle avoids that necessity by employing a word which includes its use in itself, and, by prefixing the article, he evidently alludes to something well known to the church. That the Apostle was in the habit of alluding to the Apocalypse, with reference to the day of judgment, we have seen already in this Epistle, in what he says respecting *the day of wrath—the day of the Apocalypse—the day of the righteous judgment of God* ; and we shall see other references of the same kind in the Epistles which we have yet to examine. If in these it shall be found that he uses similar expressions to that employed in this passage, but so amplified as to furnish strong evidence that he had the Apocalypse in his eye, then, I think, it will not

be unreasonable to consider as a certainty what I have only yet been stating as probable, namely, that when here speaking of *the judgment-seat*, he is expressly referring to the *great white seat*, before which *the dead shall be judged, every man according to his works*,—as he does in 2 Cor. v. 10; of which in its place.

§ 8. *Of Evidence furnished by the Epistles to the Corinthians.*

The first Epistle to the Corinthians, supposed by Critics to have been written in the year 56 or 57, exhibits, in the 15th Chapter, an evidence of its posteriority to the Apocalypse, so conclusive, that it must appear, when pointed out, very surprising that Critics could possibly have missed the sense of the Apostle.

In the Apocalypse the future time is divided into periods marked out by *Trumpets*, under the sounding of each of which, respectively, certain events are predicted. In Ch. x. 6. 7 we are taught that *time shall continue only to the days of the voice of the seventh Angel*, or the last of these seven trumpets: and, in Ch. xi. 15-18, that *when the seventh angel sounds, then is come the time of the dead that they should be judged; and that the saints shall then be rewarded.* In the

20th Chapter this reward is explained as being connected with *a resurrection* from the dead:—
 “*Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection.*”

Some of the Corinthians had misunderstood, and misapplied, the things thus taught respecting “*the Resurrection,*”—probably taking the expression as something figurative, and saying, “*there is no [real or literal] resurrection.*” The Apostle first corrects their mistaken views, showing that, *at CHRIST’S coming*, the resurrection of believers shall be as true and real as was the resurrection of CHRIST himself, who was “*the first fruits;*” and that, when this shall be, “*then cometh the end,*” (as taught in the Apocalypse): after stating this he dwells on the subject, answers questions which some might put, respecting the manner of the resurrection, and the body to be given to the dead, and in ver. 51, 52 addresses them thus: “*Behold I show you a secret ; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at THE LAST TRUMPET; for the trumpet shall sound ; and the dead shall be raised incorruptible : and we shall be changed.*”

The Apostle, by the manner of his expression, when he introduces *the Trumpet*, shows that, so far as respects *it*, he was speaking of something with which they were already acquainted ; for

he not only introduces the term “*last*,” but also employs the article—τῆ ἐσχάτῃ σάλπιγγι, “**THE** “*last trumpet* ;” and *no trumpet* had previously been mentioned in the Epistle. The *mystery* then, or *secret*, of which he speaks, respects, not the trumpet, but the sudden change to be passed on the saints who shall be alive at Christ’s second coming. They shall then undergo a change similar to that which the dead have experienced or shall experience, with this difference only, that it shall be, *in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye*. The mention of the trumpet is merely casual, to point out to the Corinthians *the period* at which this shall take place :—it shall be, **at THE LAST TRUMPET**. Had they not, before, heard of “*the last trumpet*,” Paul’s reference to it, with the Article, would have been unintelligible : but I shall rather question the judgment of those persons who ascribe barbarisms to the inspired Apostle, than believe that he writes nonsense. *The trumpet* of which he speaks is **THE LAST of the Apocalyptic trumpets** ; for in the text quoted, we have—“*the trumpet*”—“*the last trumpet*”—“*the sounding of the last trumpet*”—an *explanation of a secret* respecting an event that is to take place “*at the last trumpet*.” What farther identity would the most obtuse mind require, as demonstrative of the source whence the Apostle draws his argument as to the period of the

change of which he speaks? I venture to say more:—Those who can look at such passages and yet question the source, must be but little acquainted with the modes of quotation used by the Apostolical and evangelical writers.—“*The LAST trumpet,*” is an expression without meaning but as taken in relation to *prior* trumpets. The change of which the Apostle speaks was not to take place at the sounding of *the First trumpet*, or of any of the first six trumpets; but at the sounding of *the seventh*,—THE LAST TRUMPET mentioned in the Apocalypse. To explain this passage in the Epistle to the Corinthians, as some have done, by “a great noise, to be made at CHRIST’S descent, called *the trumpet of GOD,*” and to tell us that, “after the righteous are raised, the trumpet shall sound A SECOND TIME; *on which account it is called here the last trumpet,* during the sounding of which, the righteous who are alive on the earth, shall be changed,” is to *darken counsel by words void of knowledge*. It is to give us pure unmixed nonsense, (for even very good scholars sometimes fall into this) instead of words that are in themselves so plain as to need, one would think, no explanation whatever.

The first Epistle having been written later than the Apocalypse, of course so must the second, which was still later. The direct allusions to

the Revelation in the second, are not, however, numerous. The 10th verse of Ch. v., “*We must all appear before THE JUDGMENT-SEAT of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to what he hath done, whether good or bad,*”—has evidently a reference to the GREAT WHITE SEAT of him *from whose face the heaven and the earth flee away, when the dead, small and great, shall be JUDGED by the things written in the books, every man according to his works.* Rev. xx. 11, 13. In this passage, as in Rom. xiv. 10, he employs for the *θρόνος* ‘of the Revelations a term importing in itself the use to which the seat is applied, and also with the article—*τοῦ βήματος*; and, besides employing the article, he points out the principle on which the judgment will proceed, in such a manner as to inform those to whom he writes, respecting the contents of *the books out of which the dead are to be judged,*—namely, that they record *what every one hath done in the body, WHETHER GOOD OR BAD.*

In 2 Cor. xi. 15, speaking of *false Apostles, deceitful workers—ministers of Satan transformed as the ministers of righteousness*—he says, *their end shall be, κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν,* “*according to their works;*” which words are a verbal quotation from Rev. xx. 12 and 13, and therefore may be held as establishing the fact that, in ch. v. 10

of this Epistle, he had the same passage of the Apocalypse in his mind.

§ 9. *The Apocalypse quoted in the Epistle of James.*

As another proof of the early date of the Apocalypse the Epistle of James to the believing Jews, scattered abroad by the Roman wars, may be quoted. He reminds them that “the man is blessed who endureth temptation: for when he is tried, he shall receive τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς THE CROWN OF LIFE,” [ch. i. 12]:—what crown of life? “*That crown of life which THE LORD HATH PROMISED to them that love him.*” James does not here, by his own knowledge, as an inspired Apostle, inform those to whom he writes, that a crown of life is secured for those who endure trials, but reminds them, that *the Lord, himself, had made this promise.* Where then do we find such a promise made by the Lord himself?—It is in the Epistle addressed to the church in Smyrna—“*Fear none of those things which thou shalt suffer Ye shall have tribulation ten days: be thou faithful unto death, and I WILL GIVE THEE τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς THE CROWN OF LIFE*” [Rev. ii. 9, 10]—the very words employed by the Apostle James, and which prove incontestably that his

Epistle was written subsequently to the Apocalypse.

§ 10. *Does the Epistle to the Galatians furnish any evidence of its being of a later date than the Apocalypse?*

The subject chiefly treated of in the Epistle to the Galatians, supposed to have been written before any of the other Epistles, (except perhaps those to the Thessalonians) hardly affords opportunity for allusions to the Apocalypse. There are, however, two passages in this Epistle which seem to have reference to the Revelation. The first is in ch. iv. 25, 26, where “*THE Jerusalem which now is,*” is put in contrast with “*THE Jerusalem above.*” The presence of the article in this passage, which is omitted in the common version, indicates, pretty plainly, that the saints whom the Apostle addresses were already acquainted with the Apocalyptic Jerusalem—“*the new Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven,*” (Rev. iii. 14)—“*the holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God,*” (Rev. xxi. 10). The use of the article, I say, in this place, seems to intimate this; for it is not usual, in the New Testament, to employ the article when Jerusalem is mentioned. There are, indeed, two

passages which, at first sight, may appear to present exceptions. In Luke xxi. 20, we read, in the Greek, “*When ye shall see THE Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh.*” These words, it should however be recollected, were originally spoken in Hebrew (or in a dialect of that language). The name of the city, and the circumstances predicted respecting it, present a contrast in Hebrew which would have been put entirely out of view in the Greek, but for the Article introduced before the word “*Jerusalem.*” The Apostles were informed, that *The city of PEACE* [which is the meaning of the word “*Jerusalem*”] was to become *the theatre of WAR*, and a scene of desolation,—“*When ye shall see THE CITY OF PEACE compassed with armies, then know that its desolation is nigh.*” The presence of the Article was necessary here, the word “*Jerusalem*” being employed not merely to indicate the city intended, but to mark, by contrasting with its name, the miserable state to which it would, ere long, be reduced by *war*, though now called *the City of peace!*—The other passage, in which the name of this city occurs with the article, is in Acts v. 28; and there it seems to be employed for a reason similar to that which caused its insertion in Luke xxi—“*Behold ye have filled THE Jerusalem [the*

“**City of Peace**] *with your doctrine, and intend to bring this man’s blood upon us.*”—The High Priest and Council, as he would have had it be believed, (and perhaps they really were so) were extremely solicitous for the peace of the city, which, according to them, was endangered by the doctrine of the Apostles. In this instance, as in the former, the language employed was the Hebrew ; and we may infer that the Article was introduced into the Greek translation to mark the turn and force of the original expression: and, therefore, the inference remains no way weakened, that the presence of the Article in Gal. iv. 26, with the word *Jerusalem*, seems to indicate that the believing Galatians had heard of *the Jerusalem which descendeth from heaven.*

Respecting the evidence furnished by this epistle, of its being written later than the Apocalypse, the reader will have observed, that it is put merely as a question in the title of this section. Candour required this ; for it must not be concealed that the Jews antiently employed the term “*Jerusalem which is above,*” when speaking of the future happy days that were to be brought to Israel under the reign of the Messiah: Thus in Zohar fol. 120. col. 478. “*Rabbi Aba saith, Luz is ירושלם עלאה*” JERUSALEM WHICH IS “*ABOVE, which the holy blessed God gives for a*

“possession, where blessings are given by his hand
 “in a pure land: but to an impure land no blessings
 “to be at all. *Midras Till.* on Psal. 122. ‘Je-
 “rusalem is built as a city that is compact together.’
 “*R. Jochanan saith, The holy blessed God said,*
 “*I will not go into JERUSALEM WHICH IS ABOVE*
 “*until I have gone into Jerusalem which is below.*”
 —It is undeniable, then, that the expression in
 Gal. iv. 26 might be employed by the Apostle
 without any direct allusion to the Apocalypse;
 and that “*the Jerusalem which is above,*” may, as
 is generally stated by some commentators, be
 considered as referring to the church of God
 under the Gospel, and the privileges of Chris-
 tians: and indeed that the expression has such
 a signification is so evident, that I would not
 have quoted this text were it not that in ch. v.
 19—21 the Apostle employs words which seem
 to indicate, pretty plainly, that he had the Apo-
 calypse before him, or its language full in his
 recollection, when he wrote this epistle;—and,
 if so, I think it may be inferred, that in employ-
 ing the term “*Jerusalem above*” he meant not
 only to remind those whom he was addressing of
 the privileges that *now* belong to them, but also
 of the *future blessings* reserved for them after
 the resurrection; for, as the Apostle says else-
 where, “*if in this life only we have hope, we are of*
 “*all men most miserable;*” and he reminds the

Galatians, in the concluding chapter of this epistle, that *he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap life everlasting*, and adds, “*Let us not be weary in well-doing: for in due season we shall reap if we faint not.*”

In the other passage to which I have alluded in ch. v. 19—21 the Apostle, though not so directly as in some other of his writings, lays before the Galatians an amplified, accommodated transcript from Rev. xxi. 7, 8; for several of the works of the flesh which he enumerates, are the same as those which, in the Apocalypse, exclude from the heavenly inheritance, as *fornication* and *idolatry*, but especially *φαρμακεία*, rendered “*witchcraft*” in the common version, and its corresponding term *φαρμακῆῦσι* (or according to several manuscripts *φαρμακοῖς*) which (in Rev. xxi. 8) the common version renders “*sorcerers.*” In both places the words are, in my opinion, used figuratively, and, in this sense, mean *sophisticated doctrines*, *sophisticators of the truth*.

I also strongly suspect that part of the three verses, of which I speak, should be read in parenthesis thus:—“*But manifest are the works of the flesh (such as these, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, &c.) which I forewarn you, as I have in time past, that they who practise such things shall not inherit the kingdom of GOD.*” I am led to this view of the

passage, from observing, that some kind of emphasis is intended to be laid on $\phi\alpha\nu\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}$, “manifest;” for, if not, that word is of no use. To say, simply, “*Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are, fornication, uncleanness,*” &c. is the same thing as to say, “*the works of the flesh are, fornication, uncleanness,*” &c. But to say, “**MANIFEST** are the works of the flesh, which, I forewarn you, as I have before done, that they who do such things shall not **INHERIT** the kingdom of God,” is to refer them to some open record, in which it is expressly declared or shown or manifested, that they who do such things are excluded from that inheritance. Such I think is probably the intention of the passage; and if so, the association that has been pointed out, of these works excluding from the inheritance, will go far to prove that the Apostle had in his eye the passage that has been referred to in the Apocalypse. And this is rendered the more likely from the circumstance that he has made the same use of this passage in other epistles.

§ 11. *Of Evidence furnished by the Epistles to the Thessalonians.*

In the first Epistle to the Thessalonians are several expressions, which, if we believe that the writer often has allusions to the Apocalypse in

his other epistles, we can hardly have reason to doubt have reference to the contents of that prophecy. These believers had *turned to GOD from idols, to serve the living and true GOD, and to wait for his son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, JESUS who delivereth us from τῆς ὀργῆς, τῆς ἐρχομένης THE WRATH, THE COMING* [wrath] ch. i. 10. That is, they were not of the number of those who shall call to *mountains and rocks to hide them from τῆς ὀργῆς THE WRATH of the Lamb, when, the great day, τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτοῦ OF HIS WRATH, IS COME.* Again and again he speaks of *the coming of the Lord, JESUS CHRIST.* ii. 19, iii. 13. In the latter verse this coming is, “with all τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ THE HOLY ONES “of him (his saints)”—see Rev. ch. xx. 4: and, in the fourth chapter, he again brings to their recollection *the Lord’s coming*, as a matter of consolation respecting *those who sleep in JESUS*: —“*them who sleep in JESUS will GOD bring with him: for this we certify to you, BY THE WORD “OF THE LORD, that we the living who remain at “the coming of THE LORD, shall not precede them “who are asleep. For THE LORD himself will “descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice “of an Archangel, and with the trumpet of GOD, “and the dead in CHRIST shall rise first: then we, “the living, who remain, shall be caught up together “with them in the clouds to meet THE LORD in the*

“*air* : and so we shall for ever be with THE LORD.”

—Now all that the Apostle thus certifies, respecting the coming of CHRIST, the sound of a trumpet, and the resurrection of the dead, he does “BY THE WORD OF THE LORD.” This expression deserves particular notice ; for it is a direct reference to a written record. Had the Gospel by Matthew been in existence, when this epistle was written, it might be supposed that Paul had in his mind the twenty-fourth chapter of that Gospel, ver. 31 ; but the prevailing opinion of Critics is, that the Epistle to the Thessalonians was written ten or twelve years before the Evangelist wrote.¹ Even if we admit his Gospel to have been then in existence, there are circumstances in Paul’s statement, respecting the resurrection, which could not be gathered, directly, from Matthew ; and Paul’s previous allusion to *the day of wrath*, seems, plainly enough, to indicate the source whence he delivered “*the*

¹ Eusebius and several later writers state the Gospel of Matthew to have been written A. D. 41, and Nicephorus places it in 49 ; but Irenæus, the most antient writer on such subjects, dates it when Paul and Peter preached at Rome ; that is about the year 61. Mill, Michaelis, and various critics adopt this opinion. Owen thinks it was written so early as A. D. 38 ; while Lardner thinks it was not written before the year 64.—The first Epistle to the Thessalonians is allowed by most critics to have been written in the year 52.

“word of THE LORD.” That *the trumpet* of which he speaks is *the seventh Apocalyptic Trumpet*, receives farther confirmation from what follows, in the fifth chapter :—“Of THE TIMES AND THE PERIODS, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you ; for YOURSELVES KNOW PERFECTLY that the day of THE LORD so cometh ὡς κλέπτῃς AS A THIEF in the night” (ch. v. 1. 2). Is there no allusion here to *the times and the periods* explained in the Apocalypse? And will any person, acquainted with the ancient modes of quotation, rest satisfied, that the concluding words could have been drawn from Mat. xiv. 43. (supposing that Gospel to have been then in existence), when he finds the very words in Rev. iii. 3, and xvi. 15, already applied in precisely the same manner ; whereas the casual coincidence, in the former, can only be accommodated by inference? The Apostle refers to some plain testimony ; to something directly to his purpose ; something that THEY THEMSELVES KNEW PERFECTLY : and, in v. 3, reminds them of *the sudden destruction that cometh on the wicked*, viz. in the great day of wrath—“but ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that THAT DAY should overtake you ὡς κλέπτῃς AS A THIEF, v. 4. . . . GOD hath not appointed us to WRATH, but to obtain salvation by our Lord JESUS CHRIST,” v. 9.—And he concludes by praying (v. 23) that they may “be pre-

“served *blameless to THE COMING OF OUR LORD,*” viz. *from heaven with the trumpet of GOD.*

In his second Epistle to the same church the Apostle resumes the subject. He thanks GOD (ch. i.) for the increase of their faith,—boasting of them in other churches for the patience with which they endured persecution :—“ *A manifest token* (says he) *τῆς δικαίας κρίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ OF THE RIGHTEOUS JUDGMENT OF GOD ; in that ye were counted worthy of the kingdom of God, for which ye also suffer.*”—“ **THE righteous judgment**” alluded to, appears, from the context, to be that recorded in Rev. xix. 2. “ *True and δίκαιαι αἱ κρίσεις αὐτοῦ RIGHTEOUS HIS JUDGMENTS ;*”—for he instantly adds, “ *seeing it is a righteous thing with God to recompense trouble to them that trouble you,*”—which is an accommodated transcript from Rev. xviii. 6, “ *Reward her even as she rewarded you,*” &c.—The words that follow in the 7th verse deserve particular attention. In the common version they are given thus : “ *And to you who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord JESUS shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels.*” In this translation the preposition ἐν is translated as an adverb of time, “ *when,*” and the word ἀποκαλύψει has been rendered as the third person singular future passive of the verb ἀποκαλύπτω. Macnigh has given the same version, and the

greater number of translators have given a future signification to this word. It is probable, however, had they been aware of the possible existence of the Apocalypse, at the time this Epistle was written, that they would have rendered the passage otherwise, as they could not possibly be ignorant that ἀποκαλύψει forms the dative singular of the noun ἀποκάλυψις. Mac-night, on, "*rest with us*," says, "The Apostle does not mean, relaxation from persecution. The believing Jews had no relaxation in that sense, any more than the believing Gentiles. But he means, relaxation from the troubles of this life at death, and the enjoyment of eternal rest, the rest of GOD, along with the believing Jews."—Now, though it be true that, then, believers *shall* enjoy rest, a more natural sense may, I think, be given to the Apostle's words:—GOD gives to his people, in the present time, "*rest*, in THE APOCALYPSE OF THE LORD JESUS *from heaven, by the Angels of his power*:"—that is, in *The Apocalypse which Jesus Christ gave from heaven, by the angels of his power*; for The Revelation was given by him whom John saw sitting on a throne *in the heaven* (Rev. ch. iv.), viz. JESUS CHRIST, who *sent his angel* to make it known to John. The Apostle therefore appears to be referring to the Title of the Apocalypse, given in the first verse of that pro-

phesy. Nor is it any objection to this that in the title of the Apocalypse the word "*Angel*" is used in the singular, for a plurality were actually employed in the course of the vision, though only *one* at a time addressed John. In the promises of "*The faithful witness,*" recorded in the Apocalypse—in the belief of the things therein promised—those who are persecuted for the faith, enjoy *a present rest*,—because of the certainty of the future recompense, when *GOD will wipe away all tears from their eyes*. This very Apocalypse is now "*inflicting punishment, with flaming fire, on them who know not God:*" that is, the certainty of their punishment is therein fully declared, as well as its manner; nor can they avert any of the judgments therein denounced against them.

Destruction by *fire* is, in the Scriptures, (and particularly in the Apocalypse) a symbolical expression for destruction by the sword. Conformably to this the declaration in Mat. x. 34, "*I came not to send peace but a sword,*" is thus expressed in Luke xii. 49, "*I am come to send fire on the earth.*" Ultimately the enemies of the saints are to be "*cast into the lake of fire*" (Rev. xx. 15). "*They shall suffer punishment—everlasting destruction, ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ Κυρίου*" "*FROM THE PRESENCE OF THE LORD, even from*" "*the glory of his power, in the day when he shall*

“*come to be glorified in his saints,*” 2 Thess. i. 9. 10;—that is, “*ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ καθήμενου ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου* FROM THE PRESENCE OF THE ONE SITTING UPON THE THRONE,” (Rev. vi. 16) *when the great day of his wrath comes.*

How it may strike others time will determine; but, to the author of this work, it appears certain, that, in these passages in the first chapter of this Epistle, the allusions to the Apocalypse are quite obvious. Nor is the allusion less evident in what he states to them, in the second chapter, respecting “*THE Apostasy*” and “*THE man of sin, THE son of perdition.*” In our common version we read (2 Thess. ii. 3) “*Let no man deceive you by any means: for [that day shall not come] except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of Perdition ;*”—but the original is much more striking. There is an ellipsis in the verse, which our translators have very well supplied by, “*that day shall not come.*” the Apostle had been exhorting them not to entertain the opinion that “*THE DAY OF CHRIST was at hand*”—a persuasion that would have led to a neglect of all the relative duties enjoined in the New Testament. This day, as noticed above, is that in which *he shall come to be glorified in his saints,*—the day of wrath against the ungodly. This day, he informs them, shall not come “*until there come,*

“ ἡ ἀποστασία, **THE APOSTASY** *first, and there*
 “ *be revealed* **THE MAN OF SIN, THE SON OF**
 “ **PERDITION.**” Our translators have rendered
 ἡ ἀποστασία indefinitely, “ *a falling away,*” omit-
 ting entirely the article. Archbishop Newcomb
 gives the same version, and in his Note says,
 “ from the true Christian faith and practice.
 “ Some (says he) render, *THE Apostasy,* by way
 “ of eminence ; but in many places of the Greek
 “ Testament the article is used without its exact
 “ force.”—Bishop Middleton has shown that
 this latter assertion is quite unfounded, and that
 the inspired penmen are as precise in their use
 of the Article as other Greek writers. On this
 passage he remarks ; “ Ἀποστασία, from its use
 “ in the Septuagint, for in the New Test. it is
 “ found only here and in Acts xxi. 21, appears
 “ to denote an *act* rather than a *quality* ; and
 “ if so, the Article cannot here be inserted with-
 “ out signifying that a particular act is meant.
 “ Neither do I see the necessity for denying
 “ that the Article has here its proper force :
 “ since Apostasy, however long continued,
 “ might fitly be spoken of as *the Apostasy,* the
 “ several acts marking its progress being consi-
 “ dered as one whole.” This is true ; but I hope
 to make it evident also, that the Apostle is here
 referring to particulars that he had laid before
 them, from the Apocalypse, respecting *this*

Apostasy—this defection—this usurpation by the man of Sin, who *placed himself in the Temple of God* for “*forty and two months*” (i. e. 1260 years) Rev. xi. 2.

It is deserving of particular notice, that there is not a known manuscript in which the Article is omitted before “*son of perdition,*” before “*man of sin,*” or before “*Apostasy.*” “The Article is here emphatical,” says Macnight, “denoting both that this was to be a great apostasy, *the apostasy,* by way of eminence; and “that the Thessalonians had already been apprised of its coming—see ver. 5.” True, but notwithstanding the particulars detailed in the book of Daniel respecting *the wicked one* who was to *exalt himself above every god* (or ruling power), nothing was known respecting the real nature of *THE Apostasy* which was to furnish the basis for this usurpation,—or concerning the true origin of “*THE man of sin, THE son of perdition,*”—or of “*THE mystery of iniquity*” v. 7,—“*THE wicked one,*” or rather, as in the Greek, “*THE lawless one*” v. 8, until *THE LAMB* opened the book of Daniel,—which book, as will be shown in its proper place, (see § 14 of this Dissertation) was the one *closed with seven seals.* I mean not to say that the predicted events to which the Apostle alludes are not recorded in Daniel; but I am warranted in asserting that, though record-

ed by him, it is impossible that the interpretation could have been derived from that prophet. The vision is detailed in the 11th and 12th chapters of Daniel, and the prophet himself expressly states that *the words were CLOSED UP and SEALED till the time of the end* (xii. 9). Now if Paul, in this chapter, is giving an explanation of Daniel's prophecy, he could derive his knowledge only from the Apocalypse,—and this for the plainest reason:—before the Apocalypse was written “*no one in heaven or on the earth, nor under the earth, was able to open that book,*” none but THE LION OF THE TRIBE OF JUDAH (Rev. v). John wept much because none was found worthy to open the book; but for this he could have had no reason, had Paul already obtained this power, and explained these mysteries, in his Epistles to the Thessalonians, and to other churches;—and not only in his Epistles, but by his personal ministry (ver. 5). That, from the time when the Revelation was given, not only he, but all the Apostles, gave lessons from it to their converts, may be easily conceived; but that Paul, or any of the Apostles, could explain the sealed parts of the Prophet Daniel, before the Revelation was given, must be rejected by all who credit the declaration in Rev. v. 2—4. Indeed the allusions, in Paul's first Epistle to the Thessalonians, to “*the day of*

“wrath,” to “the word of THE LORD,”—to the Angel with a trumpet,—to the coming of THE LORD as a thief in the night, furnish sufficient evidence whence he derived the topics on which he dwells so much in his second epistle.

From the foregoing remarks it becomes quite obvious why the Article is employed, in the manner we have seen, in these allusions of the Apostle. These epithets had become familiar to the Churches, from what they had before them in the Revelation, and from the comments of their teachers; particularly of the Apostles, on the contents of that book, and of the previous prophecy of Daniel of which the Revelation was an exposition.

In 2 Thess. iii. 5. the Apostle prays thus:—“THE LORD direct your heart into the love of GOD, “and into τὴν ὑπομονὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ THE PATIENCE “OF CHRIST”—(wrongly rendered, in the common version, “the patient waiting for Christ”). Have we not here a direct allusion to the ὑπομονὴ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, “patience of Jesus Christ,” in which John says (Rev. i. 9) all believers are co-partners? This is an expression, I admit, which, from its nature, may be conceived as of ready occurrence to any writer engaged on such topics as here occupy the mind of Paul; and which therefore might be disregarded, for the object for which I have adduced it, were not other refer-

ences to the Apocalypse to be distinctly seen in this Epistle : but other references being evident, as has been shown, it is but reasonable to ascribe this expression to the same source as the others. The expression seems to have become common to all the Churches from their having the Apocalypse in their hands.

§ 12. *Of Evidence furnished by the Epistles of John as to the priority of the Apocalypse.*

John in his first and second Epistle employs the term *Antichrist*. He is allowed to have written his Epistle a considerable time after the other Apostles wrote theirs, and from his employing the Article—"THE *Antichrist*"—it is plain that this term had now become familiar among believers. Indeed he tells them that *they had heard that "THE Antichrist cometh"* (1 John ii. 18); and as he also mentions that *already there were many Antichrists*, it is plain that the former word, employed in the singular, had relation to the grand Apostasy, foretold somewhere or other, but which had not yet manifested itself, though, even at the time of his writing, there were many teachers who were actuated by the same spirit. Now the question is, Where or how did John obtain his knowlege of that Apostasy, which

was yet to appear, and which he designates by the term, "*the Antichrist?*"

The term means, *one who puts himself in the place of CHRIST—one opposed to CHRIST.*—That a ruling power, opposed to the Kingdom of the Messiah, would arise, was foretold plainly enough by Daniel; but his origin was not so plainly intimated, by that prophet, as to be intelligible to the Church, without a farther revelation; for *the words of Daniel were "sealed."* In short, till the Apocalypse was given to the churches, it was not known that this enemy was to arise or spring *from the church itself*; nor could this fact possibly be known, till *the seals* were removed *from the book of Daniel*: but we see that John was acquainted with this fact when he wrote his first epistle:—he knew that the great enemy of CHRIST would spring from the church itself; for, speaking of his precursors, he gives this as the proof that they were truly *Antichrists*:—*"They went away from us, but they were not [truly] of us; for if they had been of us they would have continued with us:"* and therefore it is plain, that he must have written his epistles subsequently to the Apocalypse; for in this prophecy, and in this alone, were the origin and true character of *the apostate, the son of Perdition, who was to set himself in the temple of God,—the Antichrist,—the lawless one,* developed to the church.

In consequence of this developement the churches knew well what was meant by these terms, employed by Paul and John in their epistles, and which, no doubt, would often occur in their oral addresses in the congregations.

John having written his Epistles later than Paul, and Paul, as has been shown, later than the Apocalypse, it was not necessary to my argument, that I should at all examine John's Epistles; but John's reference to **THE Antichrist**, as rising out of, or rather, *IN the church itself*,—a fact first made known by the opening of that book, concerning which *he wept much*, fearing that no one might ever be able to explain it,—furnishes incontrovertible evidence that he wrote his Epistles later than the Apocalypse.

This argument, however, depends on a fact of which the proof has not yet been submitted to the reader—that the book of Daniel is the *book sealed with seven seals*, which was opened or explained by *the Lion of the tribe of Judah*, in the Apocalypse. The evidence of this fact shall, however, be laid before the reader, after I shall have offered such remarks as may be called for on the few remaining Epistles yet to be noticed, and which will be confined to the next section.

§ 13. *Respecting the Epistles to Titus and Philemon, and the Epistle of Jude.*

In these, the only remaining epistles, I do not find any thing that may, with certainty, be considered as derived directly from the Apocalypse.

In that to Titus the only expression that has the resemblance of an allusion to that prophecy is in ch. ii. 13. 14.—“*Expecting the blessed hope, yea the appearing of the glory of THE GREAT GOD even our Saviour JESUS CHRIST.*”—This “*appearing of the glory*” is coincident with *the sounding of the seventh angel, when CHRIST will take to him his great power, and reign for ever—This is the period when he will give reward unto his servants, Rev. xi. 15—18. Yea, GOD shall then wipe away all tears from their eyes, and there shall be no more death, nor sorrow, nor crying, nor any more pain. They are therefore expecting this blessed hope of the appearing of this glory of our SAVIOUR.*

Any allusion to the Apocalypse could not be expected in such an epistle as that to Philemon, which is merely a short letter commending Onesimus, now become a Christian, to the kind regards of his master, to whom he had, before, been an unprofitable servant.

The Epistle by Jude refers to words, spoken by Apostles before he wrote his epistle (ver. 17), by which he may be conceived to refer particularly to the Epistles of Peter, for he alludes to the same facts respecting mockers and apostates: but however this may be, it is generally believed that, excepting the epistles of John, none of the epistles were written so late as his.

It is sufficient to say, respecting these epistles, that having been written after others which I have endeavoured to show contain allusions to the Apocalypse, they must, if my arguments have been well founded, be of a later date than that prophecy.

§ 14. *Of the sealed Book which has been opened by the Apocalypse.*

I had occasion in the 11th and 12th sections of this Dissertation to employ an argument drawn from the circumstance of both Paul and John, and I may also add Peter, having spoken very clearly of certain particulars detailed in the prophet Daniel. The sum of the argument may be stated in few words. These particulars were among the things that were *closed up and sealed* in the Book of Daniel—and they were to remain so sealed up till *the time of the end*. The ques-

tion then is simply this : Whence did these writers derive their knowledge? Certainly not from Daniel himself; for if his book could be thus read and explained, it could not be called *a sealed book*; and if this be the *sealed book* spoken of in the Revelations, how came John to weep on the supposition that no one would be found able to open, that is to explain, the book? If, until this was effected by *the Lion of the Tribe of Judah*, it remained a sealed book to John, how could it be open to Peter and Paul? and not only to them but to the churches, having been explained by Paul to the believers in Thessalonia both orally and by letter; and by Peter to the believers *scattered as strangers throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia!* What! an open book to such multitudes and yet a closed book to John! Yet this must be the fact, if John did not write the Apocalypse till the year 96 or 97, as some strenuously contend. Nay more strange still; John must have forgotten his former knowledge by the time he wrote his vision; for it is allowed, even by the most strenuous contenders for so late a date, that John's first Epistle was written about the year 80!—But the cogency of this reasoning depends on another fact: Was the sealed book which John saw opened in his vision, the book of the Prophet Daniel? If we attend carefully to

the description which John gives of this book we shall easily ascertain this point from the character and marks which he has recorded respecting it.

1. The book was *written inside and outside*. Its being written on *the outside*, evidently imports, that a part of the writing was visible; that is, the book was already in the possession of the church, and partly intelligible; and if we attend to what passed when *the Lamb who was slain, but now liveth*, took the book into his hand to open it, we shall discover a part of the writing itself, for it became the subject of the song of those around the throne, "*Thou hast made us unto our GOD Kings and Priests, and we shall reign on the earth.*" However dark the other parts of the book were, this was one thing which could be plainly read in it, that *a time was coming in which the saints shall possess the kingdom*; (Dan. vii. 25.) *when the rule and dominion and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom* (v. 27). Thus it appears that the book from which they took their song was that of the Prophet DANIEL.

2. It was a "*sealed book.*" Here we have a very particular and explicit description by which the book is ascertained to be that of Daniel, be-

yond all possibility of cavil. Daniel was commanded *to shut up the words and seal the book* of his visions. He alone, of all the prophets of God, received such a command; and, of all the books in the hands of the church, his is the only one which we find so shut up and sealed.

3. The book was not only sealed, but “*sealed with seven seals.*” It could by no means be opened till one qualified to give the interpretation should come and explain it. The seals being *seven* in number, show how perfectly the meaning was hid, “seven” in Scripture language denoting what is complete and perfect.¹ But we are not in the present instance left to take such a general signification of the term “seven.” As Daniel’s was the only sealed book in the hands of the church, so we find that character given to it in no less than four places of that prophet, viz. ch. viii. 26, ch. ix. 24, ch. xii. 4, and again in the latter chapter, at the 9th verse: and it is not a little remarkable that the number of times which *the vision—the prophet—the words—the book*, are *shut, closed up, or*

¹ The reason for this sense of the term, which is quite common in the Hebrew scriptures, is evidently this: the root, שבע, besides meaning *seven*, means also *to satisfy, to fill, to have enough, to complete*;—hence to do a thing *seven times* is to do it *perfectly*.

sealed, in these places, amounts exactly to SEVEN, as follows :

I. “ *Shut thou up the Vision.*” (viii. 26.)

II. “ *Seventy weeks are determined to seal up the Vision.*” (ix. 24.)

III. “ *Seventy weeks are determined to seal up the Prophet.*” (ix. 24.)

IV. *Shut up the Words to the time of the end.*” (xii. 4.)

V. “ *Seal the Book to the time of the end.*” (xii. 4.)

VI. “ *The words are closed up till the time of the end.*” (xii. 9.)

VII. “ *The words are sealed till the time of the end.*” (xii. 9.)

4. The book was complete : both the inside and outside of the roll or book was *covered with writing*. So the expression in the original denotes. That is, there was no room left for additions. And it is not a little remarkable that the explanation of this book given by the LION OF THE TRIBE OF JUDAH, shows that it contained a prophecy of the purposes of God, respecting his church and the reign of the Messiah, so complete and perfect, that nothing could be added to it. The removal of the seals from the book of Daniel was all that was wanted to put the church in possession of this knowledge.

5. We learn from Daniel himself how long the

book was to remain sealed. This sealing or shutting up was to continue for certain *weeks* : that is, as we find by the context (chap. ix.) till the time of MESSIAH THE PRINCE—till he should make *an end of sin*—[sin-offerings, for so the word signifies]—by the *one offering* of himself (Heb. x. 12, 14); or in other words, till *an end* should be put to the sacrifices offered under the law : and we find the same thing intimated twice afterwards (Dan. chap. xii.) by the expression “the time of *the end*,”—that is, the time of CHRIST, whose coming put *an end* to the Mosaic institutions. The book then that was opened in the Apocalypse, had its seals loosed at a period answerable to the prediction respecting the time in which Daniel’s prophecies were to be opened ; and, the fulfilment answering to the prediction, the evidence becomes complete, that the Prophet Daniel was the book that was thus opened.

The inference from all this is obvious. The writers of the Apostolic Epistles have, in various parts of their writings, spoken of some of the *sealed* things of Daniel, without any veil or mystery whatever : on the contrary, they speak of them as well known, even to those to whom they address their Epistles ;—as for example,—“*yourselves know perfectly, that the day of the Lord so cometh as A THIEF IN THE NIGHT*”—Paul in his first Epistle to the Thessalonians,

v. 2; and again in his second Epistle ii. 5, "*Remember ye not, that when I was with you, I told you these things?*"—What things? Things respecting "*the man of sin, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as a god sitteth in the temple of God showing himself that he is a god,*" ver. 3, 4: now the body or community here personified as *the son of perdition*, is the very king of whom Daniel predicted, "*he shall do according to his will, and magnify himself above every god, and speak marvellous things against the God of gods,*" &c. Dan. xi. 36; and the things respecting this *man of sin* and the manner of his destruction were among those that were sealed up—"But thou Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, to the time of the end," ch. xii. 4. This being the fact, the sealed book must have been opened before Paul wrote his Epistles; or, in other words, the Apocalypse had been given to the churches before that time, which was the point to be proved; for it is plain, from John's words, that up to the period when he saw the seals removed, neither Peter nor Paul, nor any one in heaven or on earth, or under the earth, had been "*found worthy to open the book, nor to inspect it,*" Rev. v. 4;—an assertion which would not be true, had Paul written his Epistles before that time.

While on this subject I shall take the opportunity to offer a few farther observations by no means foreign to the ultimate intention of the present publication. If the Book of Daniel was to continue sealed till the time of the end of the Jewish dispensation—if no human powers, however ingeniously exerted, could unfold or explain the sealed parts till the MESSIAH should give the true meaning of them—how should it be possible that, by following Jewish interpretations, the Christian Church should ever attain a right understanding of their import? Need we wonder, then, that Commentators should miss their aim, when, treading in the steps of the Jewish Doctors, they continue to consider Jerusalem as *the holy city*—the temple as the *sanctuary*—the Jewish High Priest as the *Prince of the Host*—Antiochus Epiphanes as *the polluter of the sanctuary, the taker away of the daily* [service], *the author of the transgression of desolation*; and the Roman armies under Titus, as those intended by *the destroyer of the city and the sanctuary*? Ought we not rather to be surprised that they could ever think it possible that *light* should be expected on this subject from those who have “*eyes, but see not, and ears but hear not unto this day,*” (Rom. xi. 8); or that they could overlook the numerous intimations given in the Scriptures respecting the substitution of another

tabernacle—another sanctuary, or holy place—another holy city, for those which existed under the Jewish dispensation ?

Of little avail will it be to admit these truths generally, if we do not follow them to all their consequences. “The Priesthood being changed” (Heb. vii. 12), there is made, of necessity, a “change also of the law” and of every thing connected with it. The first covenant had a worldly sanctuary (Heb. ix. 1), and in this a place called, by eminence, “the holiest of all,” (ver. 3), into which the High Priest entered alone once a year, not without blood, which he offered for himself and for the errors of the people (ver. 7) : the Holy Spirit signifying that the way into the *true holiest of all, was not made manifest while the first tabernacle was standing, which was only a figure for the time then present, until the time of the reformation by CHRIST.* Now, if the Mosaic institutions were to continue only till the time of the reformation by CHRIST, and if Jerusalem, the temple, &c. had no other sanctity than the legal holiness derived from these institutions, is it not absurd in those who call themselves Christians, to continue, with blind Jewish predilection, to apply to that “*Jerusalem, which is in bondage with her children,*” (Gal. iv. 25), events which were to happen subsequently to the coming of HIM, to whom Moses and all the Prophets bore

witness, as the end of the law?—Have we not “**A HIGH PRIEST** *who is set on the right hand of the Throne of the Majesty of the Heavens; a Minister of the SANCTUARY and of the TRUE TABERNACLE which the LORD pitched, and not man?*” (Heb. viii. 1, 2.) Hath not **CHRIST** come a High Priest of good things by *a greater and more perfect tabernacle* than the one made with hands? (Heb. ix. 11). HE hath not entered into “the holy places made with hands, *the figures of the true*, but “into *Heaven itself.*” (xi. 24.) Instead of the *Jerusalem which is in bondage*, have we not the *Jerusalem which is above, and free?* (Gal. iv. 26.) In one word—Has not the time come in which the true worshippers worship **THE FATHER** *in the Spirit and Truth* of all the figurative institutions of Moses (John iv. 23), being free from all bondage to the former weak, beggarly, worldly elements or rudiments? (Gal. iv. 3, 9.)

From these few observations, it is evident that things spoken of *the city, the sanctuary, the sacrifice, the oblation, &c.* and referring to periods subsequent to *the anointing of the Most Holy* (Dan. ix. 24), have no relation to the city which formerly was called *holy*, or to the worldly sanctuary and to the ritual of Moses. They are mere adaptations of old terms to the time of the New Testament dispensation.

As to the term “*Prince of the Host,*” it never

was applied, in the Scriptures, nor any similar term, to the Jewish High Priest; and to make such an application of it is not only arbitrary, but contrary to the express plan and tenor of both the Old Dispensation and the New. This is a point of some moment, but it will not require many words to set it in a clear light.—Both of them were to have a High Priest, and (not to insist here on other characteristic differences), there was to be this distinguishing circumstance between the two—the Priests under the law could only be of the tribe of Levi, and could have none of the prerogatives of Royalty, which belonged to another tribe, that of Judah. The New Dispensation, on the contrary, has a REGAL HIGH PRIEST—“*a High Priest after the order of Melchisedec,*” (Heb. vii.) who was *King of Salem*, and also *Priest of the Most High God*.—The Christian Church has A GREAT HIGH PRIEST, *who is passed into the Heavens*, JESUS *the Son of God* (Heb. iv. 14), whom GOD *hath constituted both LORD* (ruler, king, prince), *and CHRIST* (Acts ii. 36), agreeably to what had been before prophesied of him, “*I have anointed my King upon Zion, the hill of my Holiness.*” He is the PRINCE OF THE HOST—it is the name which he carries on his vesture and on his thigh—“*KING OF KINGS and LORD OF LORDS*” (Rev. xix. 16); for “*the host,*” in Daniel, as will be

proved in its proper place, means the Kings of the Earth, and particularly the Kingdoms of Europe—the body, or proper territory of Daniel's fourth beast. But if CHRIST be the Prince of the Host, Antiochus Epiphanes can by no possibility be the one who *made himself his equal, cast down his sanctuary, and took away the daily* [service] (Dan. viii. 11); nor can the "*Sanctuary*," and "*Daily*" alluded to, be the daily sacrifice, and the Temple at Jerusalem; and the whole of the fabric, that has been reared by the numerous commentators and expositors who have gone upon this system, must fall to the ground. But to return—

As the book of Daniel is the sealed book that was opened in the days of John, it follows that the same relation subsists between the writings of these two Prophets, as between a lock and its key. They are adapted to each other, and, if we would understand *the words that were closed up and sealed till the time of the end*, we must use them together; attending at the same time to what has been written upon the same subject by other Prophets and Apostles—for *all scripture is given by inspiration of GOD, and is profitable for instruction* (2 Tim. iii. 16). If we wish to profit by them, we must take the result which they may offer, even if it should *reprove* and censure what we may have been taught to re-

spect and venerate. If we hearken to the *re-proof*, we shall find that the same Scriptures also point out what is necessary to be attended to for the *correction* of those things which they condemn, and give ample *instruction* in every thing that regards our faith and practice. Instead of following the Jewish and antichristian interpretations of the Book of Daniel, which have been the principal causes that have prevented him from being understood, let us carefully attend to the explanation that has been given of this Prophet by "THE FAITHFUL AND TRUE WITNESS," as recorded in the Apocalypse; in which the seals are removed from that book; the time for which the vision, and the Prophet who saw it, were to continue sealed, having expired.

CONCLUSION.

The Apocalypse being, as I persuade myself has been proved, quoted in every Epistle in which the subjects treated of could possibly admit of it, it follows, that this Prophecy was delivered before these Epistles were written; nor is this a matter of trivial import, as viewed in connexion with rightly understanding the New Testament record. The very knowlege of the fact serves to account for many expressions

which seem abrupt, and as it were insulated, in the Epistles ; and their import, for that very reason, not always very apparent. The quotations, in fact, often carry with them the supposition, that the reader will consult the context, in the book whence they are taken ; for it would have been contrary to that plan of brevity which seems purposely to have been made to pervade the New Testament, to swell it out by large quotations from either the Old Testament Prophets or the Apocalypse. It is admitted on all hands, that when the Law or any of the Prophets is quoted, it is often indispensable that the context of the quoted words should be examined ; and now that it is known to be no less certain, that the Apocalypse is in like manner quoted by the writers of the Apostolic Epistles, the propriety and necessity of attending to that book will be held to be equally indispensable.

I am well aware that, the circumstance of quotations from the Apocalypse being found in the Epistles of the New Testament having been scarcely even suspected, many may be disposed to question the fact entirely. Let such persons first take due pains to examine the alleged quotations. In the examination they may, perhaps, find reason to reject, as not sufficiently evident, *some* of the instances that have been offered ; but I humbly apprehend that no person, acquainted with the antient modes of quotation

and reference, will be able to reject them *all*; and such is the nature of this evidence, that if but a single instance, out of the many that have been offered, shall be found to be, indisputably, a quotation from, or an allusion or reference to, the Apocalypse, the argument for an early date will remain unimpaired, and the fact incontrovertible, that the book was written at least as early as the reign of Nero, or more probably that of his predecessor.

I have supposed it possible that some of the alleged instances of quotation may be thought not sufficiently obvious to allow of their admission; but, on the other hand, I have to state, what I doubt not will be the result, a sufficiency being found to establish the general inference—and one indisputable quotation is as effectual for this as fifty would be—that other passages will be found, by those who turn their attention to this subject, which the author has not noticed; for it would be singular indeed if, in such an inquiry, none should have escaped his search. The issue I doubt not will be, that, on this subject, much will yet be discovered by the diligence of future enquirers; nor will its important uses, in illustrating those passages in which such allusions are found in the Epistles, escape the attention of such as study the scriptures with an earnest desire to comprehend their true meaning.

DISSERTATION THE THIRD.

ON THE LANGUAGE AND STRUCTURE OF THE APOCALYPSE.

§ 1. *Of the Verbal Language.*

IN reading the New Testament it should be constantly recollected that, though written in Greek, it is a record of doctrines and precepts delivered originally in Hebrew, or in a dialect of that language, and of events which had been predicted in the Hebrew scriptures; and also, that the principal speakers and actors were Jews. No new terms were invented; nor could this be necessary, in showing that what was now transacted was simply a fulfilment of Old Testament prophecies. It follows, that, in the Greek scriptures, (and this applies to the Septuagint translation so far as it gives a correct version of the Hebrew), other ideas, or shades of mean-

ing, attach to many words, than could be connected with them, as used by the heathen writers. To explain them only by Greek usage, would, on many occasions, be to exclude, in a great degree, the real subject which they are employed to elucidate. The Apostles and Evangelists, however, when exhibiting Jewish usages and ceremonies, and scripture theology, in a new garb, did not arbitrarily impose upon words, meanings foreign to their radical sense: analogy was strictly regarded. They did what good writers are obliged to do every day,—they extended the primary sense, so modified as to express or embrace, the new idea, taking care to maintain that [uniformity of use, in the new application, which should remove ambiguity and uncertainty.

It should be also recollected that, already, a language was, as it were, prepared for the penmen of the New Testament, as to the greater portion of the terms; for the Jews who were spread over the Roman Empire, and, particularly, throughout Egypt and the whole extent of the Greek provinces, were in the habit of using the Septuagint. Indeed but few of these Jews, excepting their learned men, could speak a word of Hebrew; and, but for this version, they must have sunk into a state of the greatest ignorance, respecting the history and religion of their

forefathers.¹ It is not surprising, therefore, that they should have considered the making of this

¹ Even in Judea the Hellenists made use of the Greek tongue; and, as noticed by Lightfoot (Vol. 1. p. 330), there are in the *Gemarists* several passages respecting the Greek language.—“In *Megillah* fol. 71, col. 2, they say thus, *There is a tradition from Ben Kaphra, God shall enlarge Japhet, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem.* The *Babylonian Gemara* on the same Treatise, fol. 9, col. 2, resolves us, what tongue of Japhet is meant; for having spoken, all along before, of the excellency and dignity of the Greek tongue, it concludes *יפותו של יפת יהא באוהלי שם* *The very beauty of Japhet shall be in the tents of Shem.*—Our men first named, say further thus: *Rabbi Jonathan* of Beth Gubrin saith, *There are four languages brave for the world to use, and they are these: The Vulgar, the Roman, the Syriac, and the Hebrew, and some add the Assyrian.* Now the question is, What Tongue he means by *the Vulgar*? Reason will name the *Greek* as soon as any; and *Midras Tilin* makes it plain that this is meant; for fol. 25, col. 4, speaking of this very passage, [but alleging it in somewhat different terms,] he nameth the *Greek*, which is not here named. Observe then that the Hebrews call the Greek *the Vulgar Tongue*. They proceed, *ibid.* col. 3. It is a tradition. *Rabban Simeon ben Gamaliel* saith, *In books they permitted not, that they should write, but only in Greek. They searched, and found, that the Law cannot be interpreted completely but only in Greek. One once expounded to them in Syriac, out of the Greek. R. Jeremiah* in the name of *R. Chaijah ben Ba* saith, *Aquila the proselite interpreted the Law, before R. Eliezer and before R. Joshua. And they extolled him and said, Thou art fairer than the children of*

translation a great blessing, and commemorated the event by an annual festival, which continued to be observed for some time after the Christian era.¹ As these Jews were acquainted with

men. And the same *Talmud in Satah*, fol. 21, col. 2, hath this record: *Rabbi Levi went to Cæsarea, and heard them קריין שמע אלוניםסתין rehearsing their Phylacteries HELLENISTIC, or, in the Greek Tongue.*—In a word: the conquests of Alexander served to establish the Greek language every where.

¹ In such authority was the Septuagint version held among the Hellenist Jews that, for a time, it was read in their synagogues instead of the Hebrew; and such were the unqualified praises they bestowed on it, that the Christians received it, not as a mere version, but as a second divine original, believing that the translators were inspired persons. It was early translated into Latin, and became the text book of the Western, as well as of the Eastern, churches. It was the only copy of the Old Testament Scriptures they generally used; and the only one they appealed to in all their controversies, particularly with the Jews, employing it most advantageously in confuting those from whom they had received it; proving to them from it, by the most irrefragable arguments, that their expected Messiah must have already come, in the person of JESUS CHRIST. This circumstance at length led the Jews to have it in abhorrence, and a national annual fast was instituted to deplore the same event which they had before commemorated by a solemn festival; so that, by the end of the first century, it was expelled from every synagogue. The Hebrew, however, had become so completely a dead language, not only to the Hellenists, but to the Jews generally, that they could obtain no knowlege

the law, only through the medium of a Greek version, a necessity was laid upon their teachers to address them in the Greek tongue. Thus the idiomatic changes, necessary to make this a fit language for the diffusion of a religion originating in Judea, had already been effected, before the Evangelists and Apostles began to write.

The formation of this peculiar idiom (for the Greek of the New Testament can neither be called a distinct language, nor even a dialect, in the strict sense of these terms) has been productive of benefits which have never been duly

of their Scriptures but through the medium of a translation, and therefore to supply the place of the Septuagint a new Greek version was made, about the year 129, by Aquila of Pontus, first a convert from Paganism to Christianity and then a proselyte to Judaism. His version, which is now lost, is reported to have been very obscure. Of course another was called for, and that of Theodotion made its appearance about the year 184. This writer, who had been a disciple of Tatian, then a Marcionite, and lastly a Jew, retained as much of the Septuagint version as suited his purpose, but altered, added or retrenched to make it conform to such Hebrew Manuscripts as the Jews put into his hands. The Jews of course were well pleased with this version, and the Christians were not offended because it so much resembled the Septuagint. Besides these versions there was another by Symmachus, (first a Samaritan, then a Jew, then a Christian, and lastly an Ebionite) made about the end of the second century; also translations by others of particular books of the Old Testament.

appreciated. Its peculiarity consists in expressing Hebrew phrases in Greek words; and by its establishment the Greek and Hebrew scriptures have been rendered mutual expositors of each other. An acquaintance, therefore, with what has been called Hellenistic Greek, but, more properly, the Greek of the Synagogue, is of great importance in the study of the Old Testament Scriptures; and, on the other hand, the peculiar idiom of the New can best be acquired by an intimate acquaintance with the Hebrew phraseology: nor can the most thorough knowledge of the language of the Greek classics supply the want of this; for some of the words, in the Greek scriptures, are used in senses in which they never occur in profane authors, and which, as remarked by Dr. Campbell,¹ “can be learnt only from the extent of signification given to some Hebrew or Chaldaic word, corresponding to the Greek in its primitive and most ordinary sense.”

These facts apply to the Scriptures generally, but, in a special manner to the Apocalypse. In this book the peculiar idiom alluded to is, in some respects, more prominent than in the other writings of the Greek scriptures; nor could it be otherwise; for, as has been shown, in the Dis-

¹ *Prclim. Dissert.* p. 23.

sertation immediately preceding, it was the first written book of the New Testament.

The dispersion of the Jews throughout the Greek Empire, the Septuagint translation, and the public addresses of the Elders to the Greek Jews in their Synagogues, had, as intimated, already effected certain idiomatic changes on the Greek employed in teaching the Law of Moses and expounding the Old Testament Scriptures; but these only embraced, and could only embrace, ideas connected with Judaism. More was wanted to adapt it for the general diffusion of the religion of JESUS. Hitherto uninspired men had used their best endeavours to clothe Hebrew phraseology in the garb of another language: but in the Apocalypse we have it under a Divine sanction, and adapted to the Christian dispensation. *So far, therefore, as concerns language, the Apocalypse may be considered as an initiatory or elementary work,—as the Rudiments of the New Testament Greek; and hence the number of Hebraisms, and peculiar forms of speech, which pervade this book: for a rigid adherence to what may be called the technical phraseology, is inseparable from the nature of an elementary work, and more especially, when a large portion of it has been before in use in another language—and that language the one in which all the Prophecies were*

written, to which the Apostles were to appeal when proclaiming *the glad news*, that *the promise made to the fathers was fulfilled by GOD in the resurrection of JESUS from the dead.*

Many have laboured to prove, that the entire phraseology of the New Testament is perfectly consonant to the usage of the Greek historians, philosophers and poets ; but in this attempt they have shown a *zeal without knowlege.* The formation of the idiom of which I have been speaking was indispensable ; and this idiom pervades the New Testament, but especially the Apocalypse. The assertion, however, of some men, that the Greek scriptures abound in lingual inaccuracies, does not appear to me to be well founded. In those portions which I have had occasion particularly to examine, I have found the converse to be so invariably true, as to lead me to conclude, that a stronger proof cannot be given by any person, that he has not made himself acquainted with the New Testament idiom, than his venturing to charge the sacred penmen with violations of grammar. In fact they understood the grammar of the language better than those who quarrel with them ; or, which comes to the same point, their adherence to the rules of grammar is so rigid as to repel every assault, and to place the acquirements of the critic, who makes the attack, in a very questionable point

of view.—How do such men generally proceed? They meet with some supposed violation,—they substitute the idea or mode of speech which they conceive to be intended:—they read on and presently meet with something which does not harmonise with the imposed sense; and a new violence is then committed, to prevent obscurity. The text again resists this: the Critic, never questioning his own judgment, blunders on, till he has lost the sense entirely: and then, instead of retracing his steps, or even trying what would be the result of allowing the author to speak in his own language, charges him with solecisms and violations of grammar.

In offering these remarks nothing can be farther from my mind than a personal allusion to individuals. Indeed it would be unjust to charge any, who, to the best of their ability, have laboured to explain the sacred pages, with having *wilfully* employed other than legitimate means to make out the sense. The points which I would establish are simply these: that, to admit any proposed sense, resting on a supposed violation of language in the author, is highly injudicious, in as much as it tends to set farther inquiry at rest; that it is dangerous, because we may thereby receive, as revealed truth, what is a mere human fiction; that it is, in every case, safer to remain ignorant of the true, than to receive a false sense; and, in a word, when the

assumed sense implies a violation of the rules of grammar, on the part of the inspired penman, that no other evidence is wanted to prove, that the critic, or translator, has missed the meaning of the passage. And I am persuaded that, till this shall be received and acted upon, as an invariable rule, we never shall obtain any thing like a correct version of the Scriptures.

In translating the Apocalypse if the verbal sense be not given correctly, the version will, of necessity, mislead. Every one sees that the book is difficult; and every one may see too, that this was designed by the Revealer. It was not intended that it should, as it were, counteract its own predictions:—its enemies were to be left to act as if it had never been written. One principal cause of the difficulty of the book is, the mode of expression, which at first sight appears quite easy, and the translation obvious, even to a school-boy; but a close examination shows the Greek intricate, and the translation false, as not agreeing with the nature of the Greek expression, or of the Hebrew phrase of which it is often the representative.— In the same chapter and in the same recital unexpected changes of tenses and cases are frequently obvious in the original. This fact is undeniable; but, if we disregard them, we throw away one of the principal means employed, in this prophecy, to guide the reader to the sense.

This subject is important ; and it may prove useful, before we advance any farther, to illustrate it by a short reference.

John writes in several characters : nor does he ever deviate from the style proper to each in its place. *The Revelation was given TO SHOW to GOD'S servants, things which were shortly to come to pass :—*and the things seen were to be **WRITTEN** in a book, and sent to the seven congregations : that is, the things **SHOWN**, were to be accompanied with such a detail of the circumstances of the vision, as might enable the reader to “**HEAR**,” that is, to *understand* “**THE WORDS OF THE PROPHECY**.” Accordingly, on some occasions, John *records*, simply, as a *Historian*, what he saw or heard ; and on others he becomes, as it were, *the Exhibitor*, calling upon the *reader* **TO SEE**, which in the sense of the Greek term, ἰδοὺ [*ecce*], signifies also **TO HEAR**, when the attention is called to sounds or words. The transition from the one style to the other is always sudden, and in some places frequent, but should be constantly regarded. Sometimes when he drops the participial mode of speech, (that usually employed when he introduces the servants of **THE OMNIPOTENT** to *behold* the vision,) it is for the purpose of explanation ; which, of necessity, requires another form of expression :—in one word, on such occasions he adopts the language proper to *an Expositor*. Thus, in the fourth

chapter, the first words, "*after these things I looked,*" are historical. He then CALLS upon the reader,—"**BEHOLD!** *an entrance, set open, in the heaven! also* [behold, i. e. hear] **THE "voice"**—What voice? He suspends the exhibition, till he informs the reader—not a new voice now speaking for the first time, but "*The former one which I heard, as of a trumpet, speaking with me.*" Throw these explanatory words into a parenthesis, then the sense is, "*Hear the voice saying, 'ascend,'*" &c. Having quoted the words of "*the voice,*" his language again becomes historical,—"*Immediately I was inspired;*" and, having nothing more to communicate on this point, he again calls the reader *to behold*, along with himself, the vision: "**BEHOLD** *a throne placed in the heaven,—and one sitting on the throne*"—"likewise a rainbow"—"*also twenty four seats,*" &c.—and thus he goes on, till, having invited him to behold "*seven lamps of fire burning before the throne,*" he again changes his mode of speech to perform the office of Expositor, saying—"These are [or represent, or symbolise,] *the seven spirits of THE OMNIPOTENT,*"—words which may be thrown into parenthesis; for he instantly resumes the language of the Exhibitor,—"*Behold, before the throne, as it were a sea of glass,*" &c.

Nor do these embrace all the peculiarities necessary to be attended to in the diction of the

Apocalypse. Sometimes it is *prospective*, informing the reader of something to be witnessed, at some particular part of the *future* exhibition. Thus in the fourth chapter, from the ninth verse to the end, it is intimated that, when the animals *shall give glory, &c.* to the one sitting (not *who sat*) on the throne, *then* the twenty-four elders *will prostrate* themselves, &c., *yea will adore* the one living to eternity, and *will cast* their crowns before the throne, &c.—which has reference to the adoration paid to the Lamb in subsequent parts of the vision, as in chap. v. 11. to the end, ch. vii. 10 to 13.,—ch. xi. 16. &c.—And sometimes he introduces a title, as it were, of contents to follow: as in ch. viii. 5. where, after the Angel casts fire on the earth, he prepares the reader to expect *voices, and thundering and lightnings and an earthquake*, or, rather, *a concussion*—viz. the voices of *the trumpets* of ch. viii. and ix. and xi. 15.—*the thunders* of ch. x.—*the earthquake* of ch. xi. 13.

On other occasions he is retrospective, (a fact which has been entirely overlooked by Expositors) and gives the reader a summary of what has been exhibited; as he does immediately after the foregoing particulars, adding, at the end of ch. xi., “*thus the sanctuary of God [not “temple as in our common version] was opened “in the heaven, and there was seen in his sanctuary “the ark of his testament:”*—alluding to the door-

way set open in ch. iv. 1, which enabled John to see the *throne*, *i. e.* the mercy seat, which was over *the ark of the testimony* :—“ *thus there were lightnings, and voices, and thunderings, and an earthquake :*” *viz.* those alluded to at the end of the last paragraph above. And again in ch. xvi. 18. the same recapitulation occurs, with additions, namely the *great earthquake* of xi. 13, and the division of the city into *three parts*, *viz.* the *three unclean spirits* or professions of xvi. 13. But, on such occasions, translators have generally made John express himself in such a manner as to convert his recapitulations into fresh matter of prophecy, or of vision ; and hence much of the obscurity in which this prophecy has been buried by commentators. On these occasions, however, the blame imputable to the translators is not always that of actually changing the author’s mode of speech, but, often the injudicious manner in which they translate the conjunction *καί*, making it, almost invariably, a copulative, “ *and ;*” whereas, not only in the Apocalypse, but very often throughout the New Testament, it represents the *vau*, or the *chi*, of the Hebrew, which demand, according to the exigency of the context, or the scope of the passage, a variety of expressions in English, as *even, also, yea, moreover, likewise, again ; then, therefore ; when, where, there ; yet, but, so, thus ; for, &c. &c.* True it is that the varying complexion of

these Hebrew conjunctions has been as little regarded in the translation of the Old Testament as of the conjunction *καὶ* in the New; but it is equally true, that where there is obscurity in the version, it may often be ascribed to this very circumstance.—Let not the common reader, however, take up the idea, that our Translators paid no attention to the various conjunctions required by the idiom of our language to make it express the varying significations of *καὶ*; for the contrary is the fact: they have frequently, and with great judgment, rendered this conjunction by—*even, yea, moreover, also, though, but, or, nor, namely, therefore, hence, so, &c. &c.* But time has discovered, that our public version might be improved, by a still more minute attention to this small but important word, which is of such frequent recurrence as to enter several times into almost every verse of the Bible.

One important particular respecting the style deserves to be noticed. The Hebrew nouns, like those in our own language, not admitting inflection in the oblique cases, the Amanuensis of the Apocalypse, when representing certain Hebrew epithets in a Greek garb, especially those of them which had not yet obtained proper representatives in the Greek language, exhibits them without inflection: that is, as a linguist would say, in the nominative case; as in the fifth verse of the first chapter, *ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πι-*

στῶς, “*the faithful witness*,” &c. This answers a singular purpose in this book, though hitherto unnoticed. Whenever the Greek reader meets with a nominative where, according to his ideas of Greek usage, he ought to find a genitive, a dative, or an accusative, the first thing which he ought to suspect is, that the Amanuensis is expressing some Hebrew noun (probably an epithet or title); for, without attending to this, he will sometimes miss the sense himself, and, if writing for others, will mislead them. On other occasions, if this occurs among words which John is writing from the mouth of some speaker, it will, with proper attention, be generally found, that they form no part of the words of that speaker; but are a parenthetical explanation by John himself,—and, therefore, deserving to be particularly noticed,—as in ch. iii. 14. where the words last quoted ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστῶς, “*the faithful witness*” are introduced after “*The Amen.*” In this place they are not the words of him who calls himself “*The Amen,*” but the words of John, defining the meaning of the indeclinable Hebrew noun אָמֵן (*Amen*) when thus used as a name or title. Sometimes this supposed anomaly is found in his own narrative: when this is the case, it is for the same purpose as when it occurs in the speech of another;—it is there a parenthetical explanation, and serves to intimate, that this is not to

be considered as new additional matter, but as a repetition, explanation, or amplification of something immediately preceding, as in ch. ix. 14. where, after “*the sixth Angel*,” the Greek reads ὁ ἔχων τὴν σάλπιγγα, “*the one having the trumpet;*” which are words added by John to prevent the words “*sixth Angel*” from being applied to any other than the Angel intended.

Let the Critic only make himself acquainted with these peculiarities, if they may be so called, in the style of the Apocalypse, and so far will he be from charging the writer with barbarisms, that he will wonder at the perspicuity and precision (the perfection of all language) which flow from John’s use of the nominative, and which could not, by any other means, have been attained, without a sacrifice of brevity, and often of energy. In one word, the writer of the Apocalypse, whom some Critics charge with ignorance of the common rules of grammar, so far from being careless in his style, exhibits what, in an uninspired writer, would be called, great solicitude to prevent the possibility of his language being misunderstood. He not only, on different occasions, gives a key to explain the symbol which he employs, but actually performs the office of a philologist, by giving precise definitions of the most important terms which occur in the book, as in ch. i. 8. iii. 14, &c. (See the Fifth Dissertation.)

In the use of the prepositions John is so rigid that unless a translator attends to them with great care, noting the case with which they are put in construction, he will often fail to express the sense of the original. In no point have translators failed more essentially than in this; giving a kind of school-boy version, which, in many instances, conjures up a false picture to the mind. Take the following as an instance: *Εἶδον ἐπὶ τῇ δεξιᾷ τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου βιβλίον* (ch. v. 1.) Here the first *ἐπὶ* is joined with an accusative, in which situation it never, in any instance, expresses position *on* or *in* place,—any thing resting *in situ*; yet all the versions have rendered these words thus: “*I saw IN the right hand of him that sat on the throne a book.*” Now the fact is—John did not see, nor does he say that he saw, a book in any hand whatever, either right or left. Had he meant to say so, he would, when employing the preposition *ἐπὶ*, have put the noun in the genitive. He tells us that he saw a book *on* or *concerning* a certain subject or topic; and informs us what this subject was; namely, “*the right hand of the one sitting upon the throne.*” Consequently “*the right hand*” must not be taken in its proper sense, but in some other to which the Scripture is not a stranger. In one word, a little enquiry will satisfy the reader, that he here employs the expression commonly used in the Old Testament for *power*:

—he saw a treatise or work which had for its principal topic, *the POWER of the one sitting upon the throne*. In fact, the text presents a strong Hebrew figure of speech, which escapes entirely the notice of the reader, when the preposition is wrongly translated.

It may be proper to state here, for the information of the mere English reader, that the Greeks had not the number of prepositions which are found in modern languages ; but though, in this respect, their language was not so rich as some of these, yet in resources for varying the shades of expression, required in composition and discourse, they were by no means deficient. With us this is often effected by changing the preposition : with them it was frequently effected by changing the case of the noun with which the preposition was put in construction,—the same preposition with the same noun, but in different cases, expressing quite different senses. It is, however, but too true, that translators, in general, have paid no attention whatever to this, but have satisfied themselves with making out a bungling sense,—often quite false. But in justice it should be mentioned, that, when the received version was made, but little was known respecting the nature and character of the Greek prepositions ; and, therefore, great precision cannot be expected from the translators of that period : but how comes it that, in recent versions,

no advantage has been taken of the discoveries that have since been made in this branch of learning?

On the *verbal language* of the Apocalypse the foregoing remarks may suffice for the present: but, before proceeding farther, it may be useful that we make ourselves a little acquainted with the nature of symbols or hieroglyphics, with which the book abounds; as, without some knowlege of *this particular language*, it never will be possible to come to any satisfactory conclusion, respecting the sense of many of the passages in this prophecy.

§ 2. *Of Symbolical or Hieroglyphical Language.*

No person can doubt that a large portion of the Apocalypse is delivered in Symbols, or in the language of Symbols. Indeed in the very first verse of the book we are informed that the things communicated were *symbolised* (ἐσήμανεν), to John; that is, made known by symbols, or significant signs: for this is the proper sense of the verb σημαίνω, in contradistinction to what is declared in common speech. As, then, the things exhibited to the prophet were symbols, and as, whenever any *Angel* (that is, *Messenger*) is introduced as conversing with him, it is for the purpose of calling his attention to these symbols, or to inform him of something respecting them,

it is highly necessary that Christians should make themselves as well acquainted as possible with this mode of writing or communicating information. To enter fully into this subject would require more time and space than can now be given to it: but a few general observations, in this place, may tend to facilitate future enquiries.

All primitive languages are highly figurative, and they are so from necessity. Men must possess ideas before they seek words to express them; and, when new ones are produced, making use of the language they possess, they are obliged to have recourse to such natural objects around them as are known, or supposed, to possess qualities or properties, in some way resembling the idea they wish to communicate. Hence the language of *metaphor*, which uses such expressions as these: GOD is my *rock*—my *fortress*—my *high tower*—my *shield*—and, *the horn of my salvation*. In such modes of speech, the fitness of the figure is manifest, and occasions no ambiguity; but the original paucity of language introduced another form, which, from its very nature, seems to have been prior even to the use of metaphors—I mean the *symbolical* language; in which the figure employed is not used as an adjunct, expressive of some property, quality, or function of the object or subject named along with it, but put in place of the object itself.

The origin of this mode of writing seems obvious. Oral language being antecedent to any kind of writing, the first attempts at the latter could be nothing but rude efforts to represent to the eye a draft or outline of the object described ; as, the picture of a lion when that animal was to be expressed, and that of a man when a man was the subject : but as qualities as well as objects were required to be also conveyed by the writing, and as in oral language these could only be expressed by figures drawn from sensible objects, the same method was necessarily employed in graphic attempts, and hence any particular animal was employed, not only to represent the animal itself, but as a substitute for some other object, to which one or more of the qualities proper to that animal were ascribed. Thus, a lion, by common consent, signified a man strong and powerful—a *king* ; and hence such an expression as this—“*the lion of the Tribe of Judah,*” i. e. *the king* who had his descent from that tribe ; for even after languages became more copious, and could furnish many terms proper for expressing abstract ideas, the old method continued, and was blended with oral language, and with literal writing, which was much later than the symbolic.

Strange as this method of writing appears to the moderns, it was brought to such perfection as to possess powers of expression far beyond

what can now be easily conceived. This is plain from the number of synonymous symbols that are known to have been employed in it; nor is it difficult, in some instances, to see in what manner they were derived. Every department of nature furnished objects that were fitted, in some way, for the purpose: hence, to express a king, they were not confined to the brute creation; whatever was the *chief* of its kind became, or by common consent might have become, a legitimate symbol of a monarch; as, *the Eagle*, which was so employed, because conceived to possess the first rank among the feathered tribes. Again, as a king's power to subdue his enemies depends on the strength of his kingdom, and as animals with horns are, *ceteris paribus*, stronger than those who have none, *horns* are put for *kingdoms*; and, kings having the direction of the national force, the same symbol is, by metonymy, put for kings. In like manner, the firmament, to use the ancient term, being elevated above the earth, and esteemed more splendid and glorious than terrestrial objects, was employed to symbolise the most elevated ranks among men; and as, among the planets, *the sun* possesses incomparably the highest lustre, it became the symbol of *supreme power*, while *the stars* were made symbols of those possessing *authority subordinate to the supreme*.

Among the Egyptians this kind of writing was carried to the highest degree of perfection; those traditions and mysteries, which were thought of sufficient importance to be handed down to their successors, were engraven on the pyramids, the walls of their temples, and other works of art, and hence the name *hieroglyphic*, from two Greek words *ιερός* *holy*, and *γλύφειν* *to engrave*.

The oldest writings which the corroding tooth of time has suffered to reach us, and particularly the prophetic books of the Scriptures, abound in hieroglyphical language; nor can particular parts of them be understood, correctly, without a knowlege of this species of writing. Indeed those, whose peculiar duty it is to devote their labours to the elucidation of such writings, ought to make the symbolic language an object of particular study, that they may not only be able to ascertain the general signification of symbols, as such, but those legitimate shades and modifications of meaning, which result from their varied associations.

In such an investigation it should not, for a moment, be forgotten, that each symbol has a precise and determinate meaning; and that, until this be ascertained, with respect to any one specified, it will be absolutely impossible to settle its peculiar signification, in combinations

which necessarily affect the features, though not the radical sense of the symbol.—But I shall perhaps make myself more quickly understood by an example.

The sun, as has already been noticed, was, among the ancients, the legitimate symbol of *supreme power*, and the stars of *subordinate authority*. A careless reasoner will be apt instantly to conclude, that when the sun is put for *the supreme ruler*, the moon must symbolise *the queen*; and he will not fail to recollect, in support of his opinion, that in Joseph's dream the sun symbolised the father, the moon the mother, and the stars the sons. In the case of a family these symbols could, with no kind of propriety, be taken in any other sense; but it is quite otherwise in respect to a kingdom or empire; and it is so from that necessity which determines the fitness of things. The hieroglyphic of the luminaries embraces a totality, which must not be violated, in any case to which it may be applied; the moon, therefore, cannot signify the wife of the sovereign, or it would follow, that a kingdom cannot exist without a queen, as well as a king. In fact the sun does not symbolise the sovereignty as *a male*, or as any thing but *the supreme power*; whether vested in a male, in a female, or in a plurality of persons. A queen, then, *if supreme*, may be symbolised by the sun: in this case what

would become of the moon? Consider the compound symbol, and then the parts of the complex machine to which it is applied. If the sun symbolise the sovereignty, and the stars inferior magistrates, what else remains of the political fabric to be symbolised? Only *the subjects*; for a queen, considered as the spouse of the king, is not necessary to the existence of an empire; and, therefore, cannot be embraced by any portion of a symbol that is to be so applied, except as one of the subjects. By what argument, then, can it be shown, that, in the symbol of the luminaries, the moon is applied with equal propriety to a man's wife when a family, as to the people when a kingdom, is intended? By a very obvious analogy: the man's wife is symbolised, not as a wife, but as a subject; for such is the order appointed by the Supreme Ruler of the universe,¹ an order from which the inhabitants of the East, the parents of hieroglyphics, have not deviated even to the present time.

It is deserving of notice, that the ancient astrologers, in solving political questions, seem to have been guided entirely by symbolic indications. They always considered the sun as representing the government or ruling power, and

¹ Gen. iii. 16. 1 Cor. ii. 3. and xiv. 34. 1 Pet. iii. 5. Ephes. v. 24.

the moon as symbolising the people or subjects ; but in domestic questions, as in Joseph's dream, the sun represented the husband, and the moon the wife, because subject to him. And here it may be remarked, for the analogy is striking, that Artemidorus states, that, a *lamp-stand* symbolises a wife,¹ for which he assigns this reason :² that, as a lamp, or the light thereof, signifies the master of the house, because he superintends it ; so the *lamp-stand* signifies his wife, over whom he rules and presides.

As an example of apparent change,—for the change is only in appearance,—which a symbol receives in its meaning, from a change of circumstances, I shall exhibit one drawn from the heavens. Stars sometimes symbolise, not inferior magistrates, but kings. In this case more than one king is spoken of, or the Ruler of the universe is alluded to in the context : if the former, as there is but one sun in our system, he is necessarily excluded, where a plurality of kings is the subject, and therefore other luminaries are substituted ; if the latter, the sun symbolising the *King of Kings*, the powers ordained by him are represented by stars. In the remark that has just been made, the reader will easily perceive one of the steps, by which ignorance deified the sun. In hieroglyphical language the Deity is

¹ Lib. i. cap. 76.

² Cap. 80.

“*the sun of righteousness,*”—that is, the righteous king, ruler or governor.

The object I have in view, in offering these remarks, is, not to give, at present, an explanation of particular symbols, but, to press upon the reader the necessity of distinguishing with care between metaphors and symbols. In hieroglyphical language it is not left to fancy, or to sagacity, to attach to a symbol any signification which the reader may imagine would have been more appropriate than that assigned to it by the ancients; for in elucidating such writings our business is not now to make a language, but to read one already made; and we might as well refuse to assign to any word in Hebrew, Greek, or Latin, its known and admitted sense, from a conceit that a more expressive word might have been formed, to convey that idea, as quarrel with the meaning of a hieroglyphic, because, in our judgment, a more appropriate one might have been formed. But this is, in fact, the line of conduct that has been followed by the greater part of the expositors of prophecies. They have confounded symbols with metaphors; and, because the figures employed in the latter, according to their various combinations, admit of various significations, have used the freedom to assign meanings to the former, not recognised by the ancients, and therefore inadmissible.

Where symbols are employed it is the duty of an expositor, instead of resorting to fancy, to employ industry ; not to make, but to find out the admitted sense. In Daniel and John many of the symbols they employ are explained ; the meaning of others may be found in other prophecies ; and where these fail, recourse must be had to profane authors. Nor is there more danger in seeking the meaning of a symbol in such works, than in ascertaining the sense of any word in the New Testament, by comparing the best Greek writers with each other and with the Septuagint. By following this method it can hardly be doubted that the true and genuine signification of every one of the symbols they employ may be satisfactorily ascertained. It may not be in the power of any single individual to accomplish this desirable object. Where he cannot, by his industry, discover the meaning of any particular hieroglyphic, instead of showing himself ingenious, let him be ingenuous and confess his want of success, and we may hope that others, from sources which he may not have had an opportunity of consulting, will sooner or later supply the deficiency.

On the sources whence useful information may be derived on this subject, I cannot do better than offer a quotation from Bishop Hurd, who expresses himself thus :

“ Much of the Egyptian hieroglyphic, on
“ which the prophetic style was fashioned, may
“ be learned from many ancient records and
“ monuments still subsisting; and from innu-
“ merable hints and passages scattered through
“ the Greek antiquaries and historians, which
“ have been carefully collected and compared
“ by learned men.

“ The pagan superstitions of every form and
“ species, which were either derived from Egypt,
“ or conducted on hieroglyphic notions, have
“ been of singular use in commenting on the
“ Jewish prophets. Their omens, augury, and
“ judicial astrology, seem to have proceeded
“ on symbolic principles; the mystery being
“ only this, that such objects as in the hierogly-
“ phic pictures were made the symbols of cer-
“ tain ideas, were considered as omens of the
“ things themselves

“ But of all the pagan superstitions, that
“ which is known by the name of *oneirocritics*,
“ or the art of interpreting dreams, is most di-
“ rectly to our purpose. There is a curious
“ treatise on this subject, which bears the name
“ of ACHMET, an Arabian writer; and another
“ by ARTEMIDORUS, an Ephesian, who lived
“ about the end of the first century. In the
“ former of these collections (for both works are
“ compiled out of preceding and *very ancient*

“ writers) the manner of interpreting dreams ac-
 “ cording to the use of the oriental nations is
 “ delivered; as the rules, which the Grecian
 “ diviners followed, are deduced in the other.
 “ For, light and frivolous as this art was, it
 “ is not to be supposed that it was taken up at
 “ hazard, or could be conducted without rules.
 “ But the rules, by which both the
 “ Greek and oriental diviners justified their in-
 “ terpretations, appear to have been formed on
 “ symbolic principles So that the pro-
 “ phetic style, which is all over painted with
 “ hieroglyphic imagery, receives an evident il-
 “ lustration from these two works

“ Nor is any sanction, in the mean time, given
 “ to the pagan practice of divining by
 “ dreams. For though the same symbols be in-
 “ terpreted in the same manner, yet the *prophecy*
 “ doth not depend on the *interpretation*, but on
 “ the *inspiration* of the dream It follows,
 “ that the rules, which the ancient diviners ob-
 “ served in explaining symbolic dreams, may be
 “ safely and justly applied to the interpretation
 “ of symbolic prophecies.”¹

To these remarks of the learned Bishop, I shall only add, that considerable help may be obtained from *Pierius's* work on Egyptian hiero-

¹ Hurd, Serm. ix.

glyphics, and particularly from the work that goes by the name of *Horapollo*. There is also a modern work on this subject, which may be consulted with advantage, *Lancaster's Symbolical Dictionary*; but he should be received with caution, having, in many instances, like *Daubuz* whom he follows, fallen into the common blunder of commentators, that of confounding tropes, figures, and metaphors with symbols.

§ 3. *Of the Structure of the Apocalypse.*

Though the subject of this section has been in some measure embraced in the two preceding sections, there is still room for some farther observations. One point in particular, respecting the structure of this remarkable prophecy, deserves great attention. A considerable portion of the particulars detailed by John, was not, as has been generally imagined, exhibited to him in dramatic action,—if, on such a subject, I may employ such a term. On the contrary, many of the things, which he states himself to have seen in the vision, were brought to his view, precisely as he intimates in the first verse of the first chapter (see § 2):—they were *symbolised* to him: they were *symbolical representations*, such as he describes;—that is, *pictures* of some kind,

contained in a book, which was unrolled before him. Had translators properly attended to the circumstance, that, in this part of the prophecy, especially from the beginning of the sixth to the end of the ninth chapter, John, besides describing the other circumstances of the vision, gives a detailed account of things, circumstances, and actions, seen by him in pictorial representations, *in the unsealed roll itself*, they would, perhaps, have succeeded better in attaining the author's sense; and many of the sudden changes in moods and tenses which occur, and which hasty critics have presumed to stigmatise as arbitrary, capricious, and not to be accounted for, would have been seen to be perfectly appropriate, and absolutely required by the very nature of the detail.

It is the more surprising that recent expositors should have so generally overlooked the circumstance of the sealed book or roll, of which the Apocalypse treats, exhibiting, when opened, a series of symbolical pictures; as the fact had occurred to Mr. Harmer, and had been stated by him in his very useful work on Oriental customs. His words are: "St. John evidently supposes
" paintings, or drawings, in that volume which
" he saw in the visions of GOD, and which was
" sealed with seven seals; the first figure being
" that of a man on a white horse, with a bow

“in his hand,” &c. : and further on, after speaking of two manuscripts of the Pentateuch, adorned with paintings,—“Such a book, it seems, was that St. John saw in a vision.”—Had commentators taken this view of the symbols described by John, it would have tended very much to obviate some of the difficulties they have met with in their attempts to explain the Apocalypse.

Having already had occasion to show, in the Second Dissertation, § 14, that these symbolical pictures had reference to the book of Daniel as *a sealed book*, the meaning of which was thereby explained to John, and through him to the Christian church, it is not necessary that I should here dwell long on this part of the structure of the prophecy. One observation, however, presents itself. Some commentators, mistaking entirely the nature and object of the sealed book, conceive the Apocalypse to be “divided into two main branches; the former *a sealed book*, containing seven seals, or *sealed and hidden prophecies*; and the latter an *open codicil*, containing several *open and clear ones*,”—thus actually converting what, John plainly teaches, was done for the opening and explaining of a book that was formerly sealed, into the formation of a new sealed book, containing “seven sealed and hidden prophecies!”

To treat the Apocalypse thus, is to lock it up. If these prophecies be indeed sealed, vain must be every attempt to explain them. This notion has been taken up from an idea that “*the book*” of ch. v. “*sealed with seven seals,*” must be different from the “*little open book*” of ch. x. 2. But had those who have embraced this opinion attended to the Greek text, they would have seen that the expression used in the latter imports, that the book there spoken of is one “*that had been opened*” (ἀνεωγμένον), plainly intimating that, before “*having been opened,*”—which is the correct sense of the Greek,—it had been *a sealed book*; and that, having been so opened, by the removal of the seals, as detailed in the preceding chapters, it has been explained in such a manner that it may now be understood: and, accordingly, John was commanded to *eat the book* (ch. x. 9), that is, properly to consider and digest its contents, that he might be able to prophecy still farther *respecting peoples, and nations, and tongues, and many kings, or kingdoms.* Nor does the circumstance of its being called “*a little book*” (βιβλαρίδιον) in ch. x, at all alter the case; for this only serves to describe still farther the “*book*” (βιβλίον) of ch. v, informing the reader that the one alluded to—the one “*that had been opened,*” by removing the seals from it, is not a large volume;—a fact which is

correctly true respecting the book of Daniel, and particularly the sealed parts of his prophecy. Every notion then, of such a structure as that which has just been alluded to, should be rejected, as quite foreign to the nature and design of the *Apocalypse*.

Another opinion which has been very generally entertained respecting the *Apocalypse*, should also be noticed in this place; namely, that system which considers the book as being composed of *seven seals*, all of which, in their order, embrace *distinct* and *successive* periods; to each of which certain events are supposed to correspond, as its individual contents; and to the last, in particular, is appropriated, as its contents, *seven trumpets*; all of which, consequently, are subsequent to the first six seals, and also represent so many distinct periods in succession. The seventh trumpet also, like the seventh seal, is, in this system, divided into seven distinct and successive periods, for the pouring out of *seven vials of wrath*, all of which are subsequent to the first six trumpets.—All this is laid down “for the sake of method!” and it is held, by those who conceive this to be the structure of the book, to be a sufficient reason for rejecting any proposed explanation, that it would “introduce confusion into this order.” In imitation of the savage policy of Procrustes, what-

ever in the book is too short for this bed is stretched to its length, and every thing too long is cut down to the standard.—Such is the method, with a few variations, which has been followed to explain the visions of JOHN, only because such is the order in which he narrates them.

As one means for ascertaining whether such a method of procedure is at all calculated to elicit the true sense, let us, for a few moments, apply a similar mode of interpretation to the visions of DANIEL, and see what would be the result. Upon the principles laid down by such commentators for explaining the Apocalypse in the manner just stated, we must proceed thus:—Daniel's *Great Image*, composed of four metals, represents so many kingdoms in succession. Another kingdom—the *kingdom of the GOD of Heaven*, represented by *a stone cut out without hands*, is then to be established, which is to *destroy all other kingdoms, and endure for ever*. But here, by *kingdoms*, we must *not* understand kingdoms, but *the rule and dominion of the pagan priests*; for we find *subsequently* to this period, four other kingdoms mentioned by DANIEL, and which he represents by *four great beasts*, the last of which has *ten horns*, which signify ten kingdoms more in succession.—These are followed by a *little horn*, or king, who performs

prodigies of wickedness, till at length the judgment sits, and sovereignty is given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an *everlasting kingdom*. But “*order and method require*” that we here limit the import of the word “*everlasting* ;” for we find, after this period, two empires represented by *a Ram and a he-Goat*—the latter of which is followed by *four other kingdoms*, out of one of which comes *another little horn*, no way inferior in wickedness to the one before mentioned. This new *little horn* must be explained, (no matter how, for *order and method require it*,) by the prophecy of the seventy weeks ; and in the last of these weeks we must expect *the Kings of the North and South* to appear, the last of whom will be destroyed when *Michael shall stand up for Daniel’s people* ! This is Daniel’s order of narration, and therefore, such must be the method followed to explain him.—What would be thought of the Expositor, who should propose such a series of absurdities !

Some recent Expositors have absolutely maintained that, by the “*little horn*,” twice seen in vision by Daniel, two different Powers are predicted—an *Eastern* and a *Western Antichrist* ;—because, among other reasons, the opinion that they are one, “renders Daniel liable to the charge of unvarying repetition !” But, singular

as it may appear to these Expositors, the leading sealed truths in Daniel, and open truths in Revelation, have respect only to two important facts—the reign of CHRIST, and the reign of *Antichrist*,—the punishment and destruction of the latter, and the triumph of the former. Both Daniel and John are *chargeable* with repetitions, but not “unvarying repetition.” Often, however, as they have repeated the same facts, it would appear that they have not done so often enough to prevent men from indulging in fancy and hunting for variety.

However plausible and ingenious any exposition of the Revelation may appear, if it proposes any thing that has not a direct reference to the contents of the sealed book of DANIEL, as the plain and obvious sense of what was *shut up and closed till the time of the end*, it must be rejected by those who wish to *hear the words of this prophecy*; for only by attention to the voice of “THE FAITHFUL AND TRUE WITNESS,” in opposition to the comments and glosses of those who substitute darkness for light, can a right understanding of *the book* that HE has opened, and of *the Revelation* by which HE has opened it, be obtained. To me it appears impossible, that the true sense can be elicited, by any system which would ascribe to the book such a structure as necessarily to require, that the parts of

each series of symbols shall be considered as following each other in chronological order, each individual part having its commencement when the events of the part immediately preceding have had their accomplishment; and each whole series, in like manner, having its commencement only after the particulars of the preceding series have been consummated. Conformably to this system, it is quite common with commentators to consider the Rider of the first seal as having not only gone forth, but finished his whole course, before the Rider of the second seal is suffered to commence his journey; and in like manner to give to the third a prescribed duration subsequent in time to the second, and terminating when the fourth is sent out, &c. And thus it follows, as a necessary consequence of this mode of procedure, that the Riders, respectively, have finished their entire course, and ceased to have any existence long before the events of the first trumpet have even their commencement. The absurdities that would follow from a similar mode of interpretation applied to Daniel, are apparent enough. Why then should it be held possible to render the Apocalypse intelligible by such a process?

To particularize all the varied modifications of these systems, which have been offered in elucidation of the Apocalypse, would be a waste

of time. Suffice it therefore to say, that though the Revelation may be considered as having been all communicated on the same Lord's day, and therefore, as a whole, may, for convenience, be called one vision, being, as a whole, one Revelation, yet it is evident, that the particulars exhibited, or communicated, to John, did not follow each other without any intermission; for this is plainly intimated in the prophecy itself. Thus in the fourth chapter the Apostle states that he heard *the same voice that had spoken to him before*, even *the great voice "as of a trumpet,"* quoting his own words from Ch. i. 10. On the occasion to which he alludes he had noted that he was "*inspired on the Lord's day;*" and now, on hearing the same voice again address him, he says, "*Immediately I became inspired,*"—plainly intimating that there had been a suspension of *the inspiration*, or, in other words, an interval, however short it may have been, between the former exhibition and that which he proceeds to describe in the chapter referred to.

That the Apocalypse does present several distinct details of events, which coincide in point of time, has been perceived by many; and, accordingly, various expositors have endeavoured, some with more and some with less success, to ascertain the various synchronisms to be found in it, and the different events detailed under each

respectively, but which ultimately resolve themselves into one series, filling up the prophetic history, as one whole, reaching to the end of time.

To determine the respective boundaries of the distinct insulated visions, or exhibitions, of which the Apocalypse is composed, is difficult; not from want of precision in the prophecy—for it is a Revelation—but from the peculiar structure of the book; and it is to be feared, that some of these boundaries have not yet been settled with accuracy, notwithstanding the meritorious labors of different critics and expositors. What others have failed in, it would be presumptuous in the present writer to assert he has been able to accomplish; but, without pretending to speak with confidence, he thinks, that the general contents of the Apocalypse may be briefly enumerated in the following summary.

1. The title and introduction of the amanuensis John, followed by a short notice of the place where the visions were seen, the circumstances with which they were introduced, and the commandment given to him to write the things he might see, in a book, and to send the book to the seven churches in Asia. (Ch. i.)

2. Seven epistles addressed to the seven churches respectively. (Ch. ii. and iii.)

3. John's description of *the heaven* (whatever

that was) into which he was, in vision, admitted, [see Dissert. 7. § 5.]; a description of the one sitting upon the throne in the heaven, and of the opening of the first six seals of a certain sealed book. (Ch. iv. to vi. inclusive.) See Dissert. 2. § 14.—And here let it be observed, that the prophetic history embraced by the first six seals, reaches to the “*great earthquake*,” (vi. 12.) by which all the enemies of Christ’s Kingdom shall be ultimately destroyed. This earthquake, as almost every reader must know, has been pretty generally applied to the overthrow of paganism, and the establishment of Christianity as the religion of the Roman empire by Constantine; but the terms which it employs, namely, *the sun, the moon, the stars of heaven*, are by no means descriptive of the pagan priesthood; and are, indeed, in the prophecy itself, explained to mean *the kings of the earth, the great men, the chief captains, &c.*; and the period to which this destruction refers, is emphatically called *the great day of the wrath of the Lamb*.—It would be foreign to the purpose of the present volume to go more into detail on this subject in this place: suffice it to say, that the period intended is the same to which Paul alludes in his second epistle to the Thessalonians, *when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that*

obey not the gospel of our Lord JESUS CHRIST; who shall be punished with everlasting destruction.

4. Between the opening of the sixth and the seventh seal, John announces the appearance of four angels or messengers, *commissioned to hurt the earth and the sea.* Of course this, though mentioned after, has reference to some event prior to *the great earthquake*; but the issue of *the sealing of the servants of God in their foreheads*, mentioned immediately after the introduction of these messengers, is prospective, extending to the period when *God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes.* (Ch. vii.)—See Ch. xxi. 4.

5. The singular contents of the seventh seal—seven messengers, and the evils denounced by the trumpets of the first six against the enemies of the Messiah. (Ch. viii. and ix.)—In Ch. viii. (v. 5.) occurs the intimation already noticed in § 1. warning the reader to expect *thunderings and lightnings, and an earthquake.* (See above, p. 153.)

6. The book which had been sealed exhibited to John when opened, and a command to him now to eat the same book, that he might be qualified to prophesy concerning peoples, and nations, and tongues, and many kings—i. e. kingdoms. (Ch. x.) But, previous to this command, an intimation is given in v. 7, that, *when the seventh angel shall begin to sound, the mystery of*

GOD shall be finished. From this it appears evident that the pouring out of *the seven vials* cannot relate to events posterior to the sounding of the seventh trumpet, as many have maintained.

7. The measuring of the sanctuary (*ναδὸν*, not *temple*, as in the common version,) and the altar and worshippers; the death and resurrection of the two witnesses; the great earthquake, and fall of the tenth part of the city, [viz. the mystical Babylon, or great antichristian community or family, known by the name of Christendom]; the sounding of the seventh trumpet; and the final victory of the Messiah (Ch. xi.), which being fully set forth John is now completely qualified to prophesy, in consequence of having eaten the unsealed book.—Observe particularly, that *the earthquake* (xi. 13.) is “*the great earthquake*” before mentioned on the opening of the sixth seal (vi. 12.), which in its issue absorbs all rule, authority, and dominion, in the reign of the Messiah; being followed instantly by the sounding of *the seventh*, or what Paul calls *the last trumpet* (1 Cor. xv. 53.), *when the dead shall be judged.* (Rev. xi. 18.)—And observe farther, that ch. xi. concludes with one of those retrospective summaries before noticed. (See § 1. p. 153.)

8. What, for distinction's sake, may be called John's first prophecy, embracing the history of the woman clothed with the sun, and the war of

Michael with the Dragon (Ch. xii.); the reign and marks of Antichrist, under his two forms of empire or dominion, namely, the civil (Ch. xiii. v. 1—8.), and ecclesiastical (v. 11—18.), described as two wild beasts; the victory obtained by the followers of the Lamb, and the final destruction of their enemies. (Ch. xiv.)

9. John's second prophecy; or a more particular description of the plagues denounced against Antichrist, and inflicted by the pouring forth of seven vials of wrath. (Ch. xv. and xvi.)—In ch. xvi. 18, 19. occurs the third retrospective enumeration mentioned in p. 154.

10. Information afforded to John, by a messenger, concerning the judgment of the great whore, her character, the beast that carries her, the ten kings [i. e. kingdoms] that gave to her their power, and the overthrow of these kings. (Ch. xvii.) See Dan. vii. 7—11. and 19—26.

11. A farther description of the overthrow of Antichrist and his supporters. (Ch. xviii.)

12. The triumph of the Saints, and some farther particulars respecting the final destruction of Christ's enemies. (Ch. xix.)

13. The binding of Satan for 1000 years—the first resurrection—the loosing of Satan for a short space, and his deceiving of the nations for the last time—the second resurrection and final judgment. (Ch. xx.)

14. The creation of a new heaven and a new earth—the holy Jerusalem and its inhabitants—the river of water of Life—the tree of Life—end of the curse—general invitation to the thirsty—conclusion. (Ch. xxi. and xxii.)

CONCLUSION.

From what has been stated, respecting the language of the Apocalypse generally, it seems evident, that every attempt to produce a liberal or free translation of it, must fail in giving the true sense. This will appear still more manifest, when several important particulars respecting some Hebrew terms and their Greek representatives, and the definitions which the amanuensis has given of some of them, but which for convenience are reserved for the dissertations that follow, shall have been laid before the reader. When a translator undertakes a free version, he assumes that he understands his author perfectly,—not only his facts and statements generally, but his sentiments, and every phrase or expression that he employs—so as to be able to transfuse his very mind and soul into the translation: but who can affirm that he so understands the Apocalypse! The translator who is desirous to make the unlearned acquainted with its real contents, should aim at a version as servilely literal as pos-

sible, however uncouth it may appear. Nor will this be found so easy a task as some may imagine. In point of fact, for the execution of such a version of this prophecy—if well executed,—more knowledge of the original is required than for one having a smoother and more elegant appearance.

Respecting the structure of the Revelation, it seems evident, from so many of the details pointed out in the above summary, as all coming down to the same period, namely, *the great earthquake*, which, in its consummation, is styled *the great day of wrath—the finishing of the mystery of God, when time shall be no longer—the sounding of the seventh trumpet—the time for the dead to be judged—the pouring out of the seventh vial*, (which are all so many different expressions of the same termination,) that several of the series must and do synchronise with each other throughout a greater or less portion of their extent. In strict language each new exhibition may be called a distinct vision in itself; and, therefore, though the different exhibitions and communications of which the Apocalypse consists, do, and must, from the very necessity of the case, succeed each other in the narration, yet these do not constitute, as has been imagined by many, one continued detail of an unbroken series of events, which are each to be considered as distinct, and

which are all to take place in the order in which they are written. On the contrary, it exhibits repeated orderly details of certain predicted facts, relative to the church of Christ and the enemies of this church; each detail affording precisely that degree of light which suits the propriety of the symbols employed in each respectively; and the whole so managed, by means of the accompanying narrative, that every succeeding exhibition throws light upon, and receives elucidation from, all that have preceded: the instruction which the prophecy thus yields, being as *the shining light, which shineth more and more unto the perfect day.*

DISSERTATION THE FOURTH.

ON VARIOUS NAMES BY WHICH THE CREATOR OF THE UNIVERSE IS DESIGNATED IN THE SCRIPTURES, AND THE PROPER MODE OF TRANSLATING THEM.

BY “NAMES,” in the above title, I mean attributive nouns—qualities, titles, epithets—employed as Names; for in the received sense of the term, the Creator has no proper name in the whole scriptures—excepting יהוה, [JEHOVAH]. Indeed, anciently, not only the names of persons, but of animals,—nay, of all objects,—were attributives.

The terms to which I mean principally to direct the attention of the reader in this Dissertation, are אלהים, [*Elohim*,] and other names of the same family: but a brief examination, previously, of the way in which the translators of the Common Version have rendered other attributives, applied to THE SUPREME BEING, in the writings of the prophets, may tend to throw some light on the more immediate object of our

enquiry. To these, therefore, a short section shall be devoted.

§ 1. *Of certain attributive Nouns employed in the Old Testament to designate the Deity.*

אביר [*abir*,] *strong, powerful*, is applied to the most excellent or best of its kind, whether men or brutes, as, “*the CHIEFEST of the herdmen*,” 1 Sam. i. 15; “*MIGHTY men*,” Lam. i. 15; “*STRONG bulls*,” Ps. xxii. 12. It is also employed to designate the most excellent of all beings, “*THE MIGHTY ONE of Israel*,” Isai. i. 24; “*THE MIGHTY ONE of Jacob*,” Isai. xlix. 26; and so in other places:—nor have the Translators any where rendered this word “*God*,” though in three places, Gen. xlix. 24, Psal. cxxxii. 2, and 5, they have, improperly, added the word *God* to the word *mighty*,—putting “*Mighty God*” for “*MIGHTY ONE*.”

צור [*tzur*], *to bind up, enclose, encompass*, for security—hence *bulwarks, fortresses*, places naturally strong, as *a rock*, for defence or protection, is applied, figuratively, to whatever performs this office, and so to him who is *THE ROCK of Ages*, Isai. xxvi. 4; “*JEHOVAH is my defence, yea, my powerful one, the ROCK of my refuge*,” Ps. xciv. 22; “*HE only is my ROCK*,” Ps. lxii. 2. 6;

“*Lead me to the ROCK that is higher than I,*” Ps. lxi. 2. In many passages this term is employed to designate the Creator; and in all of them, except two, the Translators have endeavoured to give the sense of the word. In Isai. xlv. 8. they have rendered it “*God,*”—“*Is there a God besides me? yea, there is no GOD.*” But this is not only inaccurate and tame, but obscures the sense. JEHOVAH had been encouraging his people against *fear*, and the words here spoken furnish the reason why they should confide in him. They ought to be rendered thus: “*Is there one powerful above me? Yea, there is no ROCK (or strong hold), none have I known.*” The other passage is in Hab. i. 12. where they translate the word by, “*O mighty God.*”—But on the margin they have given the right word, “*Rock,*” in both of these passages.

Another term, עֵלִיּוֹן [*Elioun*], *The Supreme*, is frequently employed to designate JEHOVAH; and wherever it occurs, the Translators have adopted some appropriate English word to express the sense; as in 2 Sam. xxii. 14, “*THE MOST HIGH uttered his voice;*” and in Psal. i. 14, “*Pay thy vows to THE MOST HIGH.*” This term was common with the worshippers of the true God, even among the inhabitants of Canaan, in the days of Abraham, as we see in Gen. xiv. 20. “*Blessed be אֱלֵי עֵלִיּוֹן*” [*El Elioun*], which should be

rendered "THE POWERFUL SUPREME," or "THE MOST HIGH POWER."

We learn from *Philo-Biblius* that the same epithet prevailed among the Phœnicians. Speaking of their gods, he says, κατὰ τούτους γίνεται τὴς ἘΛΙΟΥΝ καλούμενος, "among them there is a certain one called ELIOUN."—It is exceedingly probable, that this epithet was carried along with all the patriarchal families so far back as the time of their first separation from the parent stock after the flood, when sent to colonise the different portions allotted to them. The Greeks, who, no doubt, obtained it from the Phœnicians, express it in their own language by ὑψιστος, which is a literal translation of עֶלְיָ, and is sometimes employed in the New Testament to express the same Hebrew word; as in Luke i. 32, 35, 76. That this term was common among the Greeks is plain, from the exclamation of the damsel possessed of a spirit of divination at Philippi: "These men are the servants of the most high God," τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου, Acts xvi. 17: and, indeed, we find it was the most usual epithet upon their votive tablets; and, what is at least remarkable, most commonly in the *singular* number, as may be seen on those brought from Athens by Lord Elgin, now deposited in the British Museum.—Judging by *Rammohun Roy's Translation of the Abridgment of the Vedant*, "THE

SUPREME” is one of the most common epithets employed in the ancient “holy books” of the Brahmins. The end he had in translating the “*Resolution of all the Veds*” into the Hindostanee and Bengalee languages, he states to have been, to convince his own countrymen “that the unity of God, and absurdity of idolatry, are evidently pointed out by their own scriptures.” In this work GOD is designated in different places by the following epithets: “*The Omnipresent—the All-powerful—the Almighty—the Creator—the Eternal being;*” but the most common is “*the Supreme Being,*” which is employed perhaps ten times for once that any of the others occur.

The term שדי [Shaddai], *The All-sufficient*, compounded of ש (i. e. אשר) “*who,*” and די, “*sufficiency,*” or “*sufficient,*” according as it is used in the abstract, or in the concrete sense, is often applied as a title to him whose bountiful goodness sustains the universe. It has been generally translated “*The Almighty.*” Our Translators have never rendered it “*God.*”

רם [Ram], “*the High*”—ונשא [Venisha], “*and lofty one,*” Isai. lvii. 15; גבה מעל גבה [Goboah megnel Goboah], “*Higher than the Highest,*” or rather, as on their margin, “*High above the High,*” Eccl. v. 8; גדול [Gadol], “*Great;*” נורא [Nora], “*Reverend,*” or “*Terrible;*” קדוש [Kadosh], “*the Holy One;*” קדשו [Kadsho], “*His*

Holiness; גאונו [*Gono*], “*His Excellency*,” or “*His Highness*,” sometimes translated “*His Majesty*,” טובו [*Tubo*], “*His Goodness*,” and other attributive nouns, frequently employed as titles of power and dignity, to designate HIM who is the greatest and the best of beings, have never been rendered “*God*” by our Translators. They have frequently, it is true, translated the three last as adjectives, in some passages in which they are employed as appellatives, and so far they have failed in giving the precise sense; but still they have made it manifest, that they did not, in translating these and other Hebrew epithets that might be mentioned, conceive themselves at liberty to substitute the sense of another radix for the one in the text before them; which makes it the more surprising that they should have done otherwise with the words which it is proposed now to examine.

§ 2. *Of the Attributives or Epithets* אֵל [*El*], אֱלֹהִים or אֱלֹהִי [*Eloah*], and אֱלֹהִים [*Elohim*], commonly rendered “*God*” in the English translations of the Hebrew Scriptures.

These attributive nouns, which are all the same in their radical sense, have, in the Septuagint version, been generally, though not invariably,

rendered by θεός [*Theos*], or ὁ θεός, by which, in particular, they commonly translate אלהים [*Elohim*].

The inspired penmen of the New Testament, when quoting the Hebrew Scriptures, translate *Elohim* by θεός [*Theos*], also by ὁ θεός: as in Rom. iii. 18. “*There is no fear θεοῦ* (Hebrew אלהים, Ps. xxxvi. 1.) *before their eyes;*” and in Heb. i. 9. “*God, thy God,*” ὁ θεός, ὁ θεός σου (Hebrew אלהים אלהיך, Psal. xl. 7).

Throughout the Old Testament, the words אל [*El*], אלוה [*Eloah*], and אלהים [*Elohim*], and throughout the New, the word θεός [*Theos*], are, in all the English versions, with less propriety than is at first apparent, uniformly translated “*God;*” and this without any regard being paid to the presence or absence of the emphatic ה [*He*] in the one, or of the Article in the other. The word “*God,*” though now used with us as a proper name, in the language of our forefathers meant *good*. Is this the real sense of *Elohim*? If not, the word *God* is not a *translation* of, but a *substitute* for, the Hebrew term.—Let us briefly examine this point.

Some etymologists contend that אֱלֹהִים or אֱלֹהִי [*Eloah*], (for these are the same word); and also אֱלֹהִים [*Elohim*], and consequently אֱלֹהִי [*Elohi*], which differ only in form, being used only when in regimine; are derivatives: others, that they

are compounds : and some maintain, that even אֵל [*El*] is a derivative.

According to Hutchinson and his followers, אֱלֹהִים [*Elohim*] is derived from אֵלָה [meaning אֵלָה *Alah*] to swear, to curse. They maintain that אֵלֹה [*Eloah*] means, “*The accursed one*”—“the second person in the Trinity, the Son of God, who was made a curse for us.” They make אֱלֹהִים [*Elohim*] a plural—“*The denouncers of a curse* : a name (says Parkhurst) usually given to the ever-blessed Trinity, by which they represent themselves as under the obligation of an *oath* to perform certain conditions ; and as having *denounced a curse* upon all men and devils who do not conform to them.”

To this derivation Michaelis, with great reason, objects, that it is more natural to conceive the verb אֵלָה [*Alah*, he sware] as designating the one who has affirmed by אֵל [*El*], than as being itself a root. There are other and strong reasons against such a derivation. The Hutchinsonians assume אֵלֹה [*Eloah*] to be a participle passive, “*accursed*,”—but, as remarked by Dr. Sharp,¹ there is no participle passive of אֵלָה [*Alah*] to be met with in all the bible ; and, as observed by another learned writer, Dr. Hales,² “the word

¹ Sharp's Works, Vol. iv. p. 37.

² Dissert. on the principal Prophecies, p. 134.

“אלה [Eloah], in the sense ‘accursed,’ does not
 “once occur throughout the whole Hebrew
 “Scriptures, though often employed as a name
 “of the Deity.” And, farther, it may be re-
 marked, that if *Elohim* mean those who are
 “under the obligation of an oath,” then it will fol-
 low, that the witnesses in a court of law, and all
 who take oaths of office, are in fact *Elohim*. And,
 farther, in opposition to the Hutchinsonian doc-
 trine, it may be remarked, that those who perform
 whatever obligation they come under by an oath,
 are, in the very nature of things, exempted from
 the punishment, or penalty, or execration; for
 this can only fall on him who violates his en-
 gagement. But who would be so hardy as to
 predicate this of the HOLY ONE who fulfilled all
 righteousness?—of him who suffered, THE JUST
 for THE UNJUST, when he bare our sins in his own
 body on the tree. Because of this death he is
 said to have been “made a curse for us;” and the
 Apostle, to prevent himself from being misun-
 derstood, immediately adds, “for it is written,
 “Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.” The
 curse denounced against sin was death: Christ
 died that he might redeem us from this curse, and
 the species of death which he suffered was that
 which the law called *accursed*. The Apostle is
 here explaining *law phrases*, which have no rela-
 tion to the etymological derivation of a name.

It is a perversion, an absolute abuse of Scripture language, to apply the term “*accursed*,” to the Son of God. “*No one speaking by the Spirit of God calleth Jesus accursed.*” [1 Cor. xii. 3]. *By him, who is the first born from the dead, ALL THINGS WERE CREATED* [Col. i. 16. 18]; and *THE CREATOR is BLESSED FOR EVER*, [Rom. i. 25.]—*Jesus Christ, THE BLESSED and only potentate* [1 Tim. vi. 15], *GOD BLESSED FOR EVER* [Rom. ix. 5].

Even were אלה [Eloah], allowed to be a derivative from אלה [Alah], it might be, not from the verb in *Kal*, but, from the *Hiphil* conjugation, and so would signify *those who adjure or cause others to swear, and not those who swear or bind themselves by the oath*. Accordingly, some, before Hutchinson, held אלה [Eloah], to mean a *Judge*, deriving the word from האלה, the *Hiphil* of אלה [Alah].

Despairing to find the root in the Hebrew, some etymologists have had recourse to the Arabic, originally the same language as that spoken by the common parent of Isaac and Ishmael, in which the Deity is designated by ALAH, and, with the prefixed article, ALALAH,—by contraction, ALLAH. Michaelis adopts the Arabic verb ALAH as the root, in the sense of *benefacere alicui—benevolus fuit*, from the Arabic noun ALI “*good*.”

Dr. Geddes would prefer the noun ALI itself, if he could derive אלה [Eloah] from any single root. In this case he would call אל [El] not the root, but the abbreviation of אלה [Alah] and אלהים [Elohim]: but he hesitates whether to prefer this etymon, or the first compound one to be noticed hereafter.

Latterly, the learned Dr. A. Clark, asserting that the root of *Elohim* “does not appear in the “Hebrew bible,” has derived the word from the Arabic root “ALAHA, *he worshipped, adored, “was struck with astonishment, fear or terror;”*—“hence ILAHON, *fear, veneration:*”—True; but shall we add, “hence also *the object of religious “fear, the Deity?”* Is not *Alaha* an epithet more applicable to the worshipper than to the worshipped?

A priori, it is not very reasonable to suppose that the Hebrew scriptures do not exhibit, in its simplest form, the name, or epithet, by which the Creator was originally designated: and it is still less credible, that he can have a name derived from the acts or passions of creatures, who derive their powers,—their very existence, from himself. Were it even undeniable that his name imported *the object of fear or terror*, it would not follow that the noun was derived from the verb; for the converse is the order of Nature,

though Lexicographers have too generally inverted the process.

It has been somewhere remarked by Sir William Jones, that probably the elements of all the sciences may be found in the scriptures. This is strictly true respecting language. According to Moses, “Adam gave NAMES to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field”—“Whatever Adam CALLED every living creature, that became ITS NAME,”—and this before he had a companion of his own species with whom he could converse. The commencement of speech was with *nouns*.—[On this subject see Dr. Hales, Dissert. vi. *On the Primitive Names of the Deity.*]

We shall see, hereafter, that the Penman of the Apocalypse has defined the sense in which $\delta\ \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ is to be understood in his prophecy, and, consequently, throughout the New Testament. None of the foregoing modes of derivation yield a sense agreeing with his definition; and, for this reason, none of them can be received as exhibiting the true etymology of *Elohim*.

Let us now briefly examine whether such philologists as make the word a compound, have been more successful than those who hold it to be a derivative.

The greater part of the former admit אֵל [*El*] to be one of the elements of which אֱלֹהִים [*Elohim*]

is compounded ; and it is, therefore, necessary, before proceeding farther, that the meaning of that word should be known.

That לֵּל [*El*], in the abstract, means *strength*, *power*, and, in the concrete sense, *Powerful*, is certain. Accordingly, wherever the word occurs as an abstract, our own Translators have, generally, rendered it by *Strength*, *Might*, or *Power*; and had they retained this leading sense, wherever they found this word in any of its forms, they would have given much energy to their version, in many places where it is exceedingly tame. In one place (Neh. v. 5.), the translators of the Septuagint version have rendered the word by $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma$. Our translators have very properly followed them in that passage, employing the term *power*; but wherever the word occurs as an attributive noun—" *The Powerful one*," or " *The Strong one*," they have for לֵּל [*El*] given " *God*" in their version; disregarding too the emphatic ה [*He*], when it occurs as a prefix, except in a few places where they exhibit, " *the God*." It is true that for לֵּל [*El*] the Seventy have often exhibited $\acute{\iota}\ \theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ [*the THEOS*], substituting one of the Greek names of the Creator for this Hebrew name, in place of a translation ; but frequently they have well rendered the word by $\iota\sigma\chi\upsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, as in 2 Sam. xxii. 32, where our translators have used the word " *God*," to the evident injury of

the sense. The next verse commences with the same word, with the emphatic ה [He] prefixed, which the Seventy, as in various other places, have rendered ὁ ἰσχυρὸς, “*the Powerful one.*” In both of these verses our Translators have weakened the sense by giving “*God*” as the translation of אֱל [El]. The passage ought to have been presented thus: “*For who is POWERFUL [אֱל], but JEHOVAH [or the ETERNAL]? yea, who is a rock, but our ALL-POWERFUL ONE [אֱלֹהֵינוּ]? THIS POWERFUL ONE [הָאֵל], my strength, [and] might; even he maketh my way perfect.*” In some passages, too, the sense is rendered very obscure by exhibiting the word “*God*,” as a translation for אֱל—as in Isaiah, xliii. 12, which our translators have given thus: “*therefore ye are my witnesses, saith the LORD, that I am God.*” The clause should be rendered,—“*therefore ye are my witnesses, saith JEHOVAH, that I am THE POWERFUL ONE.*” The Israelites had experienced his power, in their deliverance from Egypt, when *he gave Ethiopia and Seba for them*, as stated in the 3rd verse of the chapter. *Before him there was no אֱל, nor shall there be after him. (v. 10).*

It is plain, from what has been stated, that the authors of the Septuagint, though they have frequently for אֱל [El] exhibited ὁ θεὸς, understood the word to mean *strength* or *power*; and also that our own Translators were not ignorant of its radical sense, though they chose to render it

“*God*” when used as a name. Where it occurs with the pronominal ’ [Yod] affixed to it, they have rendered it “*My God*,” as in Psal. xxii, 1. אֱלֹהֵי אֱלֹהֵי, “*My God, My God*.” Of this passage, however, Aquila has given a correct rendering, Ἰσχυρὸς μου, Ἰσχυρὸς μου, “*My strong one, My strong one*.” We have, therefore, abundant authority for the radical sense of אֵל [El]. Indeed the meaning that has been assigned to this root, is that which attaches to it throughout the Scriptures.

Some Lexicographers maintain, that אֱלֹהִים [Elohim] is the plural of אֱלֹהַ [Eloah], and make the latter a compound of אֵל [El], and the pronoun הוּא, which is sometimes used substantively for a *Person*; expressing by their junction, *The mighty HE*. Nor can it be questioned that the Creator is designated אַתָּה הוּא “*Thou HE*,” in Ps. cii. 27. (C. V. “*Thou art the same*”): and הוּא might be so rendered in Deut. xxxii. 39. “*I am THE HE*,” and in other places:—but it suits not well our English idiom.

Another way of composing the word is by employing אֵל [El] and the substantive verb הוּוּה [Havah],—importing by their union, “*The Powerful Being*.”

Rabbi Nachman makes it a compound of אֵל and הֵם, “*Their God*,” or rather, according to the root, “*Their strength*,” or “*Their Strong*

one:”—others make it a compound of אל and אים, “*The tremendous great one;*”—and some have proposed אל and הים “*The God of the waters.*”

The learned Jew Abarbanel makes אלהים [*Elohim*] or אלהי [*Elohi*] a compound of אל [*El*] and two letters (viz. the ה and י) taken from the name יהוה [*Jehovah*]. He compounds אלוה [*Eloah*] in the same way, borrowing הוה from the sacred name. He considers both words as nouns singular.

Against this etymon it has been objected, that “if אלהים comprehends אל and יהוה, God and JEHOVAH, such phrases as יהוהאלהים and אלהים יהוה, the former of which frequently occurs, “are mere tautologies.” The objector (Geddes) would not have hazarded this assertion, had he actually translated these words. Is there any tautology in the expression (which will be shown hereafter to be a true version) “THE ETERNAL OMNIPOTENT?” The idolatrous nations called the image which they worshipped, their *mighty one*—their *Elohim*; but they no more conceived the image to be eternal than the Roman Catholics do theirs. Had they called the idol *eternal*, the worms, which, by their ravages, obliged them, from time to time, to renew it, would have given them the lie.—But a more powerful objection may be urged against this composition of the word:—The name JEHOVAH is never applied to

any but the Creator of Heaven and Earth ;' but the term *Elohim* is not only applied to the Creator, but to false gods, to inanimate objects, and to men : as “ *Baal-zebub*, אֱלֹהֵי עֶקְרוֹן, *god of Ekron*,” 2 Kings i. 2. “ *Entreat the Lord that there be no more MIGHTY (Heb. Elohim) thunderings*,” Exod. ix. 28 : “ *With GREAT (Heb. Elohim) wrestlings*,” Gen. xxx. 8 : “ *It was A VERY GREAT (Heb. Elohim) trembling*,” 1 Sam. 14.15 : “ *Nineveh was AN EXCEEDING GREAT city*” (Heb. *a city GREAT TO ELOHIM*) Jon. iii. 3. In these, and other passages similarly rendered, our Translators have shown, very plainly, what they conceived to be the radical sense of the word *Elohim*, though they have in so many places rendered it “ *God*.”—That letters should have been

† It ought not to be concealed that some have maintained the contrary. Kimchi on 1 Sam. xxvi. 12. “ *sleep from Jehovah was fallen upon them*,” asserts that the thing which the Scripture wishes to magnify it joins to *the name* (meaning *Jehovah*) of God : that is, he would, as Buxtorf proposes, for “ *Sopor Domini*” translate “ *sopor gravissimus*.” For *Arbores Domini* (trees of *Jehovah*) Buxtorf also proposes “ *arbores maximæ*” or *excelcissimæ*. But Kimchi’s idea cannot be admitted. It is easy to see its source. Observing that the word *Elohim* was not applied exclusively to the Creator, and not viewing it in its proper light, as a mere attributive noun, but as a *proper name*, on Psal. lxxv. 9. he says “ *the word Elohim is a surname for any thing great or admirable* :”—and hence, probably, his hasty inference that the name *Jehovah* might also be so applied.

borrowed from the sacred name to form a term applicable to such objects as the foregoing, is not very probable, whatever may be their identity.

That the word *Elohim* is frequently applied to men, is evident from the following, and from other passages that might be quoted:—“*Thou art a MIGHTY [Heb. Elohim] Prince,*” Gen. xxiii. 6: “*The cause of both parties shall come before the JUDGES [האלהים], and whom the JUDGES shall condemn, he shall pay double unto his neighbour.*” Exod. xxii. 9. In the 28th verse of the chapter just referred to, our Translators exhibit a remarkable inadvertency:—“*Thou shalt not revile THE GODS*” [*Elohim*]. They should have rendered the word here as they had done in the context. In certain cases the people were to be carried before the judges, and in this verse they are commanded to reverence their decision—“*not to revile THE JUDGES, or curse the rulers.*”—But what sense can possibly be attached here to the word “*gods?*” The Israelites had but *one God*; and as to *the gods of the nations*, they were commanded to *destroy the names of them every where*. Deut. xii. 3. In like manner in 1 Sam. xxviii. 13. they have translated the word “*Gods*” where they ought to have rendered it “*Judge.*” They make the woman of Endor see “*gods ascending,*” though she herself says it was *an old man covered*

with a mantle. By the dress (the mantle) she knew his office; that he was *a judge*.

The word *Elohim* is also employed to designate the great and powerful among the children of men, in contradistinction to the common herd of mankind; precisely as we use “high and low,” —“great and small,” and similar expressions; as in Judges ix. 13, “*the vine said unto them, “should I leave my wine which cheereth god[Elohim] “and man”*—or, more correctly, “*gods and men*” —*and go to be promoted over the trees?*” And here it may be noticed, in passing, that to ignorance of this mode of expression being used in Hebrew must be ascribed the various absurd opinions which have obtained, respecting the meaning of Gen. ch. vi. concerning the “*sons of God*,”—read *the sons of the mighty, or powerful,*—taking to them *the daughters of men*—“*all “whom they chose;*”—a passage which merely intimates the state of violence and rapine that prevailed before the flood, when the powerful seized, by force, whatever women they fancied from the families of the lower orders!—If I mistake not, we have the same mode of expression in Luke ii. 52, where Jesus is said to have “*increased in favour with God and man.*”

Dr. Hales, in the work before alluded to, maintains, “that the elementary terms of all languages are, naturally, *nouns*, and, necessarily,

“*monosyllables*, as being easiest of pronunciation;” and concludes, “from analogy, that the simplest of the divine names, אֵל [EL] and יְהוָה [JAH], are the most ancient of all: the venerable parents—אֵל, of אֱלֹהִים [Eloah] and אֱלֹהִים [Elohim]—and יְהוָה, of יְהוָה [JEHOVAH], formed from their respective roots by additional syllables, or by composition; according to the usual progress of language.”

As אֵל [El], in the abstract sense, denotes *power*, and in the concrete, *powerful*, he considers the term, when applied to the Deity, as meaning **POWERFUL**. This must also be the radical sense of אֱלֹהִים [Eloah]; for in the expression, “*Who is God* [i. e. powerful], *save JEHOVAH?*” which occurs in 2 Sam. xxii. 32, and in Psal. xviii. 31—in the former place “*God*” is expressed by אֵל; in the latter by אֱלֹהִים. From the expression “*Is there a GOD* [אֱלֹהִים] *beside me?..... I know not any,*” (Isai. xlv. 8), Dr. Hales concludes (I think rightly) that this form of the word is intensitive. The word אֱלֹהִים, employed as a name of the Creator, he considers as a noun singular, and as meaning, **THE OMNIPOTENT OR SOVEREIGN**.

Of these various modes of composition some may be considered as more fanciful than solid; but they all agree in making אֵל the principal

element of אלהים, and that this term expresses POWER, one of the glorious attributes of JEHOVAH.

That those who hold “*Power*” to be the leading idea in the epithet *Elohim* are right; and that Dr. Hales, in particular, has given the true definition of this name, as applied to JEHOVAH; I hope to establish on an authority which, notwithstanding his deep researches, has escaped his notice, and which none will presume to controvert,—that of the amanuensis of *the Faithful and True Witness*.

Let us now attend for a few moments to another dispute which has occupied the attention of the learned. Is אלהים [*Elohim*] a singular, or is it a plural, Noun?

Some maintain that this word is always plural; others allow that this is the plural form, but maintain that, nevertheless, the word is always singular when applied to the Creator; and some assert that it never is a plural—that often, where our Translators have rendered it in the plural, they have destroyed the sense; and, where the sense conveyed in the original embraces *plurality*, that this does not depend on the form of the word, or what is called its plural termination [ים], but on the construction in which the word is found:—for example, that “*above ALL GODS,*” though the true sense of the Hebrew, is

not a strict translation, which ought to be,
 “above EVERY GOD.”

Those who hold the first opinion are chiefly the followers of Hutchinson; the greater number of sober critics maintain the second; Mr. Bellamy, a recent translator, advocates the third.

Dr. Geddes¹ puts the question, and answers it, thus: “Do the plural forms אלהים and אלהי denote a plurality of persons, when applied to the One true God?—No; not any more than אדמים denotes a plurality of *Lords*, בוראים and בראי a plurality of *Creators*, פנים and פני a plurality of *faces*, or חיים a plurality of *lives*.²—It is truly strange that such a notion should have ever been entertained: and, indeed, it is only a modern notion, of the same age with scholastic theology. The Christian Fathers

¹ Critical Remarks, Vol. 1. p. 8.

² However absurd it may appear, the followers of Hutchinson actually maintain (though Geddes does not notice it) several of these words to be plurals, and would therefore translate Eccl. xii. 1. thus: “Remember *thy Creators*.” They will have it, that God breathed into Adam’s nostrils “the breath of *lives*: i. e. *animal and intellectual*!” but they have forgot to tell us what sort of *lives* the *animals* which went two and two into the ark possessed (Gen. vii. 15.); nor have they explained what plurality of *lives* is intended by מים חיים (Levit. xix. 17.), which our translators have rendered “*running water*.”

“of the Church, who were eager enough to discover, in the Old Testament, proofs of a Trinity, never dreamed of seeking one in אֱלֹהִים.’ But Geddes, by not marking the word “*persons*” in his statement, has not half exposed the absurd position of Hutchinson, which, when analyzed, not only maintains that אֱלֹהִים [*Elohim*], is the plural of the Hebrew noun אֱלֹהַּ [*Eloah*], but that, in English, “*persons*” is the plural of the noun “*God!*” Plurality of any noun multiplies only *that* noun; and therefore, if *Elohim* must always be understood as a plural, we must, in the very first verse of the Bible, read, “*In the beginning, GODS created the heaven and the earth;*”—a mode of speech which could only lead to polytheism. But the original prohibits such a translation, for the verb בָּרָא is in the third person singular, *HE created*, and therefore its nominative, *Elohim*, must be a noun singular. Of the noun “*God,*” the plural can only be “*Gods;*”—it cannot be “*persons,*” the singular of which noun is, and can only be, “*person.*” How, in the name of common sense, can the doctrine of the Trinity be inherent in a term applied, as we have seen, to *heathen idols*, to *magistrates* and great men, to *excessive thunder*, *wrestling*, and *trembling*, and to the *magnitude* of a city?

That *Elohim*, when applied to the Creator, is a noun singular, we have seen from the first

verse of the Old Testament. In the first chapter alone the word occurs upwards of thirty times as a nominative to verbs singular. In Exod. iii. 5. we meet with the word אלהי four times, and האלהים once: “*I am ELOHI of thy father, ELOHI of Abraham, ELOHI of Isaac, and ELOHI of Jacob. And Moses hid his face, for he was afraid to look upon THE ELOHIM. That Elohi and Elohim are here nouns singular we know on an authority not to be controverted—that of the inspired Evangelists, re-quoting our Lord’s quotation from Exodus. Matthew (xxii. 32.) and Mark (xii. 26.) employ, in their translation, the nominative singular ὁ Θεός; Luke also (xx. 37.) employs the singular; but having brought in the word after a verb, he, necessarily, puts it in the accusative, τὸν Θεόν.*

It may be proper to remark, generally, for the sake of those who have no knowledge of the original, that the inspired penmen, here and in other places, were not put under any necessity, by the nature of the language in which they were writing, to employ the singular; for this noun has its regular plural in Greek: and accordingly they have used the plural form on various occasions. And this, naturally, leads to another remark, that, on the same high authority which has been adduced to prove that the word *Elohim* is a noun singular, when applied to **JEHOVAH**, it may be stated, that it is sometimes used as a

noun plural when applied to idols, and often so when applied to men. Thus we read in Acts vii. 40., where Exod. xxxii. 1. is quoted: “*Make us θεοὺς* [the accusative plural] *to go before us*”—in the Hebrew “*Make for us אלהים*.” So also, in John x. 34., “*I said ye are θεοὶ*” [nom. plural], is given as the translation into Greek of the Hebrew word אלהים [Ps. lxxxii. 6.]; and in the next verse in John we have an example of the same word *Elohim* being used both as a singular and as a plural noun—for we must not forget that the following sentence, given to us in Greek by the Evangelist, was originally delivered in Hebrew,—“If he called them θεοὺς, πρὸς οὓς ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐγένετο, GODS *to whom the word of God came,*” &c. Here θεοὺς, *gods*, represents, as we have just seen, *Elohim*; and the words ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ are put for דבר אלהים [*dabar Elohim*]. It is therefore not true, as maintained by Mr. Bellamy, that *Elohim* is always a noun singular.

Will the authority of the penmen of the New Testament, for the sense of terms employed by the prophets in the Old, be questioned, by any who have a right to be heard in this controversy? Certainly not. In no one instance have they given a plural translation of *Elohim*, when applied to THE SUPREME BEING; nor have they ever employed a plural noun as a name to

designate THE OMNIPOTENT in any of their discourses. It is, therefore, not true, that *Elohim*, as applied to THE CREATOR, expresses either a plurality of gods or a plurality of persons. It is true, however, as we have seen, that the same inspired writers do sometimes render this Hebrew word by a plural Greek noun; but, unfortunately for the Hutchinsonians, only in instances in which it *cannot*, by any possibility, be referred, directly or indirectly, to the SUPREME BEING. Could this be the case, if what they maintain respecting this name were true? Assuredly not. Another reason then must exist, for its being used as a plural, than that for which they contend: and this reason may be seen in the etymological sense of the term. When found in construction with verbs, participles, and pronouns singular, it ascribes, *collectively*, to an individual, whatever it can include or express, without any limitation, excepting what arises from the nature and fitness of things: thus, applied to inanimate objects, as a mountain, it includes magnitude in all its dimensions, but, necessarily, excludes every thing connected with active agency; applied to a city, it embraces not only magnitude but population, and whatever constitutes power and greatness in such a community; applied to a man,—a judge, for instance—it ascribes to him every power

proper to his office; or, more correctly, the *powers* of the office, rather than any thing proper to the man himself, are contemplated by the speaker,—precisely as we speak of the *powers* of any ruler among ourselves, whether of the head of the legislative and judicial powers, or of a subordinate magistrate. The extent of the signification of the word *Elohim* is measured only by the nature, the quality and character of the object so denominated, and consequently, when applied to JEHOVAH, it attributes to him the possession of power in a superlative degree—every species of power—*powers unlimited*, whether *might, force, or strength*,—*authority, lordship, or dominion*. These, and such attributes, constitute the only plurality that, properly, belongs to the word, when employed as a name of that Being who is, emphatically, **THE POWERFUL OR MIGHTY ONE**; and who is so, not at some particular period only, but ever so;—**THE OMNIPOTENT**,—**THE EVER-POWERFUL**,—**THE ALL-POWERFUL**. This the idolaters affirmed of their deities. They called them their *Elohim*—their *all-powerful* protectors; and when more than one of these is spoken of, the word is then put in construction with verbs and participles plural. In fine—whenever the word *Elohim* occurs, it is subjected to the exigencies of grammatical speech, as similar nouns are, in all lan-

guages whose structures do not admit of inflection: for example, in our own language, the terms which express the sense of this very word *Elohim*, as *Mighty—Powerful—Strong*: whether such terms are, on any occasion, employed as *singulars* or as *plurals*, depends entirely on the construction in which they are found. But though it be true, that the word *Elohim* is not a term that can, legitimately, be urged in support of the doctrine of the Trinity; and that none of the early Christian writers, or Fathers, as they are called, ever appealed to the plurality alleged to be expressed in this term, as furnishing evidence of the truth of the doctrine, the opposers of the divinity of Christ can gain nothing by the concession; for the term *Elohim* is, itself, and also its Greek representative *Theos*, applied directly, in various parts of the Divine record, to the MESSIAH. This will be shown in its proper place; and this, it will be allowed, furnishes a more powerful evidence, of the proper divinity of CHRIST, than whatever can be drawn by inference from any kind of plurality embraced by the term *Elohim*.

§ 3. *Of the manner in which the word אֱלֹהִים [ELOHIM] should be rendered, in translating the Old Testament.*

From what has been stated it is manifest, that the attributive noun *Elohim* means *Power*; and hence it must be equally evident, that, to render this term in English by the word *God* [that is, *good*], is to substitute one attribute for another; and which cannot, in every case, be done, without sometimes obscuring the sense of the original. Innumerable instances of the truth of this might be adduced, were it necessary; but a few will suffice, which occur very early in the Old Testament. In the common version we read, (Gen. i. 26—28.) “*And God said, Let us make man, in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over,*” &c. “*So God created man in his [own] image: in the image of God created he him*” “*And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish,*” &c. On this passage volumes have been written, to explain what is meant by “*the image of God*”; some of them to prove little less than that every attribute of JEHOVAH belonged to man, in his state of innocence: but, had the word “*Elohim*,” instead of having the word “*God*” substituted for

it, been truly translated, Commentators would have seen that the image, likeness, or resemblance, here intended, was given to man as the head of the animal creation;—that the resemblance related to power, the attribute by which JEHOVAH designates himself throughout the whole context. The passage, truly rendered, reads thus: “Then OMNIPOTENCE [אלהים] said, “We will make man, in our image, after our likeness, and they shall have DOMINION [this is the “specific power conferred] over the fish of the sea, “and over the birds of the air, likewise over the “brutes, even over all the earth; likewise over every “reptile that creepeth on the earth. Thus OMNI- “POTENCE created man in his image, in the image “[or shadow] of OMNIPOTENCE created he him: “male and female created he them. Then OMNI- “POTENCE blessed them, for OMNIPOTENCE said “unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, yea fill the “whole earth, also SUBDUE it: YEA HAVE YE DO- “MINION over the fish of the sea,” &c. And here it may be remarked, in passing, that for effecting this subjugation he had suitable moral and physical faculties conferred on him:—faculties which, had he continued in his state of innocence, he could never have abused, as he now does, in acts of cruelty, not only to the animal creation but to his fellow men. In point of dominion his physical powers are still great:

“every kind of beasts and of birds, and of serpents, and of things in the sea, is tamed and hath been tamed of mankind” [James iii. 7.]; but with regard to the moral exercise of his power the Divine image has been defaced, and man has become the perpetrator of crime and injustice.

Throughout the foregoing passage the word אלהים occurs uniformly without the ה, (which sometimes answers nearly to the Greek *ὁ*, and English *the* or *this*,) being prefixed to it. It is to mark this circumstance that I have rendered the word by “*Omnipotence*,”—employing this term as an appellation; for, whether we can discover the reason or not, there must be one for its insertion, and for its omission: that is, it must have some influence on the sense, though it may be difficult to detect it in every case, or to exhibit it fully in another language. The first place where the word אלהים appears with the ה prefixed, is in *Gen. v. 22* and *24*. In the latter verse it also occurs without the prefix: “*And Enoch walked with THE OMNIPOTENT* [האלהים], *and he [was] not: for OMNIPOTENCE* [אלהים] *took him.*” It occurs with the prefix in *Ch. vi. 2* and *4*. “*The sons of THE POWERFUL:*”—in *v. 9*. “*Noah walked with THE OMNIPOTENT;*” and in *v. 11*. “*The earth was corrupt before THE OMNIPOTENT.*” In *Ch. xx. 17*. it occurs both with and without the ה: “*So Abraham prayed*

“to **THE OMNIPOTENT**: then **OMNIPOTENCE**
 “healed Abimelech.” In the history of Joseph
 we have also examples of the presence and
 absence of the ה. “Joseph answered Pharaoh,
 “saying, *It is not in me* : **OMNIPOTENCE** [אלהים]
 “will give Pharaoh an answer of peace.” (xli. 16.)
 “The dream of Pharaoh is one : **THE OMNIPO-**
 “**TENT** [האלהים] hath showed Pharaoh what he is
 “about to do.” (v. 25.) “What **THE OMNIPO-**
 “**TENT** is about to do, he showeth unto Pharaoh,
 (v. 28.) “For that the dream was doubled unto
 “Pharaoh, it is because the thing is established by
 “**THE OMNIPOTENT** : yea **THE OMNIPOTENT**
 “will shortly bring it to pass.” (v. 32.)—“Pha-
 “raoh said unto Joseph, Forasmuch as **OMNIPO-**
 “**TENCE** [אלהים] hath showed thee all this, there is
 “none so discreet and wise as thou art. Thou shalt
 “be over my house,” &c. (v. 39.)—Again, when
 Joseph had released his brethren from prison, he
 “said unto them the third day, *This do, and live* : for
 “I fear **THE VERY OMNIPOTENT** [את-האלהים].
 “If ye be faithful men, let one of your brethren be
 “bound in the house of your prison : go ye, carry
 “corn for the famine of your families : but bring
 “your youngest brother unto me ; so shall your
 “words be verified, and ye shall not die.” (xlii. 18—
 20.) The words of Joseph are striking. To
 impress them with the belief that he himself
 feared **JEHOVAH**, he not only prefixes the article

ה to אלהים, but the particle את, composed of the first and last letters of the Hebrew Alphabet, (represented in the *Apocalypse* by the first and last letter of the Greek Alphabet, Α and Ω, the *Alpha* and the *Omega*.) He wishes to impress upon their minds the truth of what he had said—“*This do, and ye shall not die ;*” for he who says so “*fears,*” not a pretended *Mighty one*, but “**THE VERY OMNIPOTENT.**” In the most pathetic scene, where he makes himself known to his brethren, the use of the prefix again occurs—“*Be not grieved*” “*that ye sold me hither : for OMNIPOTENCE [אלהים]*” “*did send me before you to preserve life*” “*yea OMNIPOTENCE sent me before to preserve*” “*you a posterity in the earth, and to save your lives*” “*by a great deliverance. So now it was not you*” “*that sent me hither, but THE OMNIPOTENT*” “*[האלהים]Haste you to my father, and say*” “*unto him, Thus saith thy son Joseph, OMNIPOTENCE [אלהים] hath made me lord of all Egypt ;*” “*come down unto me, tarry not.*” (xlv. 5—9.)

It may be useful here to present another passage, calculated to show the energy that attaches to the word *Elohim*, when rendered according to its true import ; and especially when the prefixed ה is duly regarded : and this is the more necessary, as the Greek article should have the same attention paid to it, whenever it occurs,

though hitherto not sufficiently regarded by Translators.

In the contest between Elijah and the prophets of Baal (1 Kings, xviii.) the whole question was, Whether JEHOVAH or *Baal* was entitled to be acknowledged, and, consequently, worshipped, as *The Omnipotent*? but in the Common Version the sense is given so weakly, by אלהים being rendered *God*, and *gods*, that but few readers will perceive it.—The people being assembled, Elijah addresses them thus: v. 21. “*How long halt ye between two persuasions?*” “*If JEHOVAH be THE ALL-POWERFUL ONE* [האלהים], *follow after him: but if Baal, follow after him. But the people answered him not a word.*” In v. 23. he proposes that the priests of Baal should prepare a heifer for an offering, but apply no fire to the wood, and that he would do the same,—adding, (v. 24.) “*Then call ye on the name of YOUR ALL-POWERFUL ONE* [אלהיכם], *and I will call on the name of JEHOVAH: and it shall be that THE ALL-POWERFUL ONE* [האלהים], *who answereth in fire, he is THE ALL-POWERFUL* [האלהים]. *Then answered all the people and said, The proposal is good.* (v. 25.) *Then Elijah said to the prophets of Baal, Choose you one heifer for yourselves, and prepare it first; for ye are many: then call ye on the name of YOUR ALL-POWERFUL ONE*

“[אלהיכם], *but apply no fire.*” The prophets having in vain invoked him whom they taught the people to worship as *omnipotent*, when noon came “*Elijah derided them, and said, Cry with loud voice: for he is ALL-POWERFUL [אלהים]; but he is meditating, or he is busy, or he is on a journey: perhaps he is asleep and must be roused.*” When the time of evening sacrifice had arrived, Elijah restored the altar of JEHOVAH, taking twelve stones, according to the number of the tribes: and, having prepared his sacrifice, and caused it and the wood to be drenched, till the water filled also a trench made around the altar, he said, (v. 36.) “*O JEHOVAH,—Abraham’s, Isaac’s, and Israel’s ALL-POWERFUL ONE [אלהי]! to-day make known in Israel that thou art ALL-POWERFUL [אלהים], and that I am thy servant, and by thy command have declared all these words. Hear me, O JEHOVAH, hear me, that this people may know, that thou JEHOVAH art THE OMNIPOTENT [האלהים], and that thou hast turned their heart back again. Then fire of JEHOVAH descended and consumed the offering, and all the wood, also the entire stones, with the dust, and the very water which was in the trench. And when all the people beheld this, then they fell on their faces and said, JEHOVAH himself is THE ALL-POWERFUL ONE [האלהים]! JEHOVAH is THE ALL-POWERFUL [האלהים]!*”

Many other passages might be adduced to establish and illustrate the fact for which the above have been quoted; but the author persuades himself that these will be deemed quite sufficient to satisfy every attentive reader.

CONCLUSION.

From the preceding remarks it is evident, that the Hebrew term *Elohim* is not a Proper Name, but an Attributive Noun; that it means, when employed personally, in its highest sense, The OMNIPOTENT, the ALL-POWERFUL, the ALL-MIGHTY,—attributing to the CREATOR, thereby indicated, every species of power,—POWERS UNLIMITED, whether *might, force, or strength,—authority, lordship, or dominion*; and that, in its lower sense, when applied to men, it means *Kings, Judges, Magistrates, Ruling Powers*, in whatever manner their power may have been acquired, attributing to them those powers which suit them, respectively, in the light in which they are contemplated. And hence it follows,—the import of this Hebrew Attributive Noun being *Power*, and not *Goodness*,—that the word *God*, which, in the language of our forefathers, meant *Good*, is not a proper translation of, but only a substitute for, the Hebrew noun *Elohim*. But if the circumstances in which our early Translators

were placed be duly considered, it will appear evident, that they ought not to be charged with want of fidelity in rendering the Hebrew word *Elohim* by the word *God*. In fact they could hardly have done otherwise. When the gospel was first preached to our forefathers, the text employed was the Latin Vulgate; and, of course, all that the preachers would aim at would be to find a proper term to indicate—not the philological meaning of the word *Elohim*, or of *Deus*, its Latin substitute, but—the Great Being thereby intended; and as *Deus* was the term most commonly employed, in their text book, to designate the CREATOR, they would, most naturally, adopt for their Translation the term (or name) most commonly employed for that purpose in the language of their auditors. Thus the word *God* being already in use, as a name of the Deity, long before any of the English Translators commenced their labours, they could hardly do otherwise than adopt it; especially when it is recollected that, with them, it is not likely it should even become a question, Whether the term in the original was an *Attributive* or a *Proper Name*?

And farther,—from all that has been stated, respecting the meanings which attach to the word *Elohim*, and to its Greek representative *Theos*, it is not unreasonable to conclude that,

possibly, in the Apocalypse, as well as in the other New Testament writings, the latter term may be found employed with the same latitude that *Elohim* is in the Old Testament; that is, applied to *earthly ruling powers* as well as to the SUPREME RULER OF THE UNIVERSE. This has not, hitherto, been even suspected, but is not, on that account, the less likely to be true; for the words whereby *Theos* has been translated, in the different European versions, being every where considered in the light of Proper Names, this circumstance could not but operate to prevent readers, generally, from ever starting a question on the subject.

DISSERTATION THE FIFTH.

ON THE HEBREW NAME *JEHOVAH* [יהוה], AND THE GREEK EXPRESSION *ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ὁ ΘΕΟΣ*, [*KYRIOS the THEOS*], COMMONLY RENDERED “*THE LORD GOD.*”

THE subject which we now proceed to examine is one of the greatest importance. It has been not merely suspected, but, I may say, admitted, by some of the most learned and judicious Biblical Critics, that the words, *ὁ ὢν, καὶ ὁ ἦν, καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, in Rev. i. 4. and other parts of the Apocalypse, rendered in the Common Version, “*Which is, and which was, and which is to come,*” are given by John, as a periphrasis for יהוה [*JEHOVAH*]; but it has never (so far as I have been able to discover) been hitherto even suspected, that, in some of the passages, he actually employs these terms as a definition,—*defining thereby the sense in which he uses the word Κύριος [Kyrios], when he employs this Greek word to represent the Hebrew name JEHOVAH.* The

fact, however, is so; and it is so obvious, and, at the same time, so strongly marked in the record, that it will not fail to strike every Greek reader, the moment the evidence is pointed out, with as much surprize as it did the author when he was first led to perceive it, that it should so long have escaped observation. Nor is it less surprizing that the Amanuensis of the Apocalypse should, as hinted in the Fourth Dissertation [p. 201 above], have also given a definition of the sense in which Θεός [*Theos*] is used by him, and, consequently, by the other writers of the New Testament, when employed to represent the Hebrew word *Elohim* (commonly rendered “*God*” in the English Bible); and that this also should have escaped the notice of the learned.

We have seen (in the last Dissertation) that, in the New Testament, the word Θεός [*Theos*] represents the Hebrew attributive noun *Elohim*: it is that by which the Evangelists and Apostles translate *Elohim*, when quoting the Prophets. And we have also seen that this Hebrew term means THE OMNIPOTENT, OR ALL-POWERFUL. Let it be also kept in recollection, that the word Κύριος [*Kyrios*], when applied to THE SUPREME, in the New Testament, often represents the Hebrew word יהוה [JEHOVAH]: thus in Mat. iii. 3, Mark i. 3, Luke iii. 4, John i. 23, “Prepare ye

τῆς ὁδοῦ Κυρίου *the way of JEHOVAH*" (Isai. xl. 3, דרך יהוה); in Mat. iv. 7, Luke iv. 12, "Thou shalt not tempt Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου, C. V. THE LORD *thy God* (Deut. vi. 14, את-יהוה אלהיכם); and so in many other places: it follows, then, that, whatever be the sense that attaches to the name JEHOVAH in the Old Testament, the word Κύριος, when representing that name, must be understood in the same sense in the New.

These things being premised, let us attend to the words employed by the Apostle in Rev. i. 8, Κύριος ὁ Θεός, ὁ ὢν, καὶ ὁ ἦν, καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ὁ παντοκράτωρ. The words Κύριος ὁ Θεός here represent the Hebrew words יהוה אלהים [*Jehovah Elohim*]. The meaning of *Elohim* we have seen, as indicated by its Radix. The meaning of the word יהוה [JEHOVAH] may be ascertained by its etymology. It is compounded of the *past*, the *present*, and the *future time* of the Hebrew verb of existence הוה [*Havah*]; viz. the present participle הו, followed by the perfect tense הָ, and preceded by יֹ[*yod*], the sign of the future, forming together the word יהוה [JEHOVAH]; which, therefore, expresses attributes that belong only to HIM who is "*without beginning of days or end of years,*"—*present, past, and future existence.* But this is precisely what is affirmed by the three terms which follow Κύριος ὁ Θεός, in the passage

before us, namely, ὁ ὢν, καὶ ὁ ἦν, καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, **THE BEING, and THE HE WAS, and THE COMING ONE.** The common version gives the sense of the Greek pretty correctly, "*which is, and which was, and which is to come;*" but the facts connected with the present enquiry demand that the translation should be given as literally as possible, however uncouth it may sound to the English ear. In fact the words here employed by John present a translation into Greek, of the three parts of the Hebrew verb, which enter into the composition of the word יהוה [JEHOVAH], as above. But Κύριος [*Kyrios*] here stands for JEHOVAH: Why then are these terms added?—*To inform the reader of the fact,—to place it beyond the possibility of contradiction.* John writing in Greek, and using the Greek term Κύριος, for the Hebrew term יהוה, instantly gives, in Greek, a definition of the sense in which the former is to be taken, when representing that name which belongs only to **THE SUPREME.** These words then—ὁ ὢν, καὶ ὁ ἦν, καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος—are no part of those spoken by HIM who says, in the first clause of the verse, Ἐγὼ εἰμὶ τὸ Α καὶ τὸ Ω, *I am the Alpha and the Omega,*—words which John informs us were spoken by Κύριος ὁ Θεός [that is, by JEHOVAH *Elohim*]; but are explanatory terms, added by the writer (writing, however, under Divine guidance), defining, as already said, the

sense in which the term *Κύριος* [*Kyrios*], which he had just applied to HIM who calls himself *the Alpha and the Omega*, is to be understood when employed as a name of the Deity. Having thus defined *Κύριος*, he instantly defines also *ὁ Θεός* [*the Theos*, commonly translated *God*], adding *ὁ παντοκράτωρ*, that is, “THE OMNIPOTENT;” which, as has been shown, is the meaning of the word *Elohim*, when applied to the Supreme in the Hebrew Scriptures. In proof of this observe farther, that John’s first three defining terms (*ὁ ὢν—ὁ ᾗν—ὁ ἐρχόμενος*) are joined together by the copulative *καὶ*, introduced before and also after the middle term; but having finished his definition of *Κύριος* [*Kyrios*], between which and the attributive noun *Θεός* [*Theos*] there is no conjunction (nor could there be, as they represent the words *Jehovah Elohim*, which are not joined by any copula), so neither does he employ one to introduce his definition, *ὁ παντοκράτωρ*.—Nor is it possible to assign any other reason for the absence of the conjunction *καὶ* before the last term; for had the terms employed in these two definitions been merely additional epithets, as they are made to appear in all the translations, the last, as well as the preceding, would have been joined by the conjunction.

It is known that, so far back as the time of Philo and Josephus, and perhaps earlier, it was

customary with the Jews, when reading the scriptures, never to pronounce the name JEHOVAH, but to substitute for it the word *Adonai*; and hence many have inferred that, in the Septuagint, *Κύριος*, by which these interpreters often translate *Adonai*, is put for JEHOVAH for the same reason. But we have no evidence that, at the time the Septuagint translation was made, this Jewish superstition prevailed, and a much better reason may be assigned for their adopting *Κύριος* as the translation of JEHOVAH. This name, like every other among the Jews antiently, was an *Attributive*, or rather a compound of *Attributives*, all of which had reference to existence; and its sense must have been originally well understood among them: of course they could not be ignorant of its radix; and, however compounded, they must have known, that it had its origin from the substantive verb; and, with this knowlege, they would, in translating, endeavour to adopt some term expressive of the original sense. The Greek verb *κύρω* *to be, to exist*, expresses precisely the sense of *הוה* [*Havah*], the Hebrew radix of *יהוה*; and I am therefore inclined to think with the learned Bishop Pearson [On the Creed, p. 147. note. Fol. 1741], and some other critics, (indeed I have no doubt of the fact), that the authors of the Septuagint version considered *Κύριος* as standing in a similar

relation to κύριω, as יהוה to הוה. That is, they did not employ Κύριος as “*Lord*,” when translating יהוה, but as a term expressive of *existence* or *being*, like the Hebrew term itself.

Though Κύριος be used both for JEHOVAH and Adonai, in the Septuagint, a difference is sometimes made, as in Gen. xv. 2, 8. where אדני יהוה [*Adonai Jehovah*] is rendered δέσποτα κύριε, and in other places. It is also deserving of notice that the Greek scribes were wont to distinguish the one word from the other, by writing on the margin the Hebrew word יהוה, when that was the one intended. From this circumstance the unmeaning word ΠΙΠΙ had its origin, which is only a defective copy of the Hebrew word יהוה, read as Greek from left to right. According to Jerome this was common in the copies of his age (Ep. 136); and in some of the antient copies the word JEHOVAH was preserved in the Greek translations in its own Hebrew character (Ep. 130). It is curious enough that Origen’s Hexapla underwent a similar metamorphosis, from the ignorance of transcribers. One of his columns exhibited the Hebrew words in Greek characters, of which some fragments have come down to us as quotations. In one of these the word JEHOVAH, in Malachi ii. 13, has been converted into πιπι. We meet with the same change in the text of Isaiah printed by Curterius with

the commentary of Procopius.—The method adopted by John precluded the possibility of such errors as arose from writing the word JEHOVAH on the margin. Like the Authors of the Septuagint he expresses this Hebrew name by the Greek word *Kyrios*; but, to prevent the possibility of being misunderstood, he instantly adds, as already noticed, a periphrasis of the word JEHOVAH, as a definition of the Greek term.

That the true reason has been assigned for the introduction of ὁ ᾧν, καὶ ὁ ἦν, καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ὁ παντοκράτωρ, will appear still more evident, if we observe what a strange tautology would be produced, in this verse, were these words to be taken in any other sense than as a definition of *Κύριος ὁ Θεός*. As already frequently noticed, *Κύριος* represents JEHOVAH; and, as we have seen, the words ὁ ᾧν, καὶ ὁ ἦν, καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, also represent JEHOVAH: ὁ Θεός means, the *Omnipotent*, and ὁ παντοκράτωρ also signifies the *Omnipotent*: the verse therefore would truly read, if translated according to the real meaning of the different terms employed in it, “*I am the Α and the Ω, saith Jehovah the Omnipotent, Jehovah the Omnipotent:*”—or, putting it back into Hebrew, “*saith Jehovah Elohim, Jehovah Elohim.*” In the common method of translation this is not apparent, *Κύριος* being translated by the word

Lord, which does not convey the sense of the term **JEHOVAH**, and Θεὸς by the word *God*, which is not a true translation of *Elohim*. Had John written the Revelation in Hebrew, in place of the words which he employs, he would simply have said, “saith Jehovah Elohim,” אמר יהוה אלהים, because his meaning could not possibly have been misunderstood; but employing Greek words to represent the Hebrew expression, he adds,—and *only as a definition*,—the words that follow; for the Amanuensis of the Apocalypse never employs superfluous phraseology, which this would be, if taken in any other view.

“But,” it may be asked, “If these terms are only a definition of the sense in which *Kyrios* is to be understood, and are, at the same time, a periphrasis for the word **JEHOVAH**, why should John have used either the periphrasis or the Greek word *Κύριος*, when he might at once have adopted the word **JEHOVAH**?”—The answer is obvious. By such a procedure we should indeed have thus had, in the New Testament, the Hebrew term employed in the Old, to designate the Great Creator of Heaven and earth, but we should have been left in some uncertainty as to its real meaning; for though there has been less disagreement among the learned, as to the composition and meaning of this word, than respecting the term *Elohim*, yet there have been dif-

ferences, as a few examples respecting יה, [JAH,] and יהוה [JEHOVAH,] will show.

Some hold יה to be a simple root, as Kimchi, Buxtorf, Pagninus, Hales, &c.; others, as Cocceius, Vitranga, Robertson (James) deduce יה from יאה to be *lovely, fair, admirable*; the British Critic (1802) adopts the same derivation, and would render this word, “*All-glorious*” or “*All-adorable* ;” Hutchinson, Parkhurst, Bates and some others derive יה from the verb יהיה *to be*, by dropping the first ה; and Geddes, with some lexicographers, considers it as a mere abbreviation of יהוה. Dr. Hales, less happy in his inquiries into the meaning of this term than into that of *Elohim*, takes the leading idea of יה JAH to be *sameness, or immutability*,—an idea which is indeed included in the term, but which does not fully express its meaning.

The great majority of critics and lexicographers place יהוה under הוה, or under היה, which has the same sense, all agreeing that these roots express *existence*; but they differ as to the formation of the word. Some content themselves with referring to the root, without entering into its composition; others, as Bates and some of the Hutchinson school, form the word from הוה, with a formative י [yod] prefixed, and consider it as meaning “*he that is* ;” Hutchinson himself makes it a compound of יה and הוה the participle Be-

noni of the root יהוה, as does also The British Critic; Parkhurst thinks that “ Mr. Hutchinson “ is right in making this divine name a compound “ of יה *the Essence*, and the participle הוה *existing*, “ *subsisting* ;” Geddes and some others consider יהוה as merely the third person future (יהיה) of the verb היה with the middle י [*yod*] changed to a ו [*vau*] to give the verb the semblance of a noun. Hales, who considers יהוה as the immediate descendant of יה, takes the leading idea of the word *Jehovah* to be “ *oneness or unity*,”— a sense as foreign from it as *trinity* is from the word *Elohim*.

Though the great majority of these and other philologists are agreed in opinion, that “ *Existence*,” or “ *Being*,” is the prominent idea expressed in the word JEHOVAH, only some of them contend that “ *futuration* [as Bp. Pearson expresses himself] is essential to the *name*.” The Jewish writers, both antient and modern (I believe none of them write otherwise), maintain that this word includes not only the *past* and the *present*, but also the *future*. Thus Aben Ezra on Isai. xlii. 8, “ *I am JEHOVAH, that “ is my name*,” says: “ this is the proper name “ of GOD, signifying *Essence*, i. e. existing from “ *Eternity to Eternity*.” Rabbi Bechi on Exod. folio 65. Col. 4. says, “ in the name JEHOVAH “ are comprehended three times, the preterite,

“ the present, and the future, as is known to all.” The book entitled *טעמי מצות*, folio 31, speaking of God the Creator says, “ as he is the first “ without beginning, and last without end, so his “ name testifies three existences, or differences of “ his existence, the present *הָיָה*, the preterite *הָיָה*, “ and the future *יִהְיֶה*, which are the letters of “ his name *יהוה*.”

The differences which have existed among critics, respecting the meaning of the word *JEHOVAH*, demonstrate, that the use of this Hebrew word, in books written in Greek, would not have answered the end gained, by John's having employed a Greek term and having defined the sense in which he uses that term. The two languages having different alphabets presented also an impediment to the introduction of Hebrew letters in the Greek text, the extent of which has been actually exemplified in the fate of such copies of the Septuagint as made the attempt; the word *יהוה* which is read from right to left having, as already noticed, been converted by transcribers into the unmeaning word *ΠΙΠΙ* (*Pipi*) read from left to right.

It is easy to see a reason why *Κύριος* and *ὁ Θεός* were employed, in the New Testament writings, for the words *יהוה* and *אלהים* of the Hebrew Scriptures. The latter had been translated into Greek; and, in the Septuagint version,

which was in the hands of all the Jews scattered throughout the Roman, but especially throughout Egypt and all parts of the Greek Empire, *Κύριος* had, as already noticed, been adopted as the translation for *JEHOVAH*, and *Θεὸς* for *Elohim*. There was therefore a great convenience in employing the same terms in the New, that appeared in the version of the Old Testament in common use, and which was about to become general, in the hands of the Christian Church. But the Greek terms, so employed, not expressing, or by length of time having ceased to express fully, the sense of the Hebrew words for which they had become substitutes, it was necessary (for we cannot possibly conceive its being done without a reason) that their true meaning—the genuine sense in which they are used by the Apostles and Evangelists—should be accurately defined. This, we have just seen, has actually been done in the Apocalypse,—the first written (as I believe, and think I have proved, in the Second Dissertation) of all the Greek scriptures.

But whatever reasons might exist for the Greek version of “*JEHOVAH*” and “*Elohim*,” accompanied, as has been shown, with proper definitions of their sense, no tenable argument can be advanced for adopting, in translations into other languages, expressions or names which do not convey the sense of these terms.

It is self-evident that, in translating from the Hebrew, its precise sense should be transferred into the version; and as it is equally evident that, had the Apostles written in Hebrew, instead of Greek, the same Hebrew attributive nouns or names which are applied to the Creator, in the Old, would have been retained in the New Testament; it follows that, in translating the Greek Scriptures, that sense should be given, in the version, which belongs to the Hebrew word of which any Greek term is a known representative, that the translation of the whole Record (for to us the Old and New Testaments are an entire record) may present that uniformity of diction which would have pervaded the whole in the original, had both parts been written in the same language.

We have seen already from the composition of the word *Elohim*, and from John's definition of its representative ὁ Θεός [*the Theos*], that both of these, when applied to the Deity, should be rendered in a close English version by *the Omnipotent—the All-Powerful—the All-Mighty*, or some equivalent expression. When Θεός occurs without the article, then the abstract—*Omnipotence*—employed as an appellation—may be adopted with advantage; for in the New Testament the article is used with as much precision as the Hebrew prefix ׀ is in the Old: and,

as, in the Old Testament, care should be taken to distinguish between the *Creator* and the *Creatures* to which the term *Elohim* is applied; so, in the New, equal attention should be exerted to ascertain when the term *Theos* is applied to others than to JEHOVAH; for it frequently represents *Ruling Powers*, inferior to the *Great Supreme*,—though always relatively *Supreme*—*Supreme* as to the place or class with which the term is found associated: exhibiting, in this respect, as in every other, the precise characteristics of the attributive noun *Elohim*.

But how should *Κύριος* be rendered in English, when it represents the word JEHOVAH? To employ such a periphrasis as John has given in his definition, “*The BEING, and THE HE WAS, and THE COMING ONE,*” (which is a literal translation of the Greek) would not only be inconvenient, but, by suspending, too long, the current of the address or narrative, as the case might be, would often take from its energy. Inconvenient as this might be, if our language did not furnish a term, or terms, fitted to convey the entire meaning of the word in a more condensed form, it would be better that we should submit to it, than adopt one that would change the sense. But, happily, we have a term in our language, which, by use, has been made to embrace, pretty fully, the sense of John’s defini-

tion,—I mean the word ETERNAL. The Professors of Geneva have, in their French version, employed *l'Eternel* for the word JEHOVAH in the Old Testament, probably from the composition of this term in the original. How much is it to be regretted, that the same term has not yet been adopted for *Kyrios* [Κύριος], in the New. Should Translators hesitate still to adopt “THE ETERNAL,” at all events the word *Lord* should be rejected as not expressing at all the sense of the Original: the word “JEHOVAH” had better—its sense being defined—be transferred into the version for the Hebrew name יהוה, and also for Κύριος, wherever the latter occurs as the representative of that term. But where Κύριος represents *Adonai*, there *lord*, or *master*, or some similar title, should occupy its place in the translation.

Having before shown that the substitution of the word *God* for the Hebrew word *Elohim*, in a version, tends often to obscure the sense, and to take from the energy of the translation, I need not occupy much of the reader's time in showing what, *a priori*, must be manifest,—that the same consequences flow from the substitution of that word for Θεός. No proposition, which carries its reason in the original enunciation, should ever be translated in such phrase, as to require a mental process, however short, to ren-

der the sense obvious to the reader. Propositions which carry in them the character of a truism, lose in perspicuity when any of their terms are changed into others which yield the truth only as an inference from the nature of the terms that have been substituted. For example: Mat. xix. 26. (C. V.) “With men this is impossible; but *with God all things are possible.*” Though the process be short, yet a process does take place in the mind, when it assents to the truth of this proposition:—“Why are all things possible with God?”—“Because God possesses all power.” But were the proposition translated conformably to the sense which attaches to *Elohim*, and, according to John, to *Theos*, the translation would exhibit, on its face, the truth of the proposition, *παρὰ δὲ θεῶ πάντα δυνατὰ*, “*But with OMNIPOTENCE all things are possible.*”

In Romans i. 16. the Apostle says, “*I am not ashamed of the JOYFUL NEWS:¹ for it is the power of Omnipotence [θεοῦ, C. V. of God] unto salvation to every one that believeth.*” How could he be ashamed, when the *glad tidings* he proclaimed was *the power* employed by *Omnipotence* for the salvation of believers?

¹ *Εὐαγγέλιον*, C. V. *gospel*. In translating the scriptures every expression that requires that the unlearned should ask its meaning, ought to be avoided.

In Matthew xii. 28. the argument is greatly weakened, if not nearly put out of sight, by the word Θεοῦ being rendered *God*, which has led, as is often the case where any leading term is not understood, and is in consequence mistranslated, to the mistranslation of another word, viz. πνεύματι. In the Common Version, and, indeed, with slight variations, in all the translations, the passage is thus rendered: “*But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you.*” “By giving to the noun Θεοῦ a sense agreeing with the definition of *Theos*, exhibited by the amanuensis of the Divine Author of the Apocalypse, the verse would read thus: “*But if by the breath of OMNIPOTENCE [Θεοῦ, without the article] I cast forth the demons, then is the kingdom of THE OMNIPOTENT [τοῦ Θεοῦ] come unto you.*”—As if he had said—“Since my mere word is *all powerful*, manifested in the expulsion of these demons, you have evidence before you, that the kingdom of THE ALL-POWERFUL ONE,—*the kingdom of the Messiah*,—is come.” In Luke, where this part of our Lord’s history is recorded, the argument is the same, though the language be a little different. (Ch. xi. 20.) “*But if with the finger of OMNIPOTENCE I cast forth these demons, then is the kingdom of THE OMNIPOTENT come unto you;*”

but here δακτύλῳ, *finger*, is substituted for πνεύματι, *spirit*, in Matthew,—a plain proof that this word does not in Mat. xii. 28. mean the Holy Spirit.

CONCLUSION.

It cannot be necessary that I should detain the reader longer on this subject. Indeed I am fearful that I may already have tried his patience: but where innovations, and these not slight, are proposed, on long-established usages, it would be unreasonable to expect the concurrence of the wise, without offering sufficient evidence to convince the judicious and candid enquirer after truth, that they ought to be adopted; and in detailing the evidence it is difficult to apply a precise measuring line. Those, however, who, by their previous pursuits and acquirements, have found themselves able to out-run the author in his argument, will be the most ready to pardon any apparent prolixity; knowing, by experience, how difficult it is to gain access to some minds, even when a subject has been placed in every possible point of view.

In the Fourth Dissertation it was proved that the Hebrew word *Elohim* means *Power*—*Powerful*—and, when employed to designate the Creator,

THE OMNIPOTENT OF ALL-POWERFUL. In the Greek Scriptures, when the Hebrew Scriptures are quoted, the word *Elohim* is rendered *Theos*; and it has been shown, in the present Dissertation, that the writer of the Apocalypse has not left his readers merely to infer that the word *Theos*, when applied to the Creator, must have the same meaning as *Elohim*, but has, in express language, defined it to mean *παντοκράτωρ*—that is, THE OMNIPOTENT.

In translating, it is not correct to substitute the meaning of one attributive noun for that of another. Were this allowable, the word *God*—that is *good*—if understood as an attributive, would be unexceptionable as applied to that being who is emphatically *the Good one* [Mat. xix. 17.; but *goodness* and *power*—two distinct attributes—are never confounded in the original, and in truth cannot, on every occasion, be substituted the one for the other, in a translation, without doing injury to the sentiment, and obscuring, less or more, the sense of the passage. Of this several instances were given in the Fourth Dissertation, respecting the Hebrew term rendered *God* in our English version; and similar instances have been adduced, in this Dissertation, respecting passages in the New Testament in which *Theos* has been rendered by the same English term; and many more might be added,

were it deemed necessary, to establish a fact which is incontrovertible. But this naturally gives rise to a very important question:—

Since the fact is as has just been stated, that, by substituting “*God*” for “*The Omnipotent*,” the sense is frequently obscured or weakened, would it be proper, wherever the former term is employed to represent *Elohim* or *Theos*, to substitute for it the proper version—namely “*The Omnipotent*,” or some equivalent English term?—At first view many might be inclined to answer this question in the affirmative: but various reasons—and some of them very powerful—might be adduced to show, that, however desirable it might have been, that the proper translation should have been given in our early versions and never departed from; and that though some important changes may be indispensable, it would not now be advisable to make one so extensive as this would prove on the English Scriptures, and indeed on the English language, in every thing that regards our modes of speech on subjects connected with theology.—From the word *God* we have several derivatives and compounds for which it would be difficult to find substitutes, namely *Godhead*, *godly*, *godliness*, *God-like*, *god-ward*; and, even were substitutes found, it would not, on many occasions, be possible for the present generation to employ

them—especially in devotional exercises, from the suspension to the current of thought to which the hunting, as it were, for the new terms, would give rise in the mind.—And, besides, as to the Version generally, it may be asserted that, in many instances, the sense is declared as accurately by employing the word *God* as it would be by the proper translation of the Hebrew or Greek term being substituted—namely in all those passages in which an Attributive noun is employed in the original only for the purpose of designating the individual intended. For example—the sense is the same, whether we read “*Jehovah* spake unto Abraham,” or “*the Lord* spake”—“*The Omnipotent* spake,” or “*God* spake unto Abraham :”—in such cases, therefore, no change is called for ; but wherever a false sense is imposed on the text by employing “*God*” as a proper name, the translation ought to be altered so as to make it convey the precise sense of the original. In our idiom the Article is never prefixed to proper names ; and in the Greek scriptures, the word *Theos* which represents the Hebrew term *Elohim* (which is not a proper name) appears much oftener with the article than alone. Inattention to the rules of the Greek language respecting the Article, in sentences where two Attributive nouns occur, has, in various instances, occasioned the two to be

considered as indicating two distinct persons, where the text actually speaks only of one. Of all the errors resulting from the substitution of a *Name* for an *Attribute*, these are the most important and call most loudly for correction:—But this part of the subject shall be considered more particularly in a distinct Dissertation. [See Dissert. VI.]—In the mean time let it be constantly kept in recollection that the amanuensis of the Apocalypse has actually defined the meaning of the words *Kyrios ho Theos* [Κύριος ὁ Θεός], which are of such frequent recurrence in the Greek scriptures; for, assuredly, this would not have been done, were it not of infinite importance that, in whatever construction either of these words may be found, they should be rigidly subjected to the grammatical regimen of the Greek language, that the true import of the original may be elicited and made apparent in the translation.

DISSERTATION THE SIXTH.

ON CERTAIN COMBINATIONS OF δ ΘΕΟΣ, [THE OMNIPOTENT] AND ΚΥΡΙΟΣ [LORD] WITH OTHER NOUNS OF PERSONAL DESCRIPTION, WHICH ARE FOUND IN THE EPISTLES IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

THE reader may not, at first sight, perceive what possible relation this Dissertation can have with our general subject; but it is hoped that one or two considerations will show the necessity of introducing it. We have seen that the Apocalypse is quoted in the epistles of the New Testament; that is, that the Writers, sometimes, employed it as their text book; and hence it is reasonable to infer that (excluding from our present consideration symbolical and figurative language,) they will, when using common modes of speech, be found employing similar modes of diction. Now in the Apocalypse the Name *Κύριος*, that is JEHOVAH, is not only associated with δ Θεός, but the title *Κύριος*, that is, *Adonai* or *Lord*,

is found joined with other *Attributive Nouns*, precisely as in the *Epistles*; and, so far as these only are concerned, the sentences in which they occur are to be construed by the same rules, and ought to be translated in a similar manner. So that, till something is determined respecting these rules, we are not in a condition to proceed, with that precision which the subject absolutely demands, in our enquiry into the meaning of the *Apocalypse*. The reason just stated for discussing the topics which form the subject of this dissertation, is strengthened by another consideration. Various passages in which the combinations occur, which we are about to consider, have been translated in a manner which not only obscures the meaning of the original, but absolutely imposes upon the text a false sense; and that too on subjects of the first importance. This fact has been so fully established by others who have preceded me, that, on this point, little is required, but, only to endeavour not to do them injustice, in the use which I shall make of their labors; and in pursuing this object I shall, as far as I am able, endeavour to treat it in such a manner, as to enable the common reader to understand it sufficiently to arm him against the effects of distortions imposed on the text by modes of translation, which set all the rules of the language at defiance.

It is but too well known that, unhappily, different sentiments are entertained among men respecting the Divinity of THE MESSIAH. I speak not now of professed deists, but of those who call themselves Christians; who admit the authority of the Scriptures as the only rule of faith and practice; and who, notwithstanding, are directly opposed to each other on this doctrine. To what should this be principally attributed? To the darkness of the Scriptures? or to the veil cast over these lively oracles by mistranslations? Few, it is hoped, will seriously maintain that the Divine Record—the only instrument employed by God to enlighten mankind—can, possibly, itself be dark. True it is, that mankind are, naturally, so ignorant, and have their minds so pre-occupied with falsehood and error, that it is exceedingly difficult to have their prejudices removed; but this is very generally admitted, both by those who assert, and by those who deny, the Divinity of the MESSIAH; and it is also very generally allowed by both, that whoever be in error, the cause must lie somewhere else than in the writings of the inspired penmen. It is but too common, on questions of this kind, for those who differ, boldly to charge each other with wilful perversion of the scriptures, and a studied suppression of evidence. This is, however, a mode of procedure unworthy of the cause of

truth, and no way suited to enlighten and convince either those who bring the charge, or those against whom it is made: nor can the cause of truth be any way weakened, by admitting, in argument, that the opposing party is as honestly in search of it as those who deem them to be in error. It is true, that individuals may be found engaged in this controversy who have some other aim than a simple maintenance of truth; but it is equally true, that this species of dishonesty may be found not exclusively on one side of the question: nor, in a fairly-conducted argument, should it be assumed that those we oppose are ever found wilfully employing other than legitimate weapons. To the issue it is not necessary that the adversary should be proved dishonest: it is quite sufficient that his armour be shown to be not battle-proof; but this can only be done by using such weapons against him, and in such a manner, as may ultimately leave him defenceless.

It is admitted on all hands that the points in difference, among those who call themselves Christians, can be settled only by an appeal to the Holy Scriptures: and, indeed, all profess to draw their peculiar tenets from the inspired volume. Do these divine records teach opposite and contradictory doctrines? Who will presume to affirm this, and yet call themselves

Christians ? The cause, then, of the differences which exist can only be attributed to the prepossessions and prejudices of the individuals, no matter how acquired ; or to ambiguities in translations, when these are followed ; or,—which comes to the same thing,—to ignorance, in a greater or less degree, of the idiom and construction of the original text. Indeed to the latter may be attributed the greater part of the ambiguities of the different versions ; and the strong prejudices which occupy the minds of many, may be attributed to the direct, or indirect effect, produced by mistranslations. It is, then, of the greatest importance that the genuine sense of the original, in those passages which occasion the principal differences, should be fully ascertained, so that all ambiguity, whether arising from difference of idiom, the phraseology employed, or the mode of construction, may be removed, by a strict adherence to the rules of the language in which the original is written, and a close and rigid examination of the modes of speech employed by the writers.

Some notice has been taken (in the preceding Dissertations) of certain Nouns employed by the inspired penmen to designate the Creator of the Universe. It has been shown that the terms of most frequent recurrence, namely KYRIOS (*Κύριος*, commonly rendered THE LORD), and THE

THEOS (ὁ Θεός, commonly rendered GOD), have been defined by the amanuensis of the Apocalypse; and that the former, except when put for “*Adonai*,” represents the Hebrew word JEHOVAH, of which “THE ETERNAL” is a proper English translation; and the latter, the Hebrew word ELOHIM, of which the correct version is, “THE OMNIPOTENT:” but the manner in which these are combined with other Attributives, in the Apostolic Epistles, and the difference of sense resulting from different modes of combination, remain to be noticed. In this department of sacred criticism much has been done within these few years, and well done, by the late Mr. Granville Sharp, by Dr. Chr. Wordsworth, and Mr. Middleton, now Bishop of Calcutta.¹

The works alluded to, are, 1st, *Remarks on the use of the Definitive Article in the Greek text of the New Testament, containing many new proofs of the Divinity of Christ, from passages which are wrongly translated in the common English Version.* By Granville Sharp.” 1798. A Second Edition was published in 1802; and a Third Edition in 1803.

2d. “*Six Letters to Granville Sharp, Esq. respecting his Remarks on the uses of the Definitive*

¹ While the present volume was passing through the Press, accounts were received of the death of this distinguished scholar.

“*Article in the Greek Text of the New Testament.*”

1802. Published anonymously, but acknowledged to be the production of Dr. Wordsworth, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge.

3d. “*The Doctrine of the Greek Article applied to the Criticism and the Illustration of the New Testament.*” By T. F. Middleton, A. M. 1808.

Dr. Wordsworth, on perusing Mr. Sharp’s *Remarks*, experienced, as he informs us, “a feeling of uncertainty and scepticism,” that the rule insisted on by Mr. Sharp, and asserted by a writer so long ago as Beza, “should have remained so long unknown, or unacknowledged.” His first step was a determination to make an actual comparison of the rule with the volume of the New Testament. “But,” says he, in his first letter to Mr. Sharp, “at the same time, it occurred to me, that I should probably find some at least of those texts, the translation of which you had called in question, cited and explained by the Greek Fathers; not indeed as instances of any particular rule, but expounded by them, naturally, as men would understand any other form of expression in their native language. If Mr. Sharp’s rule be true, then will their interpretation of those texts be invariably in the same sense in which he understands them.” To these authorities he accordingly appealed, and examined, for the

few texts produced by Mr. Sharp, the voluminous works of seventy Greek, and nearly sixty Latin Fathers and divines, besides other theological collections—a labor, the very prospect of which would have deterred most men from the undertaking. The result was a complete confirmation of Mr. Sharp's doctrine respecting the use of the Greek Article.

In addition to this laborious work of Dr. Wordsworth (though compressed into a small volume) nothing was wanted, but a similar examination of the writings of the Greek Poets and Historians. This desideratum has been supplied by the researches of the learned Bp. Middleton. He remarks, in his preface: “That the use of the Greek Article should not have been more correctly ascertained may excite surprise, when we perceive, that hints tending to prove the importance of the subject may be traced even in the writings of the Fathers.”—“We have seen (says he) disquisitions on the Homeric Digamma, on the Greek Accents, on Dialectics, on the quantity of the Comparatives in *ION*, on the license allowed in Tragic Iambics and on their Cæsura, on the Greek Particles, and on Metres, especially those of Pindar. I will not deny that these inquiries are all of them of the highest importance to the cause of Classical Literature: yet

“ the present, considered in the same point of
 “ view, may claim at least a secondary rank ;
 “ whilst in connexion with Theology, and per-
 “ haps, I may add, with the Philosophy of Gram-
 “ mar, it obviously admits them not to any com-
 “ petition.” He then alludes to the controversy
 occasioned by Mr. Sharp’s *Remarks* ; after which
 he proceeds thus : “ The interpretation main-
 “ tained by Mr. Sharp [that such phrases in
 “ the N. T. as τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ ought to be in-
 “ terpreted of one individual] became the more
 “ probable from being sanctioned by the excel-
 “ lent Editor of *Dawes’s Miscellanea Critica*, the
 “ present *Bishop of St. David’s*. The same in-
 “ terpretation was also powerfully confirmed by
 “ the elaborate researches of Dr. *Wordsworth*,
 “ who has proved, that most of the disputed
 “ texts were so understood by the Fathers. If
 “ any thing under this head remained to be done,
 “ it was to show, that the same form of expres-
 “ sion in the classical writers required a similar
 “ explanation, and also to investigate the prin-
 “ ciple of the canon, and to ascertain its limita-
 “ tions.” This the learned author has done. In
 the former Part of his volume he resolves the
 question, *What is the Greek Article?* and in the
 Second Part he applies to the Greek text of the
 New Testament the doctrine laid down in the
 First.

It is surely to be regretted that the Rules which these writers have revived—for they are as old as the written Greek language—have not yet been applied to the correction of the authorized version of the New Testament, in passages which not only do not give the full sense of the original, but exhibit a meaning actually opposed to the truth conveyed in the Greek text. Such are the differences of idiom of different languages that, in translating from one into another, if attention be not paid to the common and little words, of most frequent recurrence, the real meaning cannot be obtained. Hasty readers are apt to consider the *Conjunction*, and the *Article*,—especially the latter—as trivial, and as having but little relation to the chief terms: but they serve, in truth, as the bolts and cement, the tenons and mortices, in an edifice: they are the marks put by the architect upon the respective pieces which compose the structure, that each may occupy its proper place, and the materials be preserved from that confusion and disorder, which would endanger the safety and solidity of the building. “ There are persons [it is true] “ who appear to believe, that the usages of language are rarely reducible to fixed rules; that “ their agreement is merely coincidence, and that “ Idiom is to be attributed solely to custom. I “ do not hold such reasoning to be at all philo-

“sophical: *custom* in language bears a close
 “analogy to *chance* in physics; each of them is a
 “name for the operation of unerring causes, which
 “we want either the ability or the inclination to
 “apprehend. Qualified by such a confession,
 “each of these terms may be tolerated; but
 “neither of them is to be employed as the ap-
 “pellation of a power which disdains to act
 “harmoniously and consistent with itself, and is
 “impelled only by caprice.”¹

The principal rule insisted on by Mr. Sharp is thus briefly stated in his Contents: “When
 “two personal nouns of the same case are con-
 “nected by the copulative καί, if the former has
 “the definitive article, and the latter has not,
 “they both relate to the same person,” or indi-
 vidual. The converse of this is equally true,
 and Mr. Sharp has given it as another rule:—
 “If they are connected by the copulative, and
 “both have the article, they relate to different
 “persons.” In his larger statement of the rule
 he describes the nouns intended as being “either
 “substantives or adjectives, or participles of
 “personal description respecting office, dignity,
 “affinity or connection, and attributes, proper-
 “ties, or qualities, good or ill.”² Bishop Mid-

¹ Middleton *on the Greek Article*, p. xviii.

² Mr. Sharp has expressly excepted Proper Names from

Middleton states the rule thus: "When two or more Attributives joined by a copulative or copulatives are *assumed* of the *same* person or thing, before the first Attributive the Article is *inserted*; before the remaining ones it is *omitted*." This rule, which is incontestably correct, however much half-scholars may cavil at it, Mr. Sharp applies, and with considerable success, to the correction of various mistranslations in our authorised version of the New Testament—several of which will be noticed hereafter.

The rule, as has been observed, is in fact as the operation of this rule; but there was no need to note these as an exception, as his rule embraces only Attributive nouns, which Proper Names are not. What was wanting respecting Proper Names the Bishop of Calcutta has well supplied in the learned work before alluded to. The general rule with respect to them is, that the article should be prefixed upon renewed mention of the name, however illustrious or well known; but not on its first introduction. The exceptions are, the names of Deities (sometimes), and of persons who are supposed to have in some way been made known to the hearer by what has gone before, though not then named; but this occurs but seldom. The reason why proper names do not take the article on their first introduction, rises out of the nature of the Greek Article, which was originally a pronoun;—but a substitute for any noun can never answer the purpose of that noun, if the one intended has not already been made known. For more ample information, and abundance of evidence on this point, I must refer the reader to Bishop Middleton's learned work.

old as the written Greek language. How then came it to be so much overlooked, as to furnish almost direct evidence that it was unknown to the Translators of the common Version? The answer is obvious. The first western version was in Latin,—the Old Italic; and the next, its successor,—the Vulgate—was also in Latin—a language which has not the Article; and these, but especially the last mentioned, have had an inconceivable influence on the turn of expression adopted in the European translations. In fact all the school divinity of the West was built upon and supported by the readings of the Vulgate: and hence the genuine sense of the original, in many important passages, was entirely lost. The majority of the Latin fathers, in all their comments and controversies, made use only of the Latin translation, precisely as the great majority of our own divines make use only of the common English version: indeed but few of them, comparatively speaking, were qualified to consult the original; and hence many passages, which, in spite of the ambiguity of the Latin, would be understood in their true sense, while Greek continued to be cultivated by the learned among the Romans, came to be obscured by the Latin fathers, from their ignorance of Greek, and from the infelicity of their own language, in the want of the Article;—and

hence the propagation of similar false views, respecting many passages of the New Testament, in the vernacular languages of Europe.

The rule so well illustrated by Mr. Sharp was not, however, unknown to all the critics and expositors. His learned Editor, Dr. Burgess (now Bishop of St. David's), addressing Mr. Sharp on this subject says, "I call the rule yours; for though it was acknowledged and applied by Beza and others to some of the texts alleged by you, yet never was it so prominently, because singly, or so effectually, as in your remarks."

A learned Reviewer (the British Critic for July 1802) in a Note on the words just quoted, correctly observes:—"Beza is not the only one among biblical critics who has noticed this idiom: it has occasionally been urged by various writers. Wolfius says, 'Articulus τῶν πρæmittendus fuisset voci Σωτηρίας (in Tit. ii. 13) siquidem hic a μεγάλῳ Θεῷ distinguï debuisset.' *In loco.* Drusius, on the same text, says, 'Non solum Deus, sed etiam *Deus Magnus*, vocatur hic Christus' (in *Crit. Sacro*); where, though the rule is not mentioned, it is taken for granted as undeniable. Bishop Bull, Calovius, Vitringa, and Dr. Twells, are all referred to by Wolfius, as supporting this sense, on the verse of Titus above

“ mentioned : and Erasmus, who speaks of that
 “ passage as ambiguous, had too much know-
 “ lege of Greek not to own, that the omission of
 “ the Article had some force against that opinion.
 “ ‘ *Quanquam omissus Articulus in libris Græcis*
 “ *facit nonnihil pro diversa sententiâ : τοῦ Μεγάλου*
 “ *Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος. Evidentius distinxisset*
 “ *personas si dixisset, καὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος.*’ ”—It may
 however, with truth, be allowed that the laws of
 the Greek idiom as connected with the use of the
 Article, had not, as a particular philological
 question, been hitherto sufficiently examined ;
 and Mr. Sharp’s work may be considered as
 the commencement of so useful and important
 an investigation.

The fact illustrated by Mr. Sharp and those
 who have followed him, and its certainty, may
 be summed up in a few words : A language
 must be consistent with itself, otherwise there
 could be no certainty respecting the meaning of
 any thing delivered in it : whatever license it may
 allow, for brevity, where the nature of the con-
 text prevents the possibility of a mistake, it can-
 not permit any regular rule to be violated where,
 the context furnishing no aid, confusion or am-
 biguity would result from such inattention.
 Without regularity in this particular, the lan-
 guage would be a jumble of confusion.—Nay
 more—there never was, nor can there ever be

such a language, even among unlettered barbarians ; and shall such an absurdity be predicated of the Greek tongue !

It is admitted on all hands that the expression *ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ*, [*the GOD and FATHER*] has reference to one individual, and cannot possibly mean two. Here, of the two *Attributive Nouns*, joined by the copulative *καὶ*, only the first has the *Article* prefixed. Nor is it denied by any that *τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς*, and *τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ*, the same words, but in other cases, also refer only to one. In a word, whatever the *Attributive Nouns* may be that are thus circumstanced, they always refer to the same person, as in the expression, “The grace *τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Σωτῆρος*, “of *THE LORD and SAVIOUR* :” in which expression the two *Attributives* “*LORD*” and “*SAVIOUR*” mean the same individual.

Grammarians need not be told that though the individual intended by the *Attributive* or *Attributives* employed in any sentence of this kind, may, as is also often the case when *Pronouns* are used, be rendered sufficiently obvious by the context, yet cautious writers, to prevent the possibility of a mistake, often name the individual to whom they are applying them ; but others, besides learned men, are deeply interested in this subject, and, for their sakes, it is desirable, that this point should be stated in as

familiar a way as possible :—Let it be noticed, then, as an example, that, though the reader may perhaps know what individual is meant by the words, “*the Lord and Saviour,*” yet the words themselves do not declare it,—the knowledge of the fact is, in every case of this kind, derived from some other source.

As a perverse and illegitimate mode of reasoning is sometimes employed to evade the conclusion which this law of the Greek language establishes respecting some important passages of the New Testament, it is necessary that it should be exposed ; and the more so as some, who use it, seem not even to suspect the possibility of obstructing the entrance of light into their own minds. The Controversialist often keeps himself in ignorance, by assuming that his views are correct, and consistent with truth ; and, instead of measuring them by the Scriptures, decides what must be the meaning of a text, by applying to it his preconceived opinions :—“*the Apostle (says he) cannot mean*” this, or that, (as the case may be) “*and, therefore, his language must not be so understood.*” But to speak thus is to beg the very point at issue. How can his meaning be known but from the language he employs ? If an individual has any other way of acquiring a knowledge of divine truths than from the Scriptures, let him say so at

once and hold his own opinions ; but, if he profess to draw his information from these lively oracles, he is bound to abide by their decision, in the plain and obvious sense which they yield, without any evasion whatever ; and if he refuse to do so, he denies their authority wholly, however much he may persuade himself to the contrary : for, in this case, though he may hold some of the things taught in the Scriptures, it is, because they agree with his decision, and not, because he has therein learnt them. Keeping this in our recollection let us attend a little to the modes of speech employed in the Greek Scriptures.

Will a mere amplification of such an expression as τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Σωτῆρος (literally, *of the LORD and SAVIOUR*) alter its application? No person who has the slightest knowledge of language will affirm this to be possible. Suppose that the writer had added, to the foregoing, these words, ὃς ἔκτισε τὸν οὐρανὸν, καὶ τὴν γῆν, “*who created the heaven and the earth ;*” would it not be evident that he still spoke of the same individual, and that the latter words were added to prevent the reader from applying the words “*LORD and SAVIOUR*” to any other than the one intended. But, instead of such amplifications, it is much more usual to write at once the name of the person, to prevent all mistake. In illustrating this case I shall put it in strong

terms, that the unlearned reader may the better be able to see where the fallacy lies in the mode of reasoning which is often employed to evade a legitimate inference. Let us suppose that in place of the above amplification, namely, “*who created the heaven and the earth,*” the writer had substituted Διὸς [*Jupiter*], making the whole read, “*of the Lord and Saviour, Jupiter;*” could he be understood to affirm any thing else but that *Jupiter is the Lord and Saviour?* Would it be any answer to say that, because this cannot be truly affirmed of *Jupiter*, the author could not possibly make such an assertion; when the question is not, Whether it be true or false, that *Jupiter is the Lord and Saviour?* but, Whether this be, or not, the meaning of the author’s words? Such indeed would be their meaning, and all that could be said would be, that the author had declared what was untrue. But, for Διὸς, let Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ be substituted, making the whole read, “*of the LORD and SAVIOUR, JESUS CHRIST,*” and then the truth of the expression will be, that *JESUS CHRIST is the LORD and SAVIOUR;* and the obvious sense will be admitted by all, though the sentence differs no way from the former, excepting only in having the Attributes applied to a different name. We meet with these very words in 2 Pet. ii. 20. “Through the knowlege τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

of *the* LORD and SAVIOUR, JESUS CHRIST." No one doubts that Peter here declares JESUS CHRIST to be *the* LORD and SAVIOUR; but had he written Διὸς instead of Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, it is equally certain that he would have made the same affirmation of *Jupiter*; otherwise there is nothing certain in Language. In the same epistle Ch. i. v. 11, we meet with the words—"into the everlasting kingdom τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ Σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ of our LORD and SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST,"—(literally, of *the* LORD of us and SAVIOUR, JESUS CHRIST), differing no way, in the mode of expression, from the example immediately preceding, but only with the addition of the Personal Pronoun, showing that JESUS CHRIST is, not only *THE Lord and Saviour*, but, *our Lord and Saviour*. And here it may be proper to remark, once for all, that in cases like the last mentioned, the position of the Pronoun does not affect the sense; for it is understood after the second Noun. Strictly speaking it should be inserted after each Noun; and when only once inserted it is wholly unimportant whether it be after the first or after the last: both terms, "LORD" and "SAVIOUR," belong to the person named—"JESUS CHRIST;" but were the last Attributive, "SAVIOUR," preceded by the Article, then, "*the* LORD of us," would indicate one individual, not named, and,

“*the SAVIOUR of us, JESUS CHRIST,*” would indicate another. In one word,—When of two **Attributive Nouns** connected by the copulative *καὶ*, and followed by the name of a person (as in the cases we have been considering), only the first **Noun** has the **Article**, *both* refer to the person named, and to no other.

But as it is true, that the substitution of one name for another after such an expression as *τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν*—“*of our LORD and SAVIOUR*”—alters not the meaning, but is only a different application, of the **Attributive Nouns**; so it is equally true, that, if another **Attributive** be substituted for *Κυρίου*, both of the **Attributives** in the expression will still apply only to one individual: for example: let *θεοῦ* be so substituted, and the words will then read, *of the GOD and SAVIOUR of us*, both referring to one person; to this no one will take any exception. Let us see then to what this would lead were the expression, *τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, (literally *of the LORD and SAVIOUR of us, JESUS CHRIST*) to have *θεοῦ* substituted for *Κυρίου*:—it would then read,—*of the GOD and SAVIOUR of us, JESUS CHRIST*—and the words would declare that *JESUS CHRIST is our GOD and SAVIOUR*. “No,” say some, who either do not know, or who wilfully disregard the rules of the language, (and I would rather believe the

former than the latter respecting them)—“No: the expression refers to *two* persons, namely, to *GOD*, and to *our SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST*.”—If they be right then it will follow, that the former expression also refers to two persons, namely to some one called “*the Lord*,” and to some other person called “*our Saviour Jesus Christ* ;” but this these very objectors will deny, affirming that but one person is there intended. Is there any difference whatever in the construction? Are not the two expressions precisely the same, excepting only the substitution of one *Attributive Noun* for another (for $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ is as much an attributive as $\text{K}\acute{o}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$, as has been fully proved)? How has the objector learnt that *JESUS CHRIST* is *the LORD and SAVIOUR*, but from the writings of the inspired penmen? and if it should be shown, that the same writers have affirmed, that he is *the GOD and SAVIOUR*, would it not be strange to find him admitting their authority in the one case, and rejecting it in the other? “But if you understand the Apostle to affirm a thing that cannot be true,” says an objector, “is not that a proof that you put a wrong meaning on his words?” This is specious; but amounts only to an assumption that nothing is true which opposes the objector’s system. Let his objection, however, be placed in a strong point of view, that he may have the

utmost benefit that it can yield him. He may say,—“ According to the doctrine that has been advanced, neither the change of a name, nor the substitution of one **Attributive Noun** for another, alters at all the nature of the sentence : that being the case, let us suppose that in some author we should meet with the following expression,—τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ Φαρισαίου καὶ Σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [*the commandment of the Pharisee and Saviour Jesus Christ*]*—could we, in this case, knowing as we do that JESUS CHRIST was not a Pharisee, believe that the author did not speak of two persons ?*” To reason thus is, however, a mere shuffle—for it involves an assumption that the writer could not state a falsehood. The first question ought to be,—What does the author affirm ? and this we must know before we can either assent to, or dissent from, his statement : the meaning of an author’s assertion, and the truth or falsehood of his assertion, are quite different things ; nor can we even enquire about the latter till the former is known. In this case the supposed author does actually call **JESUS CHRIST** “ *the Pharisee and Saviour,*” as certainly as the Apostles call him “ *the LORD and SAVIOUR,*” when they apply to him the words τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Σωτῆρος ; and whether the affirmation be true or false, it is equally certain that if Θεοῦ be substituted for Κυρίου in the latter expres-

sion, the words will declare JESUS CHRIST to be "*the GOD and SAVIOUR.*"

Now it so happens that the mode of expression which has, as yet, been put only hypothetically, respecting the substitution of Θεοῦ for Κυρίου, actually occurs in 2 Peter i. 1. "Through the righteousness τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ Σωτῆρος "Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, *of the GOD of us and SAVIOUR, "JESUS CHRIST;*" or, as Mr. Sharp renders the passage, to suit it to our English idiom, "*through the righteousness of JESUS CHRIST our "GOD and SAVIOUR.*" The authorised version exhibits an ambiguous translation,—"*through "the righteousness of GOD and our SAVIOUR "JESUS CHRIST,*"—which may be understood of *two* individuals; but not so the Greek. On their margin however our Translators have given the correct sense,—"*of our GOD and SAVIOUR.*"

It is the more surprising that the Translators of the authorized version did not put their marginal reading into the text, as all the preceding English Translators had given the same rendering—"of our GOD and SAVIOUR,"—viz. Wickliff, Tyndale, Coverdale, Mathews, Cranmer, the Bishops' Bible, and the Geneva and Rhemish versions: and later Translators, Doddridge, Wesley, Scattergood, Purver, Wakefield, Hawie, the Catholic version by C. N. C. F. P. D., and Scarlett, have all given the same version.

Clarke (Reply to Nelson, p. 83.) says on this place: “I do acknowledge that these words may, “in true grammatical construction, equally be rendered, either, *The righteousness of our God, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, or, The righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ.*” It is true indeed that the words may, as he acknowledges, be rendered according to the last method; but the Greek text positively denies that they may, “in true grammatical construction, be rendered,”—“*The righteousness of our God, and of our Saviour,*”—though the English version, as he understands it, determines it, (he says) according to his explication, i. e. as spoken of *two* persons: no, nor could all the English versions, had they all been like that now in use, ever alter the meaning of the Greek words, which have reference only to *one* person, *our GOD and SAVIOUR, JESUS CHRIST.*

In the Epistle to Titus ch. ii. v. 13. the same expression occurs, and with a still farther amplification; namely *μεγάλου* [great], inserted between *τοῦ* and *Θεοῦ*,—asserting *JESUS CHRIST* to be, “*THE GREAT GOD and SAVIOUR of us.*” The ambiguity in our English version, which reads, “*of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ,*” arises from the Pronoun “*our*” being thrust forward in the sentence, while at the same time the Article has been retained in the version, contra-

ry to the common practice of the Translators when rendering τοῦ Θεοῦ. They seem to have translated the Article (which they generally omit¹) because of the interposed Adjective, “*great*;” but they might easily have followed their usual mode of translation, by carrying the Pronoun still farther forward in the sentence, as Mr. Sharp has done, who renders the passage thus, “*Expecting the blessed hope and appearance of the glory of our GREAT GOD and SAVIOUR, JESUS CHRIST.*” In the Greek there is no ambiguity whatever: nor is there any thing so very different between the structure of our own language and that of the Greek as to prevent this fact from being rendered evident to the mere English reader. In such expressions as have

¹ Though our Translators generally omit the Article, the omission does not always affect the sense; but in several passages it occasions the same ambiguity as in some of those which refer to the MESSIAH. Thus in Ephes. v, 20. and Col. iii, 17, “*Giving thanks to GOD and THE FATHER*” means, in strict English idiom, two persons; but the Greek reads “*to THE GOD and FATHER.*” It is true that in these passages no one mistakes the sense,—because the divinity of the Father has never been called in question; but, had this become a dispute, the objectors might have brought this, and similar passages, with exactly the same force, against the identity of the Father with God, as they do passages of precisely the same construction, respecting our Saviour, against the identity of the Son with God.

been alluded to, the Greeks commonly put the Pronoun in the genitive, making it follow the Attributive Noun with which it is connected; but as in English we cannot well render the Greek Pronoun genitive without the preposition “of,” it is usual with our Translators, instead of using a Personal Pronoun, to use an Adjective Pronoun. We can, however, as I have done above, express ourselves as do the Greeks, though with less elegance; but when this is done the English is as free from ambiguity as the original, which is a point of no small moment. A few short expressions, as given in the English New Testament, contrasted with the Greek mode of speech, will make this quite familiar :

ENGLISH.	GREEK.
<i>Our</i> father Abraham.	The father <i>of us</i> , Abraham.
The God <i>of our</i> fathers.	The God of the fathers <i>of us</i> .
The Lord <i>our</i> God.	The Lord God <i>of us</i> .
The grace <i>of our</i> Lord Jesus Christ.	The grace of the Lord <i>of us</i> , Jesus Christ.
The father <i>of our</i> Lord Jesus Christ.	The father of the Lord <i>of us</i> , Jesus Christ.
The kingdom <i>of our</i> father, David.	The kingdom of the father <i>of us</i> , David.
The God and father <i>of our</i> Lord Jesus Christ.	The God and father of the Lord <i>of us</i> , Jesus Christ.
The commandment of God <i>our</i> Saviour.	The commandment of the Saviour <i>of us</i> , God.

Let us now see the passage, in the Epistle to

Titus (ii. 13), placed in the same order in which it is in the Greek :—“ *Expecting the blessed hope and appearance of the glory of THE GREAT GOD and SAVIOUR of us, JESUS CHRIST.*” Is there any thing ambiguous in this sentence? The question is not, Whether this be an elegant mode of expression in English?—but, Whether the meaning of the words, when placed in this order (which is that of the original), can possibly be misunderstood? The sentence expressly declares that JESUS CHRIST is *our* GREAT GOD and SAVIOUR.

In such sentences as we have been considering, any of the *Attributives* may be left out, and still will a complete sense be given: thus, if we here omit, “GREAT GOD *and*,” we shall have, “the glory of *the* SAVIOUR of us, JESUS CHRIST:” if “*and Saviour*,” be omitted, the sentence will read, “*the glory of the* GREAT GOD of us, JESUS CHRIST;”—JESUS CHRIST being the individual of whom every thing preceding is predicated. Had the writer intended to express “THE GREAT GOD,” and “SAVIOUR,” as a plurality, he would, as required by the rules of the language, have inserted the article before Σωτηρῶς (*Saviour*); and, by not having done so, he has declared that JESUS CHRIST, “SAVIOUR of us,” is “GOD”—not an inferior God, as some controversialists have expressed themselves, but

“**THE GREAT GOD.**” And here, it deserves to be noticed, that in this passage there is no diversity of reading among all the known manuscripts; no, nor among all the Greek fathers: and we learn, from Dr. Wordsworth, that all antiquity agreed in referring the whole words to **JESUS CHRIST**; “so that,” to use his words, “it is the more to be regretted, and wondered at, that our English translators should have deprived us of that interpretation which was the only one ever preached in all the ancient churches.” The Greek authorities adduced by that scholar are fifty-four in number (and others might have been adduced), extending from the second to the twelfth century; “and many of the passages which he has produced from the fathers (as remarked by Bp. Middleton), could not have been more direct, or explicit, if they had been forged with a view to the dispute.” Is it consistent, then, with sound reason, that the doubts, conjectures, and may-be’s, of three or four moderns, should be listened to for a moment, when contrasted with the plain, positive, unambiguous statements of men writing in their native tongue—the same in which the Apostle wrote—and some of these men Arians too?—for even these allowed that Paul, in this passage, calls **JESUS CHRIST** “**THE GREAT GOD.**” Would they have allowed this,

had the Greek been in the least degree ambiguous? Would they, in this controversy, have contented themselves, as they actually did, with quoting, along with this passage, and as the only way in which they could attempt to lessen its force, the words of our Lord (John xiv. 28.) “*My father is greater than I,*”—thus virtually establishing more than one God—a *great* and a *greater*? On this passage too, all the Latin fathers also bear the same testimony, with, “perhaps, two poor exceptions:” the number of these quoted by Dr. Wordsworth is about sixty.

Clarke (*Reply to Nelson* p. 88.) endeavours to get rid of the true rendering of Titus ii. 13. by observing that Σωτήρ is sometimes put for ὁ Σωτήρ; and instances Luke ii. 11; Phil. iii. 20; and 1 Tim. i. 1. These examples, however, as remarked by Bishop Middleton, are wholly inapplicable to the present case. In the passage in Luke Σωτήρ is mentioned for the first time, and therefore is properly without the Article. In Phil. iii. 20. Σωτήρα is in apposition and in such circumstances as to be anarthrous by the rules of the language: and in his last example, Tim. i. 1. κατ’ ἐπιταγήν Θεοῦ Σωτήρος ἡμῶν, the word Σωτήρος wants the Article because of the preceding omission before Θεοῦ, exactly as in the common forms ἀπὸ

Θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν, ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν. Clarke also thinks that Σωτήρ partakes in some degree of the nature of Proper Names, but of this he has offered no proof, which he certainly would have done, had he been able to find any in the New Testament.

“ Some critics, of great name, besides Clarke, “ seem to have been aware of the ancient inter- “ pretation : of this number was Wetstein, who, “ without adverting to any of the Greek Fathers, “ informs us that μέγας Θεὸς [*the great God*] is “ to be understood of *Deus Pater* [*God the fa- “ ther*] ; and he concludes with observing, that “ it was so understood by *Hilary, Erasmus, and “ H. Grotius* : i. e. by a *Latin Writer*, a native “ of Sardinia, who probably had at most but a “ smattering of Greek, and of two modern scho- “ lars, confessedly great men, but, compared “ with the ancient Greeks, extremely incompe- “ tent judges of the question. Of Erasmus, “ especially, this may be affirmed ; for an ac- “ quaintance with Greek criticism was, cer- “ tainly, not among his best acquirements ; as “ his Greek Testament plainly proves : indeed “ he seems not to have had a very happy talent “ for languages. But what says Erasmus on “ this text ? he tells us, that the expression is “ *equivocal* : he is inclined to think that two per- “ sons are meant ; yet he allows that the omis-

“sion of the article before $\Sigma\omega\tau\tilde{\eta}\rho\omicron\varsigma$ (*facit non-*
 “*nihil*) is somewhat in favour of the contrary
 “*opinion*. Grotius, it must be admitted, went
 “very far beyond Erasmus in the knowlege of
 “the Greek ; yet what does he urge, which
 “could thus influence the mind of Wetstein
 “against the concurring judgment of antiquity ?
 “Grotius tells us only, that Ambrose (i. e. the
 “aforesaid Latin writer Hilary, the author of
 “the Commentary printed with the works of
 “Ambrose) understood the words as of two
 “distinct persons : and that, though the reading
 “is not $TOY \Sigma\omega\tau\tilde{\eta}\rho\omicron\varsigma$, yet ‘it should be recol-
 “lected that in these writings the Article is
 “often inserted, where it is not necessary, and
 “omitted where the usage would require its
 “insertion’”—[a common method of begging the
 question]. “Grotius’s statement amounts only
 “to this : that he preferred one interpretation,
 “yet knew not well what could be said against
 “the other. The rule, both as it res-
 “pects diversity and identity, has been ob-
 “served by the Sacred Writers : and where is
 “the instance in which it has been violated ? It
 “is idle to tell us, that a certain canon is appli-
 “cable to other Greek writings but not to these,
 “without attempting to prove so remarkable a
 “difference by a single example.”¹

¹ Middleton on Gr. Article p. 569.

In Ephes. v. 5. we read in the Common Version : “ No whoremonger, &c. hath any inheritance ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ, *in the kingdom of CHRIST and of GOD ;*” as if two persons were mentioned in the Greek : but the fact is otherwise. In the original, according to the rules of the language, *the kingdom* belongs to the one individual whom the Apostle calls, “ **THE CHRIST and GOD.**” In our English version the Article placed before “ **CHRIST**” in the Greek is omitted. The meaning of the Greek word “ *Christ,*” like that of the Hebrew word “ *Messiah,*” being “ *Anointed,*” it has been contended “ that he must be a rude writer, who should say, “ *The Anointed and God ;*” but this is to reason on the usage of the Greek from that of the English language. It is assuming that the Greek and English Articles have the same origin and are governed by precisely the same laws ; but this is not the fact. Though the sense of the Greek, where the Article occurs, may generally be transferred into an English version, by means of the English Article, this is not always the case ; nor, when the sense is thus obtained in a translation, is it owing to the Article in both languages being of the same use. Bishop Middleton has shown that, as before noticed, the Greek Article is in fact a Pronoun, and, consequently, that the subintellection of

the Participle of existence, between the Article and its Predicate, becomes indispensable; otherwise there will be no more connection between them than if they occurred in different propositions. “Ὁ ἀνὴρ must signify, HE, or THE MALE, *being* or *assumed* to be a man, or else the Pronoun and the Substantive have no common medium, no principle of union by which they can be brought to act together in developing the ideas of the speaker.”¹ If then we would see the full sense of the Greek expressed in English, the proper rendering of τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Θεοῦ will be, “*Of him (being or) who is, CHRIST and GOD*”—a plain and very intelligible declaration, respecting the one to whom the Apostle ascribes the property and sovereignty of *the kingdom*, from which such characters are excluded.

But I am inclined to go farther. How comes it that “*The Anointed*” should be more exceptionable in the ears of some men than the word *Christ*? We might as well say that the latter word should have been considered as “a harsh and intolerable” expression in Greek, for the Hebrew word *Messiah*. If, in the Greek scriptures, the inspired penmen have thought it right to translate the word *Messiah* into the language in which they were writing, can any solid reason

¹ See *Middleton*, Ch. ii. throughout.

be assigned why translators into other languages should not follow their example? Had the term "*The Anointed*" or "*The Anointed one*" been introduced into our early versions and continued through subsequent translations and revisions, it would have been as familiar to our ears, and would have sounded as harmoniously, as either the Hebrew word "*Messiah*" or its Greek version "*Christ*." It is in fact the true English translation, and to object to it is to quarrel with an epithet applied by Infinite Wisdom to the Son of God. In the text before us **THE ANOINTED ONE** (or *the Christ*) is declared to be **ΘΕΟΣ** (God or) **THE OMNIPOTENT**.

Our English translators having, on many occasions, when two Attributive Nouns, referring to one person, are joined by *καὶ*, rendered this Conjunction by "*even*," instead of the English Conjunction "*and*,"—as in 2 Cor. i. 3. ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ, **GOD EVEN** *the Father*, for *the GOD AND father*,—Mr. Sharp would translate Ephes. v. 5. "*in the kingdom of Christ, EVEN of God:*" nor can it be denied, though this be not, strictly speaking, a correct version, that it conveys the true sense of the original, which is sometimes all that a Translator can do, without employing an amplification or a circumlocution; but where "*even*" is employed for "*and*," in rendering passages that have formed matter of

controversy, the circumstance should be noted, and the reason for its adoption pointed out. Mr. Sharp offers also another version in which he would introduce "*Jesus*" as a supplement, to yield, in English, the necessary sense of the Greek,—"*in the kingdom of (JESUS) the Christ and God.*"—But, in my humble opinion, many, if not the whole, of the difficulties, which present themselves to translators, arise from a fastidious adherence, where there is no necessity, to the forms and modes of expression adopted by our early translators, who modelled their versions upon the Vulgate, instead of following the Greek; and were a revision to take place for the purpose of introducing (with other improvements) the precision of the Greek Article, as far as the difference of idiom of the two languages would permit, the public ear would soon become so habituated to the change, as to see its beauty, and feel all the force and precision of the scriptural expression.

In 2 Thess. i. 12 we meet with a case similar to those already cited, but with *Κυρίου* occupying the place of *Σωτηρῆρος*: "According to the grace "*τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,*"—rendered in the Common Version, "*of our GOD and the Lord JESUS CHRIST.*" The Possessive Pronoun, as noticed above, may, in such sentences, be placed, indifferently, after either the first or last

Noun, and we may read (with Mr. Sharp) “ according to the grace of the GOD and LORD of us, JESUS CHRIST ;” or—by transposing the sentence, and (as our Translators usually do) omitting the Article before Θεοῦ,—“ according to the grace of JESUS CHRIST, our GOD and LORD.”

Bishop Middleton is “ disposed to think, that this text affords no certain evidence in favour of Mr. Sharp”—i. e. in support of his rule; because “ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς collectively is a title of our Lord familiar to the Writers of the Epistles,” and therefore, possibly, Κυρίου should here be considered as joined with the Nouns that follow rather than with Θεοῦ. It is with great deference that the present writer presumes to dissent from such a high authority: but though it is true that “ the Lord Jesus Christ” is a very common mode of speaking of our Saviour, and is employed as a title, it cannot follow that, when preceded by another title, which is also applied to him, namely Θεὸς (*God*), as we have seen, and in such a manner as to bring Κύριος within an established and an invariable rule of the Greek language, that we may, notwithstanding, exclude it from the operation of that rule. Our object in noticing this text is not for the purpose of thereby establishing a rule; but the rule being established, we apply it to this as we would to any other text of similar construction, and the

result is what has been stated. Indeed were it not thought necessary, the text being Greek, that the common reader should be informed that in the new translation offered by Mr. Sharp no rule of the Greek language is violated, the rule need not be appealed to at all so far as respects this text, for when rendered verbatim it gives, in English, the true sense of the Greek, namely “according to the grace of the GOD of us and LORD, *Jesus Christ*,” nor can the words, without doing violence to the text, have any other meaning imposed upon them.

It is with great reluctance that I detain the reader for a few minutes on Bp. Middleton’s objection, but being, as I apprehend, founded on some unaccountable mistake, it calls the more for examination by its coming from so good a scholar. That I may avoid any error in stating his Lordship’s opinion I shall quote his own words. After noticing that this is one of the texts on which Mr. Granville Sharp would rest the doctrine of the divinity of Jesus Christ, he proceeds thus: “To the validity, however, of this and of one or two others of his proofs, there are objections which I ought not to suppress. *Κύριος* is a word which has a peculiar construction: it so far partakes of the nature of Proper Names, that it sometimes dispenses with the Article, where other words would re-

“quire it. Thus, for example, had we in the
 “present instance instead of Κυρίου read ΣΩΤΗ-
 “ΡΟΣ [*Saviour*], no reasonable doubt could
 “have been entertained, that identity was here
 “intended, there being no reason derived either
 “from theory or from practice for omitting the
 “Article before Σωτήρως, if different persons be
 “meant. So 2 Pet. iii. 2. no one will deny,
 “that τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Σωτήρως [*of the Lord and Sa-*
 “*viour*] are spoken of one person. But Κύριος
 “Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς collectively is a title of our Lord
 “familiar to the Writers of the Epistles. We
 “have repeatedly ἀπὸ Θεοῦ πατρός ἡμῶν καὶ Κυρίου
 “Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ: Rom. i. 7.; 1 Cor. i. 3.;
 “2 Cor. i. 2.; Gal. i. 3. *et passim*. We have
 “also, Philip. iii. 20., Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.
 “Hence it is manifest that in the present passage
 “there is no *necessity* for detaching Κυρίου from
 “Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in order to couple it with Θεοῦ.”
 On this statement I would remark, in the First
 place, that, in a certain sense, it may be said
 that Κύριος partakes of the nature of Proper
 Names, but, I apprehend, not in that sense which
 would assist his Lordship’s argument in refe-
 rence to the passage before us, and “the one or
 “two others” of Mr. Sharp’s texts to which he
 objects. Or to speak, as I conceive, more cor-
 rectly, Κύριος is a proper name when put for יהוה
 (*Jehovah*); but that it partakes of the nature of

Proper Names, when put for *Adonai*, or, simply, *Lord*, would require some proof before being assented to. And this leads me to remark, in the Second place, that I cannot perceive how the fact he has stated respecting *Σωτήρ*ος can be held as an “example,” proving that *Κύριος* ever either adopts or dispenses with the Article in circumstances in which other Attributive Nouns would do otherwise.

As to the general proposition of the learned Author,—“that it is manifest that in the present “passage there is no *necessity* for detaching *Κυρίου* from *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* in order to couple it “with *Θεοῦ*,”—had he said that in the five passages to which he has referred there is no *necessity* for doing so, this would not only have been granted, but also that *the thing cannot possibly be done* in any of them. The first four are the common benediction of the Writers in several of the Epistles: “Grace (&c.) *from God our Father “and the Lord Jesus Christ.*” This benediction occurs also in Eph. i. 2. ; vi. 23. ; Philip. i. 2. ; 2 Thess. i, 2. ; and Philem. v. 3. : and the words *Θεῷ πατρὶ καὶ Κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ* occur in 1 Thess. i. 1. first clause of the verse, and in 2 Thess. i. 1. first clause. The foregoing are the only places in which this form of expression, with which the Writers are so “familiar,” is found in the New Testament (exclusive of a few in which

the manuscripts present different readings,¹) amounting in number to eleven. In all of them Θεός [*God*] is already coupled with πατήρ [*Father*], and *diversity* as strongly marked as in 2 John 3. where we meet with, Θεοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς, “*God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ the son of the*” “*Father.*” Nor is this all: the Article, on the presence and position of which the whole argument hinges, does not once occur in the Greek of any of the passages that have been referred to,² nor in any of the similar passages in which the readings of the manuscripts differ. The Rule in question demands, “when two personal nouns of the same case are connected by the copulative καὶ, the first having the Definitive Article

¹ These are Col. i. 2. ; 1 Thess. i, 1. ; Tit. i. 4. ; to which may be added 1 Tim. i. 1.

² The English reader is requested to keep this fact in his recollection, for it cannot be made apparent in a version into our mother-tongue. These passages furnish examples of what I have stated above, that the Greek and the English Articles, being different in their origin, are not governed by precisely the same laws. We cannot, like the Greek of Rom. i. 7., &c. say in English, with propriety, “*Grace (&c.) from God our Father, and Lord Jesus Christ,*” but are compelled, by the usage of our language, to introduce the Article before “*Lord* ;”—and, if the Possessive Pronoun “*our*” be absent, as in 1 Thess. i. 1., also before “*Father,*” thus: “*Grace from God THE Father and THE Lord Jesus Christ.*”

“and the second not, that both be referred to the “same person;” and if we act consistently we must submit to the Rule, unless it can be shown that it admits of exceptions. Can the production of passages in which, indeed, the personal nouns are connected by the copulative *καί*, but neither has the Article, be held as bearing at all on the question? Such passages as Rom. i. 7., &c. have nothing in common with the passage in 2 Thess. i. 12. so far as regards construction. Some of the same words, it is true, occur in both, namely *Θεοῦ* and *Κυριοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*; but they are differently circumstanced, as already noticed, *Θεοῦ* [*God*] in 1 Cor. i. 7., having no Article, and being expressly coupled already with *πατρὸς* [*Father*]; but in the passage under consideration *Θεοῦ* has the Article, and no other noun is present with which it can immediately be coupled excepting *Κυρίου*. And as to the passage quoted from the Epistle to the Philippians (iii. 20.) it is difficult to conceive in what way the objector would make it assist his argument, since neither *Θεός* nor any other Attributive Noun occurs either in the text or immediate context!

It is hardly possible that too much attention can be paid to such a passage as 2 Thess. i. 12.: and it is on this account that I have thought it necessary to examine and refer to every passage of the same description as those advanced by the

objector: and I shall yet adduce the only remaining passages in which the words Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς occur, in the form quoted by him,—that is, without the Article being prefixed to Κύριος,—that the reader, by the time I shall have finished this digression, may have the whole subject before him. The remaining passages are:

1.—1 Cor. viii. 6. “*But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; καὶ Εἰς Κύριος, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός,*” and ONE LORD, JESUS CHRIST, by whom are “*all things,*” &c.

2.—Philipp. ii. 11. “*And that every tongue should confess, ὅτι Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, that [Common Version] JESUS CHRIST is LORD, to the glory of God the Father.*”

3.—2 Thess. i. 12. The text under consideration.

4.—1 Tim. v. 21. Διαμαρτύρομαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν ἀγγέλων &c. rendered in our Common Version, “*I charge (thee) before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the elect angels,*” &c. but more correctly by Mr. Sharp—“*before Jesus Christ, the GOD and LORD, and (before) the elect angels,*” &c.—referring “*GOD*” and “*LORD*” to the same person, JESUS CHRIST. If we follow the Greek order of the words, the passage will read thus:

“*I charge (thee) before the GOD and LORD, Jesus Christ, and (before) the elect ANGELS.*”

5.—2 Tim. iv. 1. ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ—rendered in the Common Version, “*before God and the Lord Jesus Christ;*”—but according to Mr. Sharp, following some Manuscripts which do not exhibit the Article after the copulative καὶ, “*before the God and Lord, Jesus Christ.*”

6.—James i. 1. Ἰάκωβος, Θεοῦ καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος.

The above six are the only other places in the New Testament in which the words Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς occur without the Article.

The 1st and 2d of these passages we shall see noticed hereafter by the objector himself: and the 6th (James i. 1.), not exhibiting the article before Θεοῦ, may be dismissed entirely from our present consideration.

The 3d is the passage 2 Thess. i. 12., the proper meaning of which is disputed, on account of Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς being, as alleged, a common title of our Lord.

In the 4th some manuscripts and early versions omit Κυρίου, which, of course, would exclude the passage from the application of the Rule. “The received reading may, however, “be the true one,” says the author of *The Doc-*

trine of the Greek Article ; but, even if admitted, he acknowledges that still he would object to the conclusion furnished by the Rule, on the same ground that he objects to a similar interpretation of 2 Thess. i. 12.

Of the 5th passage (2 Tim. iv. 1.) the readings of some Manuscripts differ considerably.

“There is,” in Bishop Middleton’s opinion, “so little authority for omitting the Article before *Κυρίου*, which however must be done before “this text can be subjected to the rule,” that he expresses surprise at Mr. Sharp having adduced it as an example. But, even if the Manuscripts could be considered as warranting the reading preferred by Mr. Sharp, he would urge the objection before stated,—that, “*Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς* being a common title of our Lord, there is “no absolute *necessity* for detaching *Κυρίου* from “*Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* in order to couple it with *Θεοῦ*.”—In one word,—independently entirely of any thing that might be urged from diversity of readings, this is his real objection. He objects not to the rule,—for he himself has produced, from the Greek Classical writers, irrefragable evidence of its indubitable certainty,—but to this and the two preceding passages (the only texts in which the words *τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* occur) being interpreted according to the absolute requirement of the Rule: and the proof

he requires that they may be so interpreted is, “that in the form *Κύριος* ’Ι. Χρ., so frequently occurring in the N. T., *Κύριος* commonly is to be separated from the Proper Name in order to be joined with some preceding *Attributive*: and this proof, [says he] I fear cannot be obtained;”—a mode of expression (the word “commonly” being printed too in Italics) not easy to be accounted for, from so distinguished a scholar; since it is hardly credible that it could be unknown to him, that there are no other passages in the New Testament in which any preceding *Attributive* is so circumstanced that *Κύριος* might be separated from *Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς* to be joined with it. Indeed accumulations of *Attributives*, except when two or more, united, form the only proper title of the individual of whom they are predicated, occur but rarely in compositions of any kind: thus, for instance, the expression, “*Our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ,*” which most people, without previous examination, would expect to meet with very frequently, does not occur above twice or thrice in the New Testament.

“That *Κύριος* is commonly subject to the “Rule,” Bp. Middleton allows [p. 553]; and in proof that this *Attributive* may, to use his own mode of expression, “be separated from the “Proper Name,” in order to be coupled with

Θεὸς, when the latter occurs as the preceding **Attributive**, he refers to two “unquestionable “instances” produced by Dr. Wordsworth: “the “one from Gregory of Nyssa, ὁ δὲ Θεὸς ἡμῶν καὶ “Κύριος Ἰ. Χρ. ὁ παρακαλῶν, &c.; and another “from the Scholiast on Jude, quoted by *Mat-thai* N. T. vol. vi. p. 235. These examples “[says his Lordship] prove, I think, that Κύριος “may be disjoined from Ἰησ. Χριστὸς, and be “identified with a preceding **Attributive**: but,” —notice the words that follow—“that Κύριος “may be detached from Ἰησ. Χρ. was already “probable from 1 Cor. viii. 6. καὶ εἶς Κύριος Ἰη- “σοῦς Χριστὸς, and also from Philipp. ii. 11.”— These are two (the 1st and 2d) of the above six passages; and in these he allows that *separation*, objected to with respect to the others, is, at least, probable.

But why, in applying the Rule to a passage like 2 Thess. i. 12. is Κύριος said to be, “separated from the Proper name?” In such cases there is not a *separation* from the Proper Name, but an *addition* made to the prefix; nor, when thus enlarged, do the words become less a title of our Lord than they were before. “*Our “Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ,*” and “*Our God “and Lord, Jesus Christ,*” are, in every sense, titles as proper to him, as “*Our Lord, Jesus Christ.*”— The latter, however, we are told, “is a common

“title of Christ.” Can the greater frequency of this title be, with any propriety, held a good reason for denying him others when given to him by the writers of the New Testament? Certainly not. It is quite obvious that, had the writer, in this passage, intended *two* persons, he could have put his meaning beyond all doubt by prefixing the Article to *Κυρίου* as well as to *Θεοῦ*. There was nothing in the nature or use of this title to prevent him, for in other passages we find him employing it with the Article, as in Rom. xiii. 14. and 1 Cor. xvi. 22. τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, “THE LORD JESUS CHRIST;” and, surely, it is begging too much to suppose that where he meant to express *two* he should, notwithstanding, employ that construction which the rules of the language require for only *one* person. This consideration seems to have been pressing itself on the mind of the learned author while stating his objection; for, after remarking that “*Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς* collectively “is a title of our Lord familiar to the Writers “of the Epistles,” and that “in the present “passage [2 Thess. i. 12.] there is no *necessity* for “detaching *Κυρίου* from *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* to couple “it with *Θεοῦ*,” he proceeds thus: “It is true “that we find also ‘*Ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς*’ as in “Rom. xiii. 14. and 1 Cor. xvi. 22., though in “both those places some MSS. after *Κύριος* add

“ ἡμῶν, which would make the Article necessary. Admitting, however, the title to have been sometimes ‘Ο Κύριος Ἰ. Χρ., still such is the ambiguity, that we shall not be obliged to apply the Canon.” From this manner of speaking one would imagine that Rom. xiii. 14. and 1 Cor. xvi. 22. were almost the only passages in which this title occurs with the Article; but it is so found also in Acts xi. 17.; xv. 11.; xvi. 13.; xxviii. 31.; 1 Cor. xvi. 22. 23.; 2 Cor. xiii. 14.; and 2 Tim. iv. 22. Of some of these there are different manuscript readings, but they are sufficiently numerous to show that it was no uncommon thing to prefix the Article to this title.

* The reader will also have remarked that his Lordship, in the words last quoted, mentions the effect that would be produced by the presence of the Possessive Pronoun ἡμῶν;—that this “ would make the Article necessary.” The fact being so, it deserves the more notice, that, generally speaking, the Writers of the New Testament have preferred this way of expressing the title, namely, ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, (C. V. *Our Lord Jesus Christ*; literally, “ *The Lord of us, Jesus Christ,*”) to any other that has been noticed. It occurs about fifty times: that is, they have most commonly used that form which makes the Article indispensable. This renders

it the more evident that, when they adopted another form which excludes the Article, (as in the passage which has given rise to this digression), they did it for the express purpose of giving to their words that sense which such construction demands.

Bishop Middleton, as I have before had occasion to notice, has “ shown that the Article as “ used originally, and even by later writers, was “ no other than the Pronoun ;” and that it “ al- “ ways indicates the subintellection of the Par- “ ticipule of Existence, when that Participule is “ not expressed or otherwise implied :” for example,—“ *Ὁ ἀνὴρ* must signify, He or the Male, “ *being, or assumed to be a man.*” Thus, according to the Doctrine laid down by his Lordship, 2 Thess. i. 12., when the Participule of Existence is supplied, must and can only be rendered, (when translated literally) “ *According to the “ grace of Him [being or] who is the GOD of us and “ LORD, Jesus Christ.*”—With this result before us one may wonder how it could ever be made a question, Whether the Greek embraced one or two persons? which is just the same thing as to doubt Whether “ *Him* ” be singular or plural?—Whether the English words “ *HIM who is our “ GOD and LORD, Jesus Christ,*” mean *one or more than one person?* “ *The Rule,*” as we have seen remarked by Bp. Middleton, “ both as it re-

“specters diversity and identity, has been observed “by the sacred Writers: and” we may again ask, with himself, “Where is the instance in “which it has been violated?”

CONCLUSION.

In the passages that have been examined (not including 1 Tim. v. 21. and 2 Tim. iv. 1., the readings of which are disputed) the name JESUS stands connected with ὁ Χριστὸς (*the Christ, Messiah, or Anointed*), with Σωτῆρ (*Saviour*), with Κύριος (sometimes *Lord*, sometimes *JEHOVAH*), and with ὁ Θεὸς (*GOD, or THE OMNIPOTENT*), in such a manner, that all of these Nouns are applied to him as names or titles:—in 2 Pet. ii. 10. we have “*THE LORD and SAVIOUR, JESUS CHRIST;*” in 2 Pet. i. 1. “*THE GOD and SAVIOUR of us, JESUS CHRIST;*” in Tit. ii. 13. “*THE GREAT GOD and SAVIOUR of us, JESUS CHRIST;*” in Eph. v. 5. “*the Kingdom of THE MESSIAH and GOD*” (i. e. *of him who is the Messiah and God—or the Christ and God—or the Anointed and God*); and in 2 Thess. i. 12. “*our GOD and LORD, JESUS CHRIST.*” In none of these instances can the Nouns, thus associated, relate to any other person than the one named,—JESUS CHRIST,—according to the regular rules of the language, and the invariable

usage of those writers whose native tongue was the Greek. Dr. Wordsworth says (p. 132.) “ I have observed more, I am persuaded, than a thousand instances of the form ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ Θεὸς (Ephes. v. 5.); some hundreds of instances of the form ὁ μέγας Θεὸς καὶ Σωτὴρ (Tit. ii. 13.); and not fewer than several thousands of the form ὁ Θεὸς καὶ Σωτὴρ (2 Pet. i. 1.); while in no single case have I seen (when the sense could be determined) any one of them used but only of one person.”

In addition to what we have seen declared by the Inspired Penmen of the Epistles of the New Testament, respecting the Divinity of our Lord, I shall only add, that I have purposely avoided noticing other passages in which the same doctrine is taught, only because in these the more common modes of construction are followed in the original, and Translators in general have found no difficulty in rendering them correctly into the respective languages in which they have delivered themselves. I may also notice, in passing, that, in many places in the New Testament, where Θεὸς (*God*) stands alone, and is therefore commonly understood to mean *God the Father*, the term, when the context is properly understood, will be found to have reference not to *The Father* but to *our God and Lord Jesus Christ*.

I should next proceed to examine some of the passages in the Apocalypse, which, when rightly translated, teach the same doctrine that we have seen established in the Epistles; but as these, and matters connected with them, will necessarily occupy a considerable space, it is thought better that they should form the subject-matter of a separate Dissertation.

DISSERTATION THE SEVENTH.

ON CERTAIN COMBINATIONS OF NOUNS OF PERSONAL DESCRIPTION, WHICH ARE FOUND IN THE APOCALYPSE.

IT has already been noticed (in *Dissert.* iii. §. 1.) that, by means of the Septuagint translation, a Greco-Hebrew idiom—the same that was employed by the Elders among the Greek Jews, in teaching the law of Moses and expounding the Prophets,—had been established and perpetuated, and with which it is indispensably necessary that biblical students who apply themselves to the original should make themselves well acquainted; and that, in the Apocalypse in particular, we have this idiom, under a divine sanction, and adapted to the Christian dispensation. But there are other circumstances connected with the Apocalypse in reference to this idiom, that call for particular attention, because, at first sight, they seem to stand at variance with the rules of the Greek language.

On account of the Hebraisms (as they are called) which abound in this book, some critics

have assigned it a Hebrew Original. This I have no doubt is the fact; but not in the sense in which they use the term. They conceive the Greek to be a translation from a Hebrew manuscript. I consider the Greek, on the contrary, to be the original writing, but, as is evident from the book throughout, to be, nevertheless, in a great measure, a real translation: that is, I conceive the language used in the Vision to have been the Hebrew; and the fact is, I think, proved, by the Hebrew terms which occur in the book, and to which the Amanuensis has frequently thought it necessary to add an explanation; and, therefore, in committing the things seen and heard to writing, and doing this in the Greek language, he was necessarily obliged to perform the office of a translator. In either case the inference is the same;—that those peculiarities which mark the Greek of the Synagogue should be found to abound in the Apocalypse.

The following causes also have contributed not a little to perplex critics, and therefore demand particular attention:—

First.—Effects produced by the introduction of Definitions, and of translations or explanations of terms, employed in the narrative; and—

Secondly.—The employment of Hieroglyphical

or Symbolical terms, of personal description, in some other way than as **Attributive Nouns**.

To these, and some other particulars connected with our present subject, it may be well to devote distinct Sections.

§ 1. *Of Definitions and explanations of terms furnished by the Writer of the Apocalypse.*

OF the introduction of **Definitions** I have already had occasion to take some notice in **Dissertation iii. § 1.**, and more particularly when treating of the name **JEHOVAH** in **Dissertation v.** But it is necessary that we should here bestow some farther attention upon this subject, as the change of construction with which these **Definitions** and explanations are accompanied, has led **Critics**, who were not aware of their existence and use, to charge the inspired penman with violations of grammar. In **Rev. i. 4.** John wishes the benediction of *grace and peace to the seven Churches in Asia*, ἀπὸ τοῦ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος,—rendered in the **Common Version**, “*From him which is, and which was, and which is to come.*” The **Greek** reader will at once perceive that the **Preposition** ἀπὸ, which never governs any **Case** but the **Genitive**, after being here followed by an **Article** in the **Genitive**, is followed by three **Articles** in the **Nomi-**

native case; and this will perhaps strike him with the more surprize from seeing that the next words, *καὶ τῶν ἑπτὰ πνευμάτων*, “and from the seven spirits,” follow the usual Greek construction: but his surprize will lessen when he reflects (see Dissert. v.) that ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, represent here the *indeclinable* Hebrew Noun יהוה, JEHOVAH. The Hebrew not admitting, like the Greek, inflection in the oblique cases, the Writer puts these defining terms in what a Grecian would call the Nominative, should he overlook the care which John has taken to intimate, that they are to be taken as a Genitive, by his prefixing to them the article τοῦ in the Genitive case. That these terms are employed as a Definition is quite evident in Rev. i. 8., as already pointed out in the Fifth Dissertation. Nor is the passage in Rev. i. 8. the only one in which the Apostle has given this Definition. In iv. 8. we meet with “*Holy, holy, holy ΚΥΡΙΟΣ the THEOS,*” to which John immediately adds the same definition (only giving that of Θεὸς first) “*The OMNIPOTENT, the He Was, and The Being, and the Coming One.*” I translate the words as literally as possible, to show that all the Apostle intends is, to express the *past, present, and future* times of the Verb of existence יהוה as noticed above. In ch. xi. 17. we meet with these words: “*We thank thee, Κύριε ὁ Θεὸς ὁ*

“ παντοκράτωρ, ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ᾄων,” in which again all the words after Θεὸς are a definition, and should be read in parenthesis : and here it is remarkable that the whole term יהוה seems not to have been employed, (for, as already stated, it is evident that all the dialogue of the Apocalyptic vision was in Hebrew,) but only יהוה [Hovah], the י [yod], the sign of the future, being left out, because the time of Christ’s second coming is anticipated : for, when he shall have come, he will no longer be ὁ ἐρχόμενος, *the Coming One* : accordingly this term is omitted in the definition in this place, and also in xvi. 5. where it again occurs.

But another reason, not yet assigned, calls for farther notice respecting such definitions. In all the versions the terms which, in Rev. i. 8., follow “ *I am the Alpha and the Omega saith Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς,*” are rendered as additional titles, appropriated to himself by the Alpha and the Omega, but which, in the form in which they appear, if considered as titles, would involve an anomaly ; for these terms, by the interposed Conjunctions and Articles, would express *three* individuals. This difficulty is got over, to be sure, by referring to the Verb, *saith* (λέγει), which is in the singular ; but this is to compromise the grammar of the Writer, where there is no necessity ; for the words are not those of the previous Speaker, but of John, performing the office of a

philologist, and are not intended to be taken in construction with the Verb. But will not the same objection lie against the terms $\delta \ \acute{\omega}\nu \ \kappa\alpha\iota \ \delta \ \eta\upsilon \ \kappa\alpha\iota \ \delta \ \epsilon\pi\chi\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$, considered as those of John, as would when considered as those of *the Alpha and the Omega*? No; for John does not apply them to a *person*, but to the *name* of a person, which is quite another thing; and his definition simply affirms *three distinct propositions*, as being included in the name Κύριος , when this Noun is employed to represent the Hebrew name **JEHOVAH**, any one of which, independent of either of the others, may be asserted as involved in the term, which he simply declares has this threefold meaning: **THE BEING**, that is, **He** who has being in himself, who is being in the abstract, and therefore the cause of being to every thing that has existence; *also*, **THE HE WAS**, that is, the being of whom alone it can be affirmed that he always *was*—always had existence—without a beginning; *and* **THE COMING ONE**, **He** who is *without end of days*. The third proposition however includes another idea:—“*the Coming One*” has reference, in particular, to what the **OMNIPOTENT** has made known respecting himself, that he will come to judge the world.

Instances of this kind occur frequently in the *Apocalypse*, that is, words put in the Nominative, where, from the intention of the Writer not

having been understood by critics, they have objected to their accuracy in a grammatical point of view, insisting that they should have been put in another Case. Thus in the 5th verse of the first chapter we read *καὶ ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστὸς*, and from JESUS CHRIST *the faithful witness*: here the Nouns Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ are, according to regular usage, put in the Genitive, being preceded by ἀπὸ, which never governs any other Case; but the words that follow are in the Nominative. The reason, though at first sight not so apparent, is at bottom the same as in the preceding example of this kind of construction, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστὸς representing here the *indeclinable* Hebrew noun אָמֵן, *Amen*, as may be seen in ch. iii. v. 14, where, having expressed the Hebrew word in Greek letters—“*thus saith THE AMEN*” (ὁ ἀμήν),—the Writer instantly gives a Greek translation of the Hebrew term, adding ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστὸς, thereby intimating that, wherever he uses this Greek expression, he speaks of him who, in the Old Testament scriptures, is called “*THE AMEN* :” it is owing to a similar cause that the words which follow these in the text, namely ὁ πρωτότοκος ὁ ἀρχων, *the First-born* from the dead, and *The Prince* (or *Ruler*), are also found in the Nominative. The Apostle here applies other two *indeclinable* Hebrew Nouns to JESUS

CHRIST, viz. בכור [*bechor*] and עליון [*elioun*], thus informing the reader that these epithets, applied to the *Messiah* in Psal. lxxxix. 27, belong to JESUS CHRIST—OR, in other words, that he alone is the *Messiah*; and by the other words which he introduces,—“*from the dead*,”—explaining the sense in which he is called “*the first-born*,” in the Psalm from which John takes the epithet. In the Common Version the supplement “*my*” alters the sense of the proposition, which is, “*I will make (or constitute) him FIRST-BORN, [I will constitute him] ELIOUN (the Most High),*” or, according to John’s translation, “*THE PRINCE (OR RULER) over the kings of the earth.*” But these and similar definitions, translations, and explanations, introduced into his work by the Writer of the Apocalypse, shall not be insisted on farther at present, as they necessarily must come into discussion in another work (should the author be blessed with health sufficient to enable him to finish it), to which the present volume is intended as a prelude. Enough, however, has been said to prove that they involve no violation of Grammar. Had they been put into that form of construction for which critics have in vain been looking, the whole sentence in which any of them occur would have conveyed a different sense from that intended by the writer, and the church would have lost that important instruc-

tion which these, and such like, definitions, and explanations, were intended to communicate.

It may be remarked respecting these definitions and explanations, that, generally, their existence being once known, they are easily discovered, being commonly put in the Nominative case, and so glaring that this very circumstance led to the idea that the book is written in barbarous Greek ; but let the Greek reader, wherever he finds these “ barbarisms,” pass them and proceed till he comes to words in proper construction with those which preceded them. He will then find that he has got the writer’s entire sense ; the intervening terms being merely parenthetical : and when these supposed intruders are not followed by words in construction with those that went before, they are to be considered as in some way explanatory of some of the preceding terms that were found in proper construction.

§ 2. *Of the junction of Attributive Nouns with Symbolical terms,—and particularly with τὸ ἀρνίον, THE LAMB.*

THE second particular which has contributed, not a little, to perplex translators, and, consequently, to obscure their versions, is the frequent employment of Hieroglyphical or Symbolical

epithets in the Apocalypse, not as Attributive Nouns, but in some other way : as, for example, τὸ ἀρνίον, THE LAMB. The first place in which this Noun occurs in the Apocalypse is in ch. v. 6., “and I saw in the midst of the throne and of the four animals and in the midst of the Elders, ἀρνίον, A LAMB,” &c. Here, conformably to the rules of the language, this Noun appears without the Article, being its first introduction. In the case of any particular lamb, the recurrence of the same lamb would require the article, and it would of necessity be subjected to the rules that apply generally to common Nouns ; but when, on the recurrence of this very term, we find that it is not used in its *proper* but in *some other sense*, though we may expect to find it preceded by the Article, to intimate that the *Lamb* intended is the same that had been mentioned before, we must first enquire in what sense the term is employed before we can decide how far it is to be considered, in other respects, under the dominion of the rules that apply to Nouns used in their common and proper acceptation, or to Attributives personified. Now it so happens that throughout the Apocalypse the Noun ἀρνίον (excepting in one instance ch. xiii. 11. presenting no difficulty) is never employed as a common Noun, or even as an Attributive, in the common acceptation of these terms. It is always em-

ployed as a *Proper Name*, and that in a manner too which puts it out of the common rules; at least I know of no similar examples, nor do I know where they could be found, unless some work could be pointed out composed on the same principles as the Apocalypse. The singularity arises from the blended use of common and of Hieroglyphical language, and preserving the proprieties of each throughout. In Rev. v. 6. a Hieroglyphical or Symbolical *Lamb* is seen in the midst of a symbolical throne (or seat) and of four symbolical animals; and whenever mention is afterwards made of *this Lamb*, it is, according to rule, invariably preceded by the Article,¹ to show that this and no other lamb is alluded to; and is at the same time used as a Proper Name, as already noticed, but with this peculiarity, that it is a *Hieroglyphical Proper Name*. Now it is easy to conceive that, were the whole language of the Vision Hieroglyphical, this circumstance would produce no alteration whatever in the construction of the sentences, however much it might affect the sense or the interpretation: but the case is otherwise; for, in the same sentences, common Attributive Nouns,

¹ The common Greek Text presents an exception in ch. xiv. 1., but the best Mss. and the ancient versions read τὸ ἀρνίον—the *Lamb*; and Griesbach and other critics here admit the Article into the text.

and having their usual application, are found blended with, or united to, Hieroglyphical terms; and if we fetter the terms of *two* distinct languages by the same rules that would govern them if they both belonged to *one*, it is not only possible, but absolutely certain, that we shall sometimes not only miss the sense, but entirely pervert it.

This Hieroglyphical Proper Name is often preceded by **Attributive Nouns**, and joined to them by the common Copulative *καὶ*; and, always having the **Article**, as well as the **Attributives**, translators have generally rendered the passages in which these combinations are found, in such a manner as to make the **Attributives** represent *one* individual and the proper name *another*; precisely as they would have been called to do had the latter been also an **Attributive**. Thus the words, ἡ Σωτηρία τῷ Θεῷ ἡμῶν τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου καὶ τῷ ἀρνίῳ (vii. 10) are rendered in the authorised version, “*Salvation to our God*” “*which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb,*” making the **THEOS**, who sits on the throne, one person, and the **LAMB** another person; and yet the intention of the writer (as will be proved hereafter) is quite different: his meaning, when properly understood, is this: “*The salvation be to*” “**THE MIGHTY ONE** *of us* [or, *to our GOD*] (who “*is*) *the one sitting upon the throne, and (who is)*

“**THE LAMB.**” The mistake originates, not from the presence of the Article before ἀρνίῳ, (for by no rule of the language could it be excluded) but, from the Translator’s treating this Noun as an Attributive, the Conjunction καὶ being present, which (were this Noun an Attributive) would have referred it to some other person than *the* THEOS. Once taking up the idea that two persons were spoken of, there was no difficulty in making this appear certain in the translation, by inserting the preposition “*unto*” (*unto* the Lamb), which was no more required, though the Noun be in the dative case, than before the second dative τῷ καθήμενῳ; and, had they done the same with this dative, they would have given the mere English reader *three* persons, for the translation would then have been,—*Salvation unto our God, unto the one sitting upon the throne, and unto the Lamb.*

From what attention I have been able to give to this subject it appears to me evident, that when the Hieroglyphical Proper Name is applied to the individual indicated by the Attributive Noun or Nouns going before,—or, *vice versa*, when these Attributives are applied to the person to whom “**THE LAMB**” is immediately after applied as a *Proper* (Hieroglyphical) *Name*,—then “*the Lamb*” has the article, for the same reason that this *name* would have it, were no

Attributive present, namely to indicate that the same individual that was seen *in the midst of the throne*, and no other, is the one in the mind of the Writer ; and the Conjunction *καὶ* is used, only to tie an Attributive or Attributives of *common language* to a Proper Name belonging to *another language*—the *Hieroglyphical*. That this is the fact, whatever may be the rule on which it is founded, I am well persuaded : but as it is of much importance that the fact should be placed beyond all doubt, I shall lay before the reader the leading steps by which I was led to perceive it, and, consequently, to follow out the results to which it leads respecting some very interesting passages in the book now more particularly under consideration.

§ 3. *Of the Lamb in the midst of the throne.*

THE indispensable points in the investigation in which we are engaged are, to ascertain the principal personage or personages brought forward in the Vision ; and to settle, with precision, to what person or persons the different Attributives and Proper Names, whether common or Hieroglyphical, which occur throughout the Apocalypse, are appropriated by the Amanuensis, or by any of the speakers in the Vision.

In prosecuting this enquiry it might have been

allowable to take for granted some particulars, which are admitted by all Christians; being clearly taught in other parts of the New Testament; but as the author believes the Revelation to be the first divine communication, published under the Christian dispensation—and coming too from *the Prophet like unto Moses*, who delivered the first written divine communication to the children of Israel,—that is, believing *the great christian Prophet* to have, in this respect, as well as in others, been like *the great Prophet of Israel*, he soon became persuaded, that, if not mistaken in his opinion,—that the Apocalypse is the foundation prophecy of the New Testament record,—he should be able to find the relations which the different Names and Attributives in this prophecy have to each other, from the prophecy itself, independently of the other writings of the New Testament; and, under this conviction, he thought it advisable, at least in the outset of the present enquiry (whatever use may be made of these writings afterwards), to confine himself to the information and evidence afforded by the prophecy itself. He mentions this, that the reader may acquit him of inroaching unnecessarily upon his time, in proving some facts which none might be inclined to dispute; for, to himself at least, considering the Apocalypse as the first divine Christian record, the evidence would

appear less satisfactory, were we obliged to have recourse for it to other books written subsequently:—not that the facts would be less true in themselves, but only, that, as to the Apocalypse, the argument would be less conclusive, if drawn from any other source.—To proceed then—

In the midst of the throne, John saw “a Lamb,” Rev. v. 6.; otherwise called, in the preceding verse, “*The Lion of the tribe of Judah, The Root of David.*” These three names, or epithets, indicate the same individual.

Who “*The Root of David*” is, we are plainly taught in Rev. xxii. 16.—“*I JESUS have sent my messenger to testify unto you these things I am THE ROOT, and The offspring of DAVID.*”—Here we have the name “JESUS” identified with “THE ROOT OF DAVID,” that is, with “THE LAMB.” JESUS then is the individual called, “THE LION OF THE TRIBE OF JUDAH”—“THE ROOT OF DAVID”—“THE OFFSPRING OF DAVID,” and “THE LAMB *in the midst of the throne.*”

The Lamb, the individual who *opens the sealed book* (Rev. ch. vi.), that is, “*The Root of David,*” continues “*in the midst of the throne,*” (ch. vii. 17.) But JESUS is “*The Root of David*” (ch. xxii. 16.)—Therefore JESUS is the individual who continues *in the midst of the throne.*

The Lamb is described, in Rev. v. 6., as *having* seven horns, and seven eyes, “*which* [eyes] are “ (or symbolise) τὰ ἑπτὰ πνεύματα τοῦ Θεοῦ, *The “ seven spirits of God.*”—The individual who dictates the seven epistles to the churches in Asia, designates himself, in the Epistle sent to the church in Sardis, as, “*the one having* τὰ ἑπτὰ “ πνεύματα τοῦ Θεοῦ, *the seven spirits of God.*”—Here we have *The Lamb* identified with him who commanded John to send these epistles to the churches. *The Lamb*, then, *The Root of David*, that is, JESUS, is the author of the seven Epistles; and, consequently, all the titles and descriptive epithets which are appropriated to himself, by him who speaks in these epistles, belong to him who is called “*The Lamb*,” and who is called “*Jesus, The Root of David.*”—Is this JESUS any other than the one called CHRIST?

In the Epistle addressed to the Church in Laodicea he styles himself, “**THE AMEN**, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός, *The Faithful Witness*,” Rev. iii. 14; and, in ch. i. 5, the inspired Amanuensis of the Apocalypse informs us, that “**JESUS CHRIST**” is, “ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός.” Thus **JESUS THE MESSIAH** is identified with **JESUS THE ROOT OF DAVID**, who is **THE LAMB** *in the midst of the throne*:

Again.—**JESUS CHRIST**, addressing the Church in Thyatira, calls himself “**THE SON OF**

GOD—the one having τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ ὡς φλόγα πυρός, καὶ οἱ πόδες αὐτοῦ ὅμοιοι χαλκολιβάνῳ, *his eyes as a flame of fire, and his feet like to fine brass,*” (Ch. ii. 18.); which is part of the description that **John** gives of one “*like a son of man,*” whom he saw *in the midst of the golden lamp-stands*, girt with a golden girdle, “his head, even the hair, white as white wool, as snow, and οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ ὡς φλόξ πυρός, καὶ οἱ πόδες αὐτοῦ ὅμοιοι χαλκολιβάνῳ, *his eyes as a flame of fire, and his feet like to fine brass,*” (Ch. i. 14, 15). Here then we find **THE SON OF GOD**, in the likeness of *a son of man*, **JESUS CHRIST**,—the one who sent the **Epistles** to the **Seven Churches**, (and who has before been found identified with **THE LAMB**)—identified with him who was seen (in the habit of a **Priest**) “*in the midst of the seven golden lamp-stands*” (Ch. i. 13.), or, as expressed in Ch. ii. 1., “*walking in the midst of the golden lamp-stands.*”

Thus it is evident, that the person seen *in the midst of the golden lamp-stands* was **JESUS CHRIST, THE SON OF GOD**; that he was the individual who *dictated the Epistles to the Seven Churches*; that he is the one called, in Hebrew, “**THE AMEN,**” which **John** renders in Greek, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστὸς, “**THE FAITHFUL WITNESS;**” and also called “**THE ROOT OF DAVID,**” and “**THE LAMB who is in the midst of the throne;**” and, consequently, that whatever is predicated

of any of these names, titles, or epithets, is affirmed of one and the same individual, though in different relations, answerable to the different characters and offices in which he has been graciously pleased to exhibit or describe himself in the Vision, and in the record thereof, delivered to the Christian Church in the Apocalypse.

The reader will observe that, on this point, only such passages have been quoted as were necessary to identify the person to whom they are applied. A few others must necessarily be examined hereafter,—and only a few;—for to notice all the things predicated of the same individual would be, in some measure, to enter on an explanation of the prophecy, which, however, is not the object of the present volume. The reader will also notice that some of the terms of personal description which have been adduced belong to *Common*, and some to *Hieroglyphical*, language. This is absolutely necessary to be attended to; for the strict proprieties of each are preserved in each respectively, and the diversity of style, which this occasions, is one of the causes which have led Commentators to assume a diversity of persons in passages which we shall find refer to the same individual.

§ 4. *Of the Throne,—the Kathēmenos or Sitting One,—and the Book concerning the Right Hand of the Kathēmenos.*

HAVING identified JESUS CHRIST, *the SON OF GOD*, with *THE LAMB in the midst of the throne*, it is necessary that we should now make some enquiry respecting this Throne. It is obvious that it is the same *θρόνος* that John saw set *ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ*, *in the heaven*, as he states in Ch. iv. 12. ; for every thing that follows, down to Ch. v. 6., where the Lamb is mentioned as *in the midst τοῦ θρόνου*, *of the throne*, is only a description of that throne and of things connected with it. Where this throne is described, it is introduced without the Article ; but wherever the same *throne* or *seat* is in other places alluded to, it always appears with the Article ; and wherever other thrones are mentioned, they may always, without difficulty, be distinguished from this, by their adjuncts. Observe then, this throne is always in the singular number : is a *single seat for a single person* ; nor does the term admit of the idea that we attach to a bench or form, on which more than one can be accommodated. Accordingly the inspired Writer informs us, v. 2., that he beheld, upon the throne, a *καθήμενος*,—“ *a sitting one*,” or “ *one sitting* ;” introducing this participle without the Article : but whenever he speaks

afterwards of this personage, he always calls him ὁ καθήμενος—“*The sitting one* ;” invariably employing the Article, to show that this and no other *Kathēmenos*, is the one in his mind. In fact this term, in reference to this throne, is so used that it may be considered as a kind of title, appropriated to the individual who is the occupier of *this Seat* (See ch. iv. 9, 10.—v. 13.—vi. 16.—vii. 15., &c). The plural is never used in reference to the occupation of this throne. There is, then, but *one Kathēmenos* ; nor does the fact, that this very *Kathēmenos* himself [for it will be proved hereafter that he is the same] speaks of granting to others to *sit with him IN his throne, even as he is set down with his Father IN his throne* (Ch. iii. 21.), at all prove that more than one are sitting ON the throne ; for here we have the throne governed by the Preposition ἐν (IN), but in all the other places the governing Preposition is ἐπὶ (UPON) ;—the former expression is employed metaphorically, and means that the individuals shall participate in the power of the throne (for they are constituted *Kings*, and are to *reign* upon the earth, Ch. v. 10., xx. 6.)—but the latter is used in its more obvious sense, and applied to the individual who is represented as filling, occupying, or SITTING UPON *the throne*,—as being *in the midst of the throne* ; and this one is *The Lamb* (Ch. vii. 17). From this it follows

that whatever other names are given, in this book, to the *Kathēmenos* (*the sitting one*), they are names, or *Attributives*, applied to him who has the *Hieroglyphical Proper Name*, "*The Lamb*;" but the passages in which they occur, combined with this hieroglyphical name, having, as already noticed, been generally translated in such a manner as to make them refer to another person, precisely as if a *plurality* had been mentioned as sitting on this throne, (an idea completely excluded by the text throughout the whole of the *Apocalypse*), it may be necessary to show, by other arguments, that *the Lamb*, only and exclusively, is the individual who, in another character, is called *the Kathēmenos*, by whatever other titles or names he may be designated. Before entering, however, on these, let us ascertain, if possible, the cause or causes which have principally contributed to produce the idea of two persons being spoken of, where there cannot possibly be more than one in the mind of the *Writer*—though, indeed, he may contemplate that individual in more than one character.

It is obvious that the opinion, taken up very early, that the writer of the *Apocalypse* frequently disregarded the rules of the Greek language, was calculated to beget, in the minds of *Critics* and *Commentators*, a notion that they might impute to him any license whatever; even

a total violation of grammar, in the most common expressions; especially when by so doing they were enabled to make out a sense to their liking, in passages of which they could not discover the meaning, when interpreted according to the sense put by them on the terms employed. The first verse of Ch. v., on which I have before had occasion to animadvert (see Dissert. iii. § 1.), respecting *the Book ἐπὶ τῆν δεξιάν, on (or concerning) the right hand, (that is, concerning the Power) τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου, of the one sitting on the throne*, is a passage precisely of this description. Not perceiving the meaning of the strong Hebraism here employed for *Power*, they took the expression literally, though at the expense of the Writer's grammar; for had the writer meant to express a book *in* the right hand, he would not, along with the Preposition ἐπὶ, have used the accusative case τῆν δεξιάν, but the genitive, τῆς δεξιᾶς. This violence put upon the grammar of the writer, (namely, construing his words as if he had been speaking in the genitive, when, on the contrary, they should have been interpreted agreeably to the case in which he has put them, whether the Critic could discover the meaning or not ¹) would contribute not a little to

¹ This remark is not intended to apply to the translators of the Common Version or of any of the more early modern versions, though all of them exhibit the same inaccuracy; for the first modern scholar who throw any light on the na-

beget and propagate the idea that "*the sitting one*," mentioned in the 1st verse, must be a *different person* from the individual who is afterwards described, in *v. 8.*, as *having taken the book*,—and, further on, *as opening its seals*: and this idea, once entertained, would, (if erroneous,—which we shall soon ascertain,) tend to lead to corruptions of the text. In fact, in *v. 7.* of this chapter we have a striking instance of this:—some early scholiast, unable to comprehend how or in what sense *the Lamb* could be said to *come and take the right hand of the one sitting on the throne*; and observing that, in the following verse, *the Lamb* is said to *have taken the book*; and having taken up the idea, that *the book* mentioned in the 1st verse, was *IN the right hand of the one Sitting on the throne*; wrote on his margin, or interlined in *v. 7.*, the words τὸ βιβλίον, "*the book*;" thus making *the Lamb take the book out of the right hand of the one sitting upon the throne*; and thus—if a sup-

ture of the Greek Prepositions was Dr. James Moor, Greek Professor in the University of Glasgow, in an Essay published so recently as the year 1766: but it applies forcibly to the ancient Commentators, who, by their erroneous interpretations, tacitly charged the writer with barbarisms; and it certainly applies, with some force, to those versions of the Apocalypse which have appeared since the publication of Moor's Essay, of which there are nine, perhaps more. This Essay has been reprinted in that useful work *The Classical Journal*: Vol. iii, 23.

plement was necessary and he had used a proper one—making it impossible that “*The Lamb*” and “*The Kathēmenos* (or *sitting one*)” could be the same individual. But no supplement was wanted, nor could any one be introduced that would not change the Writer’s meaning, which is simply this,—that the one called “*The Lamb*” is the same of whom it had been predicted, that he should come and occupy *the right hand*—that is—*the power of JEHOVAH*; that he had come accordingly, and *taken to him this power*. This is a mode of speech quite common to the writers of the Hebrew Scriptures, and especially in reference to *the Messiah*, as, for example, in Psalm cx. 1., “*JEHOVAH said unto ADONAI, Sit thou on my right hand* (i. e. occupy the power of Jehovah) *until I make thine enemies thy footstool.*” This is said of him who, by *the oath of Jehovah*, is constituted *a priest for ever, after the order of Melchizedek, v. 4.*; and is by our Lord himself applied to “*the Messiah*” in Luke xx. 41, 42.: “*How say they that the Messiah is David’s son? since David himself saith, JEHOVAH said unto my Lord, ‘Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool.’*” In this 7th verse of the 5th chapter of the Apocalypse we have a striking instance of the injury done to the sacred text by the ignorance of transcribers; but happily the Alexandrian and many of the best

MSS. have escaped corruption in this place: and,—now that it is shown, that the Writer made no improper application of the Preposition ἐπι with the Accusative τὴν δεξιάν; that he speaks of a book which has FOR ITS SUBJECT, *the right hand, or the power of the Kathēmenos*, and not of a book IN *his right hand*, as must have been supposed by the person who first presumed to alter the text,—there cannot, I would hope, be much danger of this corruption being entailed on the divine record (though Junius, Walton, Mill, Wetstein, Griesbach and other good critics have retained it); and the idea of two persons being found in this passage must be abandoned, as being altogether contrary to truth. In concluding this part of my argument I beg, once more, to remind the reader, that the Preposition ἐπι never means, when governing an Accusative, position *in situ*, but always *tendency on its object*, in some way or other; and often takes, as in the case we have been considering, precisely the sense of the English preposition “*on*,” when applied to a book *on* any particular subject, as a book *on* Algebra, *on* Power, *on* the Apocalypse.¹

¹ An extract from Professor Moor’s Essay, alluded to in a preceding note, may in this place prove acceptable to some of my readers.—“With respect to *motion* and *rest*; some prepositions express only the one of these; and then they

govern only one case. Others express both; and then they govern two cases; one, when they express *motion*, the other, when they express *rest*. By *motion*, in this inquiry into the signification of the Greek prepositions, I always mean *progressive motion*; or, in common language, *motion towards*. When a Greek preposition expresses only motion, the one case which it governs is *always* the *accusative*; or case of the active verb; by a very proper and natural analogy in language; as all external action implies *motion towards* that we act upon. If my hand strike the table, it must move towards the table. When a preposition expresses only *rest*, or *situation*, the one case which it governs is *never* the accusative, but always one of the other two oblique cases, the genitive or dative. When the same preposition expresses *both* motion and rest, it governs *two* cases; when motion, always the accusative, as before; when rest or situation, always one of the other two; not interchangeably, but invariably; the *one* or the *other* of the two. Thus the Greek ἐπί, which answers precisely to the English preposition *upon*, expresses both motion and rest. We say equally, *the ball is FALLING UPON the ground*; or, *is LYING UPON the ground*; in Greek, ἡ σφαῖρα πίπτει ἐπὶ ΤΗΝ γῆν; and, ἡ σφαῖρα κεῖται ἐπὶ τῆς ΓΗΣ; the difference of case governed, expressing distinctly the difference of acceptation meant; even suppose the verbs were not expressed. For, ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, by itself, would show that *motion upon*, that is, *progressive motion pointing upon*, was meant; and, ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, *rest upon*, or, *situation upon*; but not interchangeably, ἐπὶ τῇ γῇ; if only rest, or situation, was meant, and nothing further. For, when, besides the two cases appropriated to express *motion* or *rest* in general, a Greek preposition governs a third case, it then expresses some one particular, and remarkable mode of the general signification. Thus, ἐπὶ, with the third case, the dative, expresses *close upon*; either in *place* or in

I have no doubt that some of the difficulties which oppose the right understanding of this book, are to be ascribed to the temerity with which early transcribers and critics presumed to alter the text, to make it speak, according to their ideas, better Greek. Where the manuscripts present various readings I am much in-

time ; that is, *next-behind*, or *next-after* ; for example : ἐπὶ ἐμοὶ, when meant of *place*, signifies *next-behind me* ; when meant of time, *next-after me*. So, ὙΠΟ, answering precisely to the English preposition *under*, with the accusative expresses *motion under* ; that is, *motion tending under*, or *coming under* ; with the genitive, *rest*, or *situation, under*. *The ball is running under the table ; ἡ σφαῖρα κυλίνδεται ὑπὸ τὴν τράπεζαν.* *The ball is lying under the table, ὑπὸ πῆς τραπεζῆς.* ὙΠΟ likewise governs the dative, and then it expresses such particular modes of *under*, as we would express by saying, *protected under*, *subject under*, *directed under* ; as, ὑπὸ τῷ ναῷ, *under the protection of the temple* ; ὑπὸ τῷ βασιλεῖ, *subject under the king*. To give one instance more. Εἰς and ΠΙΠΟΣ both signify *to* ; but, with this difference : *eis* signifies *motion to*, and that only ; therefore governs only the accusative ; *πρὸς*, on the contrary, *never* signifies *motion to* ; but expresses any other kind of *relation to* ; being of the most general and extensive meaning of all the Greek prepositions, and answering to the English expressions, *relating to*, *with relation to*, *with respect to* ; and it governs the accusative, in this its principal and primary signification ; but it governs also the dative, and then it signifies those particular *relations to*, which we express in English by the words *close to*, or *at* ; or, by the words *united to*, *joined to*, *added to*."

clined to believe, with Bengel and Michaelis, that what may at first sight appear the smoother reading, is more to be suspected as the corruption, than that which may seem more uncouth; for it is easy, in almost every such case, to see an inducement operating to produce the former, when no satisfactory reason can be assigned for any change of the text to produce the latter. Very particular attention should therefore be paid to the various readings in the Apocalypse; and here I shall notice one connected with the subject before us. In this chapter (the 5th), after the Lamb takes the book, the animals and elders fall down before *the Lamb, and sing a new song*; and an innumerable company of *angels around the throne, and the animals and the elders* (and consequently around *the sitting one*) are then heard saying, “*Worthy is the Lamb that was sacrificed to receive power,*” &c.—“*blessing, and honor and power be TO THE ONE SITTING UPON THE THRONE,*”—καὶ τῷ ἀρνίῳ,—C. V. “*and UNTO THE LAMB,*”—a mode of expression which, as hitherto understood, refers to *two persons*,—the *sitting one*, and *the Lamb*; and in the Common Version this is marked, as strongly as possible, by introducing the preposition “*unto.*” In the Alexandrian MS., one of those which have preserved the true reading in the 7th verse, this passage appears without the conjunction

καὶ: it reads thus, τῷ καθυμένῳ ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου τῷ ἀρνίῳ, “to the one sitting on the throne, the *Lamb*,”—making the sitting one and the *Lamb* one person. Two of the Slavonian Codices collated by Dobrowski also reject the καὶ; and, did all the MSS. read thus, it would be impossible for the most fastidious opposers of the Apocalyptic Greek to evade the inference. But though there may be instances in which, from internal evidence, the reading of a solitary manuscript might be justified against an host of Codices reading differently, it would be rash to conclude, on the authority of those that reject the καὶ in this instance, that the reading is spurious; since, in all the other places where the same words occur, the Alexandrian exhibits the καὶ, like the generality of manuscripts and early versions; and though it be possible that, in all the passages, the καὶ has been interpolated, to mark the diversity conceived to be taught in the early part of the 7th chapter—and certain, that, could this interpolation be proved, it would tend very much to shorten the present enquiry—yet it seems by no means probable that in all the passages, in so many codices as have been collated, such numerous interpolations could have been effected, without any escaping, except two or three, and these only in *one* of the passages. It seems then more reasonable to conclude that, in

this instance, the Alexandrian MS. presents a corrupt reading ; and that, possibly, we owe the corruption to some individual who, knowing the Hebrew idiom, imagined that the presence of the *καὶ* might induce a belief of two persons being spoken of, when, he knew, from the context, that but one could be in the mind of the writer. And if we owe the error (for both readings cannot be right) to any idea of this kind operating on the mind of a transcriber, it is possible that his intended remedy involved an impropriety, not quite obvious at first view, but which a little consideration may render evident; for it strikes me that by placing “ the *Kathēme-nos*” in immediate concord with “ *the Lamb,*” the latter would be represented as *sitting*, which is a posture altogether inconsistent with the propriety of the symbol,—a point strictly attended to by the writer throughout the whole of this prophecy. And this naturally leads me to offer a few observations respecting the language employed when JESUS CHRIST, in reference to *the throne*, is spoken of in the character of THE LAMB; for in this character he is never said *to sit*; no, nor *to stand, on the throne*, in the proper acceptation of these terms; though, from the words ἀρνίον ἐστὴν ὡς ἐσφαγμένον, which in the Common Version are rendered “ *stood a Lamb,* “ *as it had been slain,*” it has, without enquiry,

been assumed, that this expression has relation to *posture*,—that the Lamb is here said *to stand on the throne*. This, along with the circumstances that have already been noticed, has tended to prop the false idea, that the *Kathēmenos* and *the Lamb* must, necessarily, mean different individuals, as the Lamb is represented as *standing*, while the other term indicates one who does not stand, but is *seated on the throne*. I mean not here to assume that both of these terms—*The Kathēmenos*, and *The Lamb*—refer to the same individual: all that I have now in view is to show, that the passage before us furnishes no proof of their diversity, and that, if these terms indicate different individuals, the proof must be found elsewhere. The term ἐστῆκός, rendered “*stood*,” is the neuter Participle Preter of the verb ἵστημι, *I stand, place, set, make to stand*, i. e. *establish, ratify, confirm, &c.* The Greek having Participles for all its numerous tenses, few only of them can be directly rendered in English, which has properly only two, and hence the difficulty which critics often experience in translating them perspicuously. The case before us presents a striking instance of this, for the Participle here has no relation whatever to *animal posture*, and the sense cannot be given in English without a circumlocution or an expansion of the term. To obtain the precise meaning of the ex-

pression, the context must be strictly attended to. The Lamb spoken of is one *slain* or *sacrificed*, and this Participle must have relation to this *slaying*, being connected therewith by the Particle *ὡς*, denoting *the manner* in which something was effected—this *something* refers to the Lamb as either the *agent* or *instrument*, and the participle *ἑστηκός* to *the thing effected* and *so continuing*,—and the words that follow inform us, *how?*—*ὡς ἐσφαγμένον* (another Neuter Participle Preter, and therefore not capable of being accurately rendered in one word, but strictly meaning) *as one having been sacrificed*. The relation of the different terms being established, it becomes evident that *ἑστηκός* expresses what had been effected, in some way or other, by *the Lamb* having been thus sacrificed: he served to *ratify*, or *establish and perpetuate*, that which required a sacrifice for *confirmation*, namely *a covenant*. In this view the verb *ἑστημι* answers precisely to the Hebrew verb *קִּיּוּם* (*Kum*), when applied to *confirmation* or *ratification* by a sacrifice; and accordingly is the one employed in the Septuagint for this Hebrew verb, as in Gen. vi. 18. and ix. 11., *στήσω τὴν διαθήκην μου*, *I will establish my covenant*; Gen. ix. 9. *ἐγὼ ἀνίστημι*, *I establish*, &c.; Exod vi. 4., *ἑστήσα*, *I have established my covenant*. We have then, in this passage, nothing about “*a lamb standing*,”—in reference to *pos-*

ture. The meaning of the passage, however it may best be expressed with perspicuity, is briefly this: “*I saw in the midst of the throne, and of the four animals, and in the midst of the Elders, a lamb continuing set, [or placed, or appointed] as one having been [or that had been] sacrificed.*” That is, a lamb *placed in, or standing, remaining, abiding, continuing* in the RELATION of a sacrifice:—the expression referring solely and exclusively to the official performance of a legal requirement, and having nothing to do with *standing* as opposed to *sitting*, or any reference whatever to *posture*. THE LAMB, however, is *in the midst of the throne*; and though the propriety of the symbol requires that, in reference to JESUS the α and ω (the *Alpha* and *Omega*), in the character of THE LAMB, posture should not be mentioned—for lambs do not sit on thrones,—he may, for any thing that appears to the contrary in this chapter, be the individual who, in some other character, is called *the Kathēmenos,—the sitting one*. The evidence on this point, afforded by the Apocalypse, we must inspect; but previously thereto it is necessary that we should ascertain some other particulars connected with *the throne, in the midst of which he was seen* by John.

§ 5. *Of the Scene of the Vision.*

THE scene of the vision, according to the views most generally entertained on this subject, is laid *in heaven* [that is, in heaven above,] because John saw “*a throne set in heaven ;*” but it is allowed by many that, in the description given of this throne, there is a reference to the Tabernacle and Temple service. *The throne* which John saw is believed by some to have reference to the *Mercy-Seat*, and rightly so, for around the throne are *twenty-four seats*, answering to the twenty-four chambers of the Chiefs of the priests, twelve on the south side and twelve on the north side of the priests’ court—that which immediately surrounded the sanctuary ; and to these seats are attached *twenty-four elders*, answerable to the twenty-four Chiefs of the twenty-four courses of the priests. Here also there is a *glassy sea*, answerable to the *brazen sea* placed before the sanctuary, and, consequently, *before the seat* ; likewise the *Cherubims* which spread their wings over the mercy-seat in the holy of holies, sufficiently indicated by the description given of the *four living creatures* ; and also *seven lamps of fire burning before the throne*, answering to the seven lamps of the seven-branched lamp-stand, placed before the

veil in the holy place. From this last circumstance we learn, that the place in which John saw these things, in vision, was connected with, or a portion of, the same place in which he saw the *seven lamp-stands* (ch. i. 12.)—for the one are the lamps of the other,—and from this we learn also, that the *Epistles to the seven Churches* were dictated in the sanctuary.

I have no intention in this place to enter on a particular description of the symbols beheld by John, or of the things symbolized by each respectively; but our subject requires that we should ascertain one point, on which expositors (at least such as I have seen) have hitherto talked in rather general terms, namely, What the inspired writer means by, ἐν τοῖς οὐρανῶν—not “*in heaven*,” as commonly rendered, but—“*in the heaven*,” in Rev. iv. 2. ? It is very generally believed that, in vision, John was transported to heaven above to witness the scene that was laid before him. The presence of the Article here intimates, however, that the Writer had before been speaking of the same place to which he applies this term. Monadic Nouns, it is true, often take the article without previous mention, but never, I believe, except when used in their proper sense, which no one will affirm can be the case with this Noun in this place. In fact we have seen from John’s mention of *the lamps*, that

he is still speaking of the place that contained the *lamp-stands*, in which he saw him who “*became dead but liveth for evermore, who has the keys of Death and of Hades.*” The relation which subsists between the *burning lamps* and *the stands which support them*, proves this fact; though it is rendered less apparent than it would otherwise be, in some of the translations, by the employment of the term “*candlesticks*” for “*lamp-stands*,” in ch. i., but retaining “*lamps*” in ch. iv.; for *burning lamps* have precisely the same relation to their *stands* or *supports*, that *burning candles* have to their *candlesticks*. Was John, then, *in heaven* (in the sense in which this term is usually taken) when he saw the *seven golden lamp-stands*? No: he intimates nothing of the kind. So neither was he in that heaven,—even in vision—when he saw *the throne*; but he informs us that now, on hearing *the same voice which he had heard before as of a trumpet*, (See ch. i. 10.) *he became ἐν πνεύματι*, “*inspired*,” and in this state he beheld *the throne stationed, or set, i. e. already set* (he did not witness the operation of its setting or placing) *in the heaven*. He also states another circumstance respecting the place which he calls “*the heaven* :” he saw in it *an entrance, or doorway*,—not a *door* but a *θύρα* (whence comes our English word *thorough*—a *thorough-fare*), and we must not confound the two; for in strict lan-

guage a *door* is that which closes or shuts up the *θύρα* or *entrance*. This entrance, *ἀνεωγμένη*, (a Participle Preter Pass.) *had already been opened*, before John saw it, and, from the manner of the narration, it appears that the throne was seen through the *door-way*; for the circumstance of this *door-way* or *entrance having been set open*, seems to be stated as a thing necessary, before John could see *the seat* and *the Kathēmenos*, otherwise it is impossible to discover a reason for the mention of this *door-way*, as at all necessary to the narrative. Now where a *door-way* is mentioned, the idea of an apartment or apartments naturally suggests itself to the mind; and, if John saw this *seat*, through the *opened entrance*, he must have been in one apartment and the seat in another—an arrangement that accords perfectly with *the Tabernacle*, and afterwards *the Sanctuary* in the Temple, which consisted of two apartments, commonly kept apart by *the veil* which covered the *entrance* (the *θύρα*) from *the holy place* (the outer apartment) into the *most holy place*, or *holy of holies* (the inner apartment) In the holy place stood the seven-branched golden lamp-stand, or *the seven lamp-stands* all united to one foot; and these were what John first saw in vision, when *inspired, on the Lord's day, in the Island of Patmos*. At this time he saw not the *mercy-seat*,—*the veil* therefore was

then in its place; and this veil, let it be recollected, was never drawn aside, or the θύρα, *doorway*, or *entrance* opened, but once in the year. The circumstance of *the entrance* having been opened before John's attention was called to it by *the voice, as of a trumpet*, addressing him a second time, informs us of the special day of service that answers to John's vision; for it was *on the great day of atonement*, and on that only, that the high priest (having opened the entrance by removing the veil) went into *the holiest of all*, in which were *the ark of the covenant, and over it the cherubims of glory shadowing the mercy-seat*. If the scene of John's vision, then, was the *Tabernacle* or *Sanctuary*, and not *heaven*, (in the common acceptation of this term) as has been very generally imagined, why does John call it *the heaven*?—*Because it was so called anciently*; though the circumstance has been overlooked, and, in consequence, many passages in the Old Testament in which השמים, "*the heaven*," occurs, have been misunderstood, this term having been referred to *the heaven above* in places where, in fact, it refers to the typical *sitting-place* or *dwelling*, which God had condescended to establish among the children of Israel. As this is a fact of some importance, I shall briefly state what led to the investigation of this point, and refer to a few passages in the Hebrew

scriptures in proof of what has been just stated.

Observing, what several expositors had before noticed, the coincidence between John's description of *the heaven* and the description given in the scriptures respecting *the sanctuary*, I was led to conclude that, possibly, the scene of the vision had no relation whatever to *heaven above*, but simply to *the Tabernacle on the earth*; and I was the more confirmed in this by the consideration, that those who place the scene of the vision in heaven, the place of God's actual presence, are, in some way or other, obliged to conceive the appurtenances of the sanctuary to have some *actual* resemblance, or similitude, to things that exist in the place of God's glory—an idea that appears exceedingly revolting to my mind, however much those who talk thus may invest their descriptions with a halo of high-sounding words of apparent piety, but altogether incomprehensible, about angels, and archangels, seraphims and teraphims, &c. &c. The Book, being a Revelation, is evidently intended to explain things that before were comparatively obscure. If in the question before us this book has reference to the typical and symbolical services and furniture of the Tabernacle, it must be for the purpose of yielding information from them in reference to the antitype; and to apply these typical things to existences in hea-

ven is to divert them from their purpose, and to exclude entirely all search after an increase of knowledge respecting the things that were adumbrated by these *material symbols*. Having come to this conclusion I was naturally led to ask the question, Why John should call the sanctuary, *the Heaven?* and it was this that first led me to discover what was meant by *the opened θύρα* (or *entrance*), as stated above, and thus to establish some farther points respecting the coincidence between the scene of the vision and the sanctuary, which had, I believe, entirely escaped the notice of those who have preceded me in this enquiry. But still I was not quite satisfied: the question yet remained to be answered, Why does John call the sanctuary, *the heaven?* At length it occurred to me, that, as the writer of the Apocalypse employs Hebrew phrases, and often has Jewish customs and observances in his mind, even in passages where it has been but little suspected, this might possibly be a Hebrew epithet or name, expressed in Greek, though the circumstance had hitherto escaped observation;—and thus I was led to do, at last, what I should have done at first; and which had I done, would have saved me much unnecessary labor.

The *mercy-seat* is called *God's seat*; and *the sanctuary* which contained the *mercy-seat*,

GOD'S *dwelling*, or GOD'S *sitting-place*. When Moses was commanded to construct a sanctuary, it was for a *dwelling-place* for JEHOVAH (Exod. xxv. 8.); an *ark* (a chest) was made for this dwelling-place to contain *the Tables of the Law*; over the Ark was placed the *Mercy-seat*; and on the ends of the Mercy-seat, Cherubims, covering the Mercy-seat with their wings. Respecting this seat, GOD says to Moses "*There will I meet with thee, and, ודברתי, I WILL COMMUNE*" [speak] WITH THEE, *from above the Mercy-seat, from between the two cherubims which are upon the Ark of the testimony,*" &c. (Exod. xxv. 22.) The place of the Mercy-seat being for oral communication, it gets a name answerable to this in 1 Kings ch. vi. and viii., and in 2 Chron. ch. v., where it is called, רביר, THE ORACLE (*the speaking-place*); which term, in 1 Kings viii. 6., is also put in apposition with קדש הקדשים, *the holy of holies*, or *the most holy place*, the name given to the inner apartment of the sanctuary. In the dedication of the Temple by Solomon (1 Kings ch. viii.) several things are remarkable—" *I have surely built thee an house* (says Solomon in his address to JEHOVAH) *to dwell in, A SETTLED PLACE* [Heb. מכוון, literally A PREPARED PLACE] *for thee to abide in*" (v. 13). *And Solomon stood before the Altar of JEHOVAH, in the presence of all the congregation of Israel, and spread forth his hands toward hea-*

“*ven*”—[Hebrew **השמים**, “THE HEAVEN”] *v.* 22. What heaven? Not the region of the clouds, which is sometimes called heaven, as in *v.* 35.—“*When heaven* (**שמים** without the **ה** prefixed ¹) *is shut up, and there is no rain,*” &c. ; nor *the heaven above*, for in this chapter particular pains are taken to distinguish this heaven from that of which Solomon principally speaks in his dedicatory prayer, by contrasting it with *the earth beneath*, as in *v.* 23., “*There is no GOD like thee in THE HEAVEN ABOVE nor on THE EARTH BENEATH;*” —and in *v.* 27. *the heaven of Solomon* (for he made it, as we shall see immediately) is actually put in contrast with *the heaven above*: “*But will GOD indeed DWELL ON THE EARTH? [viz. at Jerusalem] behold THE HEAVEN, [that which Solomon built for him to dwell in at Jerusalem,] yea THE HEAVEN OF HEAVENS [the heaven above], cannot contain thee, how much less THIS HOUSE which I have built.*” In fact, the place of GOD’s *dwelling* or *sitting* (for the Hebrew means either), wherever supposed to be, is called HEAVEN, which is only another name for *his dwelling-place*, whether *the heaven above* (otherwise called *the Heaven of heavens*) be intended, or

¹ In 2 Chron. vi. 26. the common Hebrew text has the **ה**, but it is an undoubted corruption. Many of Kennicott’s codices are without the **ה** in this place.

a prepared place of dwelling, made by his appointment, wherein to give a sensible manifestation of his presence on the earth. Solomon (v. 13.) had “built for JEHOVAH a house for him TO DWELL IN, a PREPARED PLACE for him TO ABIDE IN,” in compliance with what had been appointed by GOD in his command to David, “*Thy son shall build the house,*” v. 19. Observe: Solomon speaking of *this house* calls it also, *the prepared place*, putting these terms in apposition; and, consequently, whatever other terms may, in the context, be found put in apposition with either of these, must have a similar application. This being premised, let us now attend to some of the expressions which occur in the dedicatory prayer of Solomon. He repeatedly intreats,—when the people shall pray *in*, or *towards* “*this place,*” v. 30, 35.,—“*this house,*” v. 33, 38, 42.,—“*thine altar in this house,*” v. 31.,—“*the city which thou hast chosen, and the house which I have built to thy name,*” v. 44, 48.,—employing all these terms as equivalents for each other, with respect to place generally,—then *hear thou* “*in the heaven*” (שָׁמַיִם) v. 32, 34, 36, 45.,—“*in thy sitting-place, (or dwelling-place) in the heaven,*” v. 30.,—“*in THE HEAVEN, THE PREPARED PLACE OF THY SITTING, (or dwelling),*” v. 39, 43, 49.,—employing these terms also as general equivalents, as to place. But observe particu-

larly,—in the last-quoted words, “THE HEAVEN” and “THE PREPARED PLACE OF THY SITTING,” are in apposition, both meaning the same place; and let it be recollected also, that we have before seen THE HOUSE put in apposition with THE PREPARED PLACE, in v. 13.; and here the latter term is put in apposition with THE HEAVEN: “THE HEAVEN” then, and “THE PREPARED PLACE OF GOD’S SITTING,” and “*the* HOUSE,” express the same thing generally; that is, when *the house* is spoken of, *the prepared place*, or *the heaven* (for these two terms are identical as to what is expressed by them) is included in the expression,—*the heaven*, or *prepared place of GOD’S sitting*, meaning *the sanctuary and its appurtenances*, and particularly *the mercy-seat or throne of GOD*. This identity is in some measure put out of sight in the common version, by the words מִכּוֹן שְׁבֵתֶךָ in v. 39, 43, 49. having been rendered precisely in the same manner as the words מְקוֹם מִבְּתֶךָ in v. 30., “*thy dwelling-place*,”—as if there were no difference whatever in the meaning of the respective terms. But the roots קוּם, and כּוּן, have not the same signification, though they may often admit of a similar rendering. The former, as a Verb, means *to rise up—stand up,—standing*, in opposition to *sitting or lying,—to have a standing* in any sense whatever; and, as a Noun, a *standing-*

place—a *station*—a *being-place*, — and hence often answers to *place*, simply considered, embracing nothing in its signification respecting any attribute of the place; and if any thing is made known respecting the place, it is by other words with which it is connected in the sentence, as in *v.* 30., with שבתך, *thy dwelling*: but the other root, בָּנָה, means to *make ready*—*put in order*—*prepare*, &c.; and hence, whether it can be rendered *place*, when used as a Noun, depends on the nature of the *prepared thing*, or the purpose for which the action of the Verb has been put forth; thus if the preparation is a *being-place* for a something to rest on, the word is then rendered, *a foot*—*a base*—*a pedestal*—*a foundation*, &c.; but if materials have been *put in order*—*arranged*—*prepared* for a habitation, it is, when connected with a Noun expressive of this, often rendered *place*;—but it always means *a place PREPARED*, and *SET APART for the special purpose mentioned*, as in *v.* 39, 43, 49., for a *dwelling*, or *sitting (place)*—the idea of *place* having reference to the *space* occupied by the structure, that is, to *the structure itself*, and not, necessarily, to the place on which the structure stands, or the city or country where situated, though these may often be found by the context.

From what has been stated it is obvious that the sense of the original in *v.* 39, 43, 49., cannot

be fully apprehended, if מִכּוֹן “*in the prepared place,*” be taken in the sense of מִקּוֹם, “*in the place;*” for had the latter word been found in these verses instead of the former, though “*the heaven,*” and “*the dwelling-place,*” would have been in apposition, and understood by every one to refer to the same place (as is indeed evident in the common version), the reader might have been left to conclude that “*the heaven above*” is what is here intended by GOD’S “*dwelling-place,*” and that no other *heaven* could be in the mind of Solomon; but מִכּוֹן being used in these verses, it ought to be taken in its true signification—“*IN THE PREPARED PLACE*”—namely, *the place prepared by Solomon*, as he had before expressed himself, in v. 13.,—“*I have surely built a house for thee to inhabit, מִכּוֹן לְשִׁבְתֶּךָ A PREPARED PLACE FOR THY SITTING (or dwelling),*” or, in our English idiom, “*a Session-house prepared for thee,*” for this is precisely the meaning of the expression. In v. 39., &c. his expression is, “*Then hear thou in THE HEAVEN, מִכּוֹן שִׁבְתֶּךָ THE PREPARED PLACE for thy sitting (or dwelling);*” using the very words applied by himself, in v. 13., to *the house*, and at the same time calling *THE PREPARED PLACE*, in this house, *THE HEAVEN*. *The Heaven*, then, is the place that was prepared for *sitting*; that is, for *the seat of GOD—the Mercy-Seat*, overshadowed by the Cherubims; or, in the

other words, the Sanctuary, and more especially the holy of holies, is *the heaven* of which Solomon speaks throughout this prayer. In 2 Chronicles ch. vi. we have the same prayer: v. 2. of this chapter answers to v. 13. of 1 Kings ch. viii., and exhibits the same expression in the Hebrew,—“A
 “PREPARED PLACE *for thy sitting* ;” and v. 30, 33, & 39. answer to v. 39, 43 & 49. noticed above, all of them exhibiting, “THE HEAVEN, THE PREPARED PLACE *of thy sitting*,”—this *prepared place* being, in all the passages, in the temple, built by Solomon, in Jerusalem. But in 2 Chron. vii. 1. a circumstance of great importance is noticed, which is not stated in the book of Kings :—
 “*And when Solomon had ended his prayer, and the fire descended FROM THE HEAVEN, and consumed the burnt offering and the sacrifices ; for the brightness of JEHOVAH had filled the house ; then the priests could not enter into the house of JEHOVAH, because the brightness (or glory) of JEHOVAH had filled the house of JEHOVAH.*” The answer thus given to the prayer of Solomon, in the presence of all the worshippers, gave evidence that GOD had accepted *the house, the sanctuary,—the heaven, the place prepared for his sitting* ; for the fire here spoken of descended, not from “*heaven above,*” but, from *the heaven,* THE PREPARED PLACE,—from *the cloud which covered the mercy-seat in the holy of holies.* Observe—the cloud of

glory had filled not only the inner apartment in which the priests had placed the Mercy-seat, but the holy place or outer apartment in which the priests usually officiated, so that the priests could no longer continue there (1 Kings viii. 10). All were in the court without, in that part where the altar stood, viz. before the sanctuary (See 2 Chron. vi. 11. 13.); and when Solomon had ended his prayer, fire came forth from *the sanctuary* (from which the priests had been expelled by the *luminous cloud*), *the prepared place of GOD's sitting*, THE HEAVEN, and fell upon and consumed the sacrifice!—a glorious token of divine acceptance. The coincidence of the circumstances stated respecting *this heaven—the place prepared by Solomon* for the GOD of Israel to dwell in, and those stated by John respecting *the heaven* that he describes, are very striking. In Solomon's heaven there was *a seat or throne* (the Mercy-seat), so there is in John's: Solomon's heaven was a *speaking-place* (an oracle), and from Solomon's heaven came *fire* to consume the sacrifice: from the throne described by John also proceed *voices and lightnings*, Rev. iv. 5., and the seat in each is occupied by one to whom divine honors are paid. Other coincidences have been before pointed out, and need not be repeated.

It seems to me impossible, from these pre-

mises, to come to any other conclusion than that the scene of John's Vision was the sanctuary; and that the throne which he saw, *already set in the heaven*, was the mercy-seat, seen through the *thura* [θύρα]; which, except on the great day of atonement, was always closed by the veil: but instead of seeing there a high priest of the Tribe of Levi, he saw a priest *pertaining to another tribe,—to the tribe of Judah, of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood,—even him who is a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedec.* This was the personage whom John saw in the habit of a priest “*in the midst of the seven golden lamp-stands,*” and “*having in his right hand seven stars:*”—that is, he saw him opposite the centre light of the seven, here called *stars*, and his hand occupied with the lights. It was the office of the priest every morning to trim the lamps and put them in order, and this was done by the priest seen by John, in dictating the epistles to the seven churches,—for, in Ch. i. the lights or stars are made to symbolize the *messengers* of the churches to whom the epistles were addressed.

The foregoing are not the only passages which serve to prove that “*the heaven,*” in which John saw *the opened entrance* and *the throne*, was *the sanctuary.* In proportion as the relation which subsists between the different things mentioned

in the Apocalypse is discovered, our knowledge of the particulars will be extended. This is made very obvious by the case before us; for it so happens that in other passages the place in which John was, in his vision, is actually called **THE SANCTUARY**. In Ch. xi. 1. a measuring rod is given to John, and he is commanded to measure τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, *the sanctuary of God*,—C.V. *the temple*; but the Noun ναὸς never means *the temple* generally, but always *the holy place*, though this circumstance has been overlooked by all our Translators, except Campbell.—See on this word his *Preliminary Dissertations*. The same sanctuary is again mentioned in the 19th verse of Ch. xi., and elsewhere.

From the facts that have been established we are now in a condition to proceed to another enquiry, which, however, will not occupy much time: namely,—Whom did John see *sitting on the throne, in the heaven, or holy of holies?*

§ 6. *Particulars respecting the Kathēmenos or Sitting One.*

In Rev. xxii. 12, 13. the speaker says “*Behold I am coming quickly, and my reward with me, to requite to every one as his work shall be.*” **ΙΑΜ τὸ Α καὶ τὸ Ω, ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος, ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος,** **THE ALPHA AND THE OMEGA, THE**

“FIRST AND THE LAST, THE BEGINNING AND THE END.” I have no doubt that the speaker in this passage is the same that speaks in *v. 16.*, namely JESUS CHRIST; but as commentators are not agreed on this point, I shall not take it for granted, but will establish the fact by evidence. All that I remark at present is, that, whoever may be the person, he is “THE *A* AND THE *Ω*,”—he is “THE FIRST AND THE LAST,”—he is “THE BEGINNING AND THE END.”

In *Ch. xxi. 5, 6.* *the Sitting one* (ὁ καθήμενος) declares, respecting himself, that he is, τὸ *A* καὶ τὸ *Ω*, ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος, “*The Alpha and the Omega, The Beginning and the End.*” From this we learn that he who is called THE ALPHA AND THE OMEGA, THE BEGINNING AND THE END, is THE KATHĒMENOS (*the Sitting One*), and consequently that THE ONE SITTING ON THE THRONE is the speaker in the passage quoted from *Ch. xxii. 13.* But who is this individual?—

We obtain an answer to this question, by attending to what is said by him who addresses the church in *Smyrna* (*Ch. ii. 8.*),—“These things saith ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος, THE FIRST AND THE LAST.” It has already been proved that the Epistles to the Seven Churches were dictated by JESUS CHRIST, or, as expressed in the verse from which we have just been quoting, him “*who became dead but liveth.*” Here he

informs us that he is the individual called "THE FIRST AND THE LAST;" but he who is so called is also THE BEGINNING AND THE END, (xxii. 12.) and THE ALPHA AND THE OMEGA; and, as we have seen, in the paragraph immediately preceding, also THE KATHĒMENOS, OR THE ONE WHO SITTETH UPON THE THRONE: and it has also been shown that the same JESUS, who dictated the Epistles, is also called THE ROOT OF DAVID—THE OFFSPRING OF DAVID—and THE LAMB.

Thus it is proved that the individual who, in the character or office of the Ratifier, or Confirmer of the Covenant, is called "*The Lamb in the midst of the throne,*" is, under some other aspect or in some other character, called "THE SITTING ONE, *upon the throne.*" What this other character is, the reader who has attended to what has been stated in these dissertations, will already have anticipated. The *Priest after the order of Melchizedec* must be king as well as priest—a king upon his throne.

We have seen that JESUS CHRIST, THE SON OF GOD, who is THE ONE SITTING UPON THE THRONE AND THE LAMB, is τὸ Α καὶ τὸ Ω, "THE ALPHA AND THE OMEGA." Let us attend then to what *the Alpha and Omega* himself saith in Rev. i. 8.—Ἐγὼ εἶμι τὸ Α καὶ τὸ Ω, λέγει Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς—"I am THE ALPHA AND THE OMEGA, saith

THE LORD GOD," or, saith THE GOD JEHOVAH:" not an inferior god,—one of the "Gods many and Lords many,"—but the Creator of the Universe: for *Κύριος ὁ Θεός* represent here (as has been shown) the Hebrew epithet יהוה אלהים, *Jehovah Elohim*. I need hardly remind the Greek reader that the common Greek text is here corrupt, presenting *ὁ Κύριος*, for *Κύριος ὁ Θεός*, which is the true reading, as is proved not only by the best Mss., and by the antient versions, and commentators, but by internal evidence furnished by the text itself; the words that follow, namely *ὁ ὦν, καὶ ὁ ἦν, καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, "The BEING, and The HE WAS, and THE COMING ONE," being, as has been already shown, a definition of the name *Κύριος*, when put for JEHOVAH, and the next word, *ὁ παντοκράτωρ*, "THE OMNIPOTENT," a definition of *ὁ Θεός* when employed to represent *Elohim*; which shows that *ὁ Θεός* has been dropt from the common Greek, and *ὁ* inserted before *Κύριος*. Indeed we have this point put beyond all doubt, by what is stated in Ch. iv. 8., "They cease not day nor night, saying—'Holy, holy, holy *Κύριος ὁ Θεός*'" (C. V. *Lord God*), but, according to John's definition of these words, *ὁ παντοκράτωρ*, the omnipotent (i. e. *Elohim*), *ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ὦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, the He Was, and the Being, and the Coming one (i. e. JEHOVAH). In the latter passage the order

of the definitions is changed, that of $\delta \Theta\epsilon\delta\varsigma$ being put before that of $\delta \text{Κύριος}$, but this no way alters the meaning or intention of the Writer; and as the terms in both refer to the same individual, he who is called *the Alpha and the Omega* in Ch. i. 8. is the same to whom the ascription of praise is given in Ch. iv. 8. : and, observe, the ascription to **JEHOVAH ELOHIM** is, in v. 9., declared to be addressed $\tau\tilde{\omega} \text{καθήμενον}$, **TO THE SITTING ONE upon the throne.**

I might have shortened this argument, could I, without laying myself open to the cavils of objectors, have followed the common Greek text in Ch. i. 8., which, after the words "*I am the Alpha and the Omega,*" adds, "*the Beginning and the End:*" but many Manuscripts are without the latter words; and different critics have considered them as an interpolation, as also the first clause of v. 11., "*I am the Alpha and the Omega, the First and the Last.*" I thought it better, therefore, though necessarily by a more circuitous process, to prove the application of these titles, to the individual whom they indicate, by passages, the authenticity of which is admitted by critics; and the more so, as by pursuing this method the evidence is equally conclusive, and leaves no room for those exceptions which might be taken against deductions founded on disputed passages.

To sum up the whole in few words :—JEHOVAH ELOHIM (C. V. the LORD GOD), he “*which was, and is, and is to come,*” ch. iv. 8., is “*THE SITTING ONE upon the throne, who liveth for ever and ever,*” ch. iv. 9, 10. :—He “*which is, and which was, and which is to come,*” is *the Alpha and the Omega* ch. i. 8. :—in ch. xxi. 6. *the Alpha and the Omega* (who is *THE SITTING ONE upon the throne* in ch. xxi. 5.) is called *the Beginning and the End* ; and the *Speaker* in ch. xxii. 12., who is *the Beginning and the End*, is also *the First and the Last*, and *the Alpha and the Omega* ; and in Ch. ii. 8. the one who dictated the epistles to the churches declares himself to be “*the First and the Last,*” and therefore *the Alpha and the Omega*. This personage, we have seen, was no other than JESUS CHRIST : JESUS CHRIST then, who is *the one sitting upon the throne*, is *the First and the Last, the Beginning and the End, the Alpha and the Omega*, JEHOVAH the OMNIPOTENT (C. V. THE LORD GOD) : and it has before been proved, that the same JESUS, *the Root of David* (Ch. xxii. 16.) is *THE LAMB*, who prevailed to open the sealed book ; and hence it follows, that “*the Sitting one on the throne,*” and “*the Lamb in the midst of the throne,*” are only different descriptions of the same person, JESUS CHRIST, who, by the Record before us, is proved to be, JEHOVAH THE OMNIPOTENT.

§ 7. *Of the manner in which certain passages where common Attributive Nouns are found joined to the Symbolical name, "THE LAMB," should be rendered in English, that they may exhibit the true sense of the Greek text.*

THE Reader must have perceived, that the object in view in this Dissertation is, to ascertain, with precision, the manner in which certain names and Attributive Nouns of personal description, and their combinations, in the Apocalypse, should be rendered in a version, so as to convey, in the translation, the precise sense of the writer. For this purpose it became necessary, that the true sense of *Κύριος ὁ Θεός* should be accurately understood; and this expression, as has been shown (Dissert. v.,) had been defined by the amanuensis of the Apocalypse himself, though hitherto overlooked. It was also necessary that the manner in which Attributive Nouns are combined in the Greek language, when referring to one individual, should be ascertained, —a desideratum which we have seen (Dissert. vi.) had been completely supplied by the labors of Mr. Sharp, Dr. Wordsworth, and Bishop Middleton. And, as Attributive Nouns are found, in the Apocalypse, combined, not only with Attributives, but, with Symbolical terms, and particularly with the Hieroglyphical Proper Name,

“THE LAMB,” it became also indispensable, that we should ascertain, with precision, to what person or persons this Proper Name, and these Attributives, are applied—and this from the Book itself—as, otherwise, the same uncertainty would still remain which has operated to obscure, in the versions, the sense of the Writer; a consequence not to be avoided, if names and attributes predicated of a plurality, be applied to one individual; or, on the contrary, if predicated only of one person they be applied to a plurality.

The latter we have seen is the error into which translators have generally fallen, from (as it would appear) their treating the Hieroglyphical *Proper Name*, THE LAMB, as if it were a common *Attributive Noun*; and hence, as already noticed, they have always rendered such passages as Rev. vii. 10., in a manner that makes the writer speak of two persons, when in fact he is only speaking of one—“*The salvation be to our*” “*GOD [who is] THE SITTING ONE on the throne,*” “*and [who is] THE LAMB,*”—words which are usually rendered, “*Salvation be to our God who sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb.*” The latter method of rendering makes THE THEOS (GOD) and the *Kathēmenos* one person, and THE LAMB another person; but we have seen that the *Kathēmenos* is JESUS CHRIST, the *Alpha and the*

Omega; that *the Alpha and the Omega* is **JEHOVAH THE THEOS**; that *the Alpha and the Omega*, is also *the First and the Last*, the one who dictated the epistles to the churches, namely **JESUS CHRIST**, who is *the Root of David*, **THE LAMB** *in the midst of the throne*: the former is therefore the proper rendering of this and all similar passages; for all these titles and appellations belong to the same individual, and to apply them otherwise, their identity having been proved, is to impose upon the Writer a meaning not only foreign to his sense, but which makes him contradict himself. I am not disposed to deny that such expressions as ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἀρνίου, ch. xxii. 1. (C. V. *out of the throne of God and of the Lamb*) have, at first sight, very much an appearance of two persons being meant; and, undoubtedly, were τοῦ ἀρνίου (*the Lamb*) an **Attributive** as well as τοῦ Θεοῦ, in this case, by the rules respecting the **Article** and the **Conjunction**, they would indicate two, namely, *the Theos* and *the Lamb*; but we have seen that *the Theos*, and *the Lamb*, are terms which indicate the same individual; and we have seen that *Theos* (**GOD**) is an **Attributive**, but that *the Lamb* is a **Proper Name**—and that too of a different language, the **Hieroglyphical**—and for this reason, if for no other, these terms do not come within the rules. By the evidence that has been adduced,

they both refer to one person, and therefore cannot, without error, be represented as two; and one of the terms being a Proper Name, while the other is an *Attributive*, they come not within the rules, as already said; and therefore this, and similar expressions, must be taken as predicating two distinct things, respecting the one person in the mind of the *Writer*—*He who is THE OMNIPOTENT, and who is THE LAMB*. The words quoted speak only of *one throne*—a single seat—and therefore but one person can be intended. There seems to be another peculiarity in the expression: by the order of the words it is “*the seat of the THEOS*”—he sits on it,—but we may conceive it to be *the LAMB’s seat* in another point of view,—namely, his *property*, being *the THEOS*,—though, in his character of *the LAMB*, he is not said to *sit on* but to be *in the midst of the throne*,—and it may be, that the necessity of not violating the propriety of the symbol was what dictated to the writer this form of construction, predicating by two distinct propositions, interposing the *Conjunction* between them, what might have been made evident, as to identity, by placing the terms in apposition, without the *καὶ* interposed; but in this case, as already stated, *the LAMB* would have been said *to sit on the throne*, an affirmation which the *Writer* seems carefully to avoid, when speaking of

JESUS CHRIST in this character. From these considerations the reader will see that it is impossible to render these words directly into English, so as to leave no ambiguity, without introducing expletives. The sense, as to identity merely, would be perspicuously given by rendering *καὶ*, *even*—"out of the throne of GOD, even of the LAMB;" and, in xxii. 1. this mode of rendering has been resorted to by Scarlet, the only translator, of all I have seen, who appears to have perceived the identity of the person indicated by the two terms here employed (yet in other places he has made them two): but though this translation yields the required identity (required, because John applies these and the other epithets that have been mentioned, to the same individual) it is liable to the objection already stated—that of making THE LAMB *to sit, as THE LAMB*, which John seems to guard against. By putting in the expletives, "*who is,*" this is avoided; but, notwithstanding, the other method falls in so much more smoothly with the idiom of the English language, that, on the whole, I am inclined to prefer it, provided the reader be once warned, that by rendering *καὶ* "*even,*" he is not to understand THE LAMB as being thereby represented, in that character, as *sitting*. This being kept in mind, let us see what a different aspect some other striking passages

in this book will exhibit from what they do as commonly translated, if we render them, as we are bound to do, so as to preserve the same identity which was in the mind of the Writer, as to the personage to which they refer.

We have seen already that *the Kathēmenos on the throne*, and *the Lamb in the midst of the throne*, in Ch. v., indicate the same person, but in different characters. In v. 13., for, “*Blessing and honour and glory and power be unto him that sitteth upon the throne AND (καί) unto the Lamb,*” as in all the English translations, read “*Blessing,*” &c. “*be to the Sitting one on the throne, EVEN the Lamb.*”—I hope I shall not be understood as meaning to object to the words, “*unto him that sitteth upon the throne ;*” for I have no such intention, as these words really express the true sense of the original. All I intend by preferring at present, “*the Sitting one on the throne,*” is to keep in the mind of the reader that in this and all similar passages, the Greek presents the term *καθήμενος*, to which, as a term of frequent recurrence, we have been obliged to pay particular attention, being really employed as an *Attributive*.

In ch. vi. 15, 16. “*the Kings of the earth, and the great men,*” &c. say to the mountains and rocks, “*Fall on us and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne [the Kathēmenos on the throne] and from the wrath of the LAMB*”—

read “*even (καὶ) from the wrath of the LAMB : for the great day of his wrath is come.*” The *Kathēmenos*, and *the Lamb*, as has been so often repeated (for repetition is necessary on a point which has been so little attended to), refer to the same individual, the MESSIAH—“*He shall speak to them in his wrath, and vex them in his sore displeasure. . . . Bewise now therefore, O ye Kings : be instructed, ye judges of the earth . . . Kiss THE SON, lest he be angry, and ye perish : when his wrath is kindled but a little, blessed are all they that put their trust in him,*” Psal. ii.

The passage in Rev. vii. 10. has been already noticed—“*Salvation be to our GOD, the Kathēmenos (the Sitting one) on the throne, even THE LAMB*”—“*UNTO the Lamb*” is quite improper, as the Greek has here no Preposition. In v. 11. the angels, &c. worship THE OMNIPOTENT (C. V. GOD), meaning still the same person ; and so throughout the whole chapter, the terms being changed to answer the exigency of the context, or to suit the character in which the Writer exhibits the personage to whom he applies the terms ὁ Θεός, THE OMNIPOTENT (i. e. God),—τὸ ἀρνίον THE LAMB,—*the throne of THE OMNIPOTENT*,—*the KATHĒMENOS on the throne*—*THE LAMB in the midst of the throne.*

In Ch. xiv. those who sing the *new song* “*are those following THE LAMB wheresoever he goeth*”—

“they are a first-fruit to THE OMNIPOTENT, (και) even the Lamb,” v. 4. The Lamb is here THE OMNIPOTENT ONE, (C. V. GOD), and so wherever such combinations occur as ὁ Θεὸς καὶ τὸ ἀρνίον; the sense being, as above,—*him who is THE OMNIPOTENT (or GOD), and who is THE LAMB.*—To examine minutely all the passages in which these terms occur, and have been rendered in such a manner as to exhibit two persons, where but one was in the mind of the Writer, would occupy much time, for the context affected by this mistake is, in some instances, extensive. To prosecute the enquiry farther is however not necessary, for, in one word, if the identity of the terms employed by John be kept in recollection it will be found that, in no single passage, do they indicate more than one person. But before dropping the subject we ought, at least, to attend to one most important passage to which but little justice has been rendered by the majority of translators,—perhaps full justice by none.—

Ch. xxi. 22. Καὶ ναὸν οὐκ εἶδον ἐν αὐτῇ· ὁ γὰρ Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ ναὸς αὐτῆς ἜΣΤΙ, καὶ τὸ ἀρνίον.

23. Καὶ ἡ πόλις οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχει τοῦ ἡλίου οὐδὲ τῆς σελήνης, ἵνα φαίνωσιν ἐν αὐτῇ· ἡ γὰρ δόξα τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐφώτισεν αὐτήν, καὶ ὁ λύχνος αὐτῆς τὸ ἀρνίον.

In the Common Version the 22d verse is ren-

dered,—“ *And I saw no temple therein : for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it :*”—and so also, with trifling variations, in Tindale’s translation, Cranmer’s, the Bishops’ bible, the versions of Doddridge, Wynne, Worsley, Newcome, the Unitarian version commonly attributed to Belsham, the anonymous translation of 1729, the Catholic version of CN., and the translation of 1812 by the author of the Christian Code. Nothing can mark more strongly the force of prepossession than such a version. The translators seem to have seen that *the Lamb* as well as *the Theos* is declared to be the Temple (or, more correctly, *the Sanctuary*) ; but, notwithstanding, fully persuaded, in opposition to John’s words, that these two terms indicate two individuals, they have, as if John knew not what he was saying, converted his singular verb “ IS ” [*ἔστι*] into the plural “ ARE ! ” Such a bold departure from the original, and the error which it tends to foster and propagate, cannot be too much lamented. I am happy however to be able to state that several translators have here given the substantive verb in the singular ; as the Doway version, “ *for the Lord God Almighty is the temple thereof, and the Lamb ;* ” Webster’s translation of Simon’s French, “ *was the temple thereof, with the Lamb ;* ”—Cooke’s translation, “ *is the temple of it, and*

the Lamb :”—Wakefield’s, “*is its temple, and the Lamb :*” but, with still more precision, as to the identity required by the original (for the substitute for the temple IS [*ἜΣΤΙ*] but ONE), Haweis renders the passage thus,—“*for the Lord God Almighty is the temple thereof, EVEN the Lamb ;*” and Scarlet thus, “*for the Lord God Almighty EVEN the Lamb is its temple.*” Either of these two gives, as to identity, the true sense of the Greek text, in which the expressions *ὁ Θεός* (God) and *τὸ ἀρνίον* (the Lamb) are each a nominative to the verb singular *ἜΣΤΙ*, and therefore both indicate the same individual.

Another circumstance may be noted, in passing, respecting the expression employed by John in this verse, *Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ*, commonly rendered, “*the Lord God Almighty.*” We have seen that the first two of these Nouns represent the Hebrew Nouns *Jehovah Elohim*. Here all the three are employed as a name of the Creator (for the last term is not in this place a definition of *Θεός*, or we should have had along with it the definition also of *Κύριος*), and as the first two represent Hebrew terms, it seems not unreasonable to conclude, that so must the last ; and that this is the fact will appear evident on turning to the Old Testament, to discover by what epithet the name *Jehovah* is most commonly followed, when, in addition to *Elohim*, a third

term is employed. It will instantly occur to the reader that the word צבאות, *sabaoth*, "hosts," or "armies," is often joined to *Jehovah* and to *Jehovah Elohim*; and if he take the trouble to examine the Septuagint he will find that the Hebrew term *sabaoth*, when translated (for in that version it is often retained untranslated, and expressed in Greek characters) is commonly rendered παντοκράτωρ. Thus the words יהוה אלהי צבאות *Jehovah Elohi sabaoth*, Amos iii. 13.; iv. 13.; v. 14, 15, 16, 27, &c. usually translated "the LORD, the God of hosts," are, in the Septuagint, rendered, Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ,—the precise words used by John in the passage before us: and, therefore, if it be desirable that a uniformity of diction should, where the expression is identical, pervade the translations of the Old and the New Testament, the words of John in this place, and those of the Prophet Amos, ought to be rendered in the same manner; for there can be no doubt that John is here expressing, in a Greek translation, this Old Testament name of the Creator; and so also in Rev. xv. 3.; xvi. 7., and xix. 6.,—the only places in which παντοκράτωρ is found along with Κύριος (JEHOVAH), excepting Ch. 1. 8., iv. 8., and xi. 17., where, as has been seen, it is introduced in definitions. It appears also in Ch. xvi. 14., and xix. 15., along with the Noun Θεὸς; and in both of these, the double term seems obviously to mean what John, had he

been writing in Hebrew, would have expressed by *Elohi sabaoth*, "GOD OF HOSTS," for, in both, the context has relation to armed hosts. This term, except in one other place, is found only in the Apocalypse, a book evidently cast in a Hebrew mould. The other passage in which it occurs, in the Greek Scriptures, is 2 Cor. vi. 18, where it is joined to *Κύριος*; and where, I doubt not, the expression, in any Hebrew translation of the epistle, ought to be *Jehovah sabaoth*: indeed Paul seems to have had the Apocalypse full in his mind when he wrote this passage, as may be seen by comparing the context with Rev. xxi. 3., and xviii. 4.

The 23d verse of Ch. xxi. is thus rendered in the common version: "*And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it; for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb (is) the light thereof;*"—the word "is," in the last clause, being a supplement, and so printed. All the versions introduce either "is," or "was," in the last clause, some marking the substantive verb as a supplement, but others omitting to do so. The great majority of them, like the common version, read, "*glory of God;*" but Tindale, Coverdale, Cranmer, and the Catholic version of C. N., in closer harmony with the scope of the passage, "*the brightness of God,*" and Scarlet, "*the splendour of God;*" and *ὁ λύχνος* is by some rendered "*the light,*" and by others, more

properly, "*the Lamp.*" In all the versions the supplied substantive verb "*is,*" or "*was,*" tends to hide the sense, converting the concluding clause into an independent and distinct proposition; whereas, in the text it is connected with the verb singular ἐφώτισεν, *enlightens*: that is, ὁ λύχνος αὐτῆς τὸ ἀρνίον, literally, "*the Lamp of her, the Lamb,*" is that which *enlightens her* (the city):—there is but one enlightener, and, therefore, "*the splendour of the Omnipotent*" (or God) which "*enlightens her,*" and "*the Lamp of her, the Lamb,*" are equivalent terms, both referring to the one source of the light by which the city is illuminated, and consequently indicating one person. To remove every ambiguity the conjunction καὶ should be taken in the sense of the Hebrew copulative ו (vau), which frequently requires to be rendered *even*, to make the sentence fall in with the English idiom. The verse when literally rendered, in the order of the Greek, reads thus: "*and the city hath no need of the sun or of the moon to shine in her (or it); for the splendour (or brightness) of THE OMNIPOTENT enlightens her, even the lamp of her (or it), THE LAMB.*"

The argument need not be carried farther, for the purpose for which it was undertaken; namely, to ascertain, how the Names and Attributive Nouns, which are found combined together in the Apocalypse should be translated, so

as to prevent the possibility of the reader applying them to any other person than the one to whom they are applied in the Greek text. The collateral points which the enquiry has brought under review, though of great importance, have not been dwelt on longer than was necessary for the purpose for which they were adduced; these not being the direct object of the investigation. I am not aware of a single objection that may, for a moment, be urged against any part of the general argument, except, perhaps, the reference to Ch. xxi. 5, 6., where "*the Kathēmenos on the throne*" calls himself "*the Alpha and the Omega, the Beginning and the End.*"—The objection that may be started is: that *the Kathēmenos* there spoken of may be different from *the Kathēmenos* sitting on "*the throne set in the heaven;*" for *the throne* of Ch. xxi. 5. may be the "*great white throne*" of Ch. xx. 11. This objection, however, would come with an ill grace from those who have hitherto held, that the *Kathēmenos* of both of these thrones is the same individual; though they never contemplated JESUS CHRIST as being the one upon either throne. But it so happens that, in our chain of argument, many of the links are double, and this is one of these. Let the objector take it out, if so inclined, and still the chain will remain unbroken; for "*The First and the Last,*"

Ch. ii. 8., is the one who dictated the Epistles to the Churches, namely JESUS CHRIST; and “*the First and the Last*” is “*the Alpha and the Omega*” Ch. xxi. 6. and xxii. 13.; and “*the Alpha and the Omega*” is *Κύριος ὁ Θεός*, *Jehovah Elohim*, (C. V. *the Lord God*) Ch. i. 8. and iv. 8., who is *the Kathemenos* Ch. iv. 10. It is impossible to evade the conclusion:—the *Kathemenos* (*the Sitting one*), on both thrones, is the same individual, JEHOVAH ELOHIM [*the Eternal Omnipotent*], *the Alpha and the Omega, the First and the Last, JESUS CHRIST*; who appeared in the midst of the Golden Lamp-stands; who, in the Sanctuary, dictated the Epistles to the seven Churches; who is *the Root and the Offspring of David, the Lamb in the midst of the throne*:—the same individual who hath declared, that “*He that honoreth not the Son, honoreth not the Father.*”

THE CONCLUSION.

The author is fearful that he may have failed to express himself with that perspicuity and energy of which, from the premises, the general argument was susceptible; but in whatever stronger light it might, in abler hands, have been placed, he holds the general conclusion to be completely established: for, after a truth has

been demonstrated, there is no room left for “modest diffidence” on the point. With such a torrent of evidence, all furnished by the Apocalypse itself, that JESUS CHRIST is JEHOVAH, THE OMNIPOTENT, what shall we say of a critic of considerable eminence, who has asserted, that “the true and eternal Godhead of Christ is certainly not taught so clearly in the Apocalypse, as in St. John’s Gospel?” It cannot be more clearly taught than in this book; and though John, as an inspired writer,—one taught personally by his Master while on earth, and enlightened by the Holy Spirit after his ascension—had no need to apply to the Apocalypse for information respecting the Godhead of CHRIST, in writing his Gospel,—and indeed the very nature of the history therein delivered (the life and death of CHRIST) precluded reference to the Apocalypse, in the course of the narrative,—it is not a little surprizing that, in the very outset of his Gospel, declaring this Godhead, he begins by using an Apocalyptic expression (as is indeed noticed by the critic alluded to)—a title applied to the Messiah in the Revelation; and which he instantly follows up by other expressions which evidently show that the phraseology of that book was full in his mind.—In Rev. xix. 11. John sees the *rider on the white horse* (the same who went forth con-

quering and to conquer in Ch. vi. 2.) returning as victor, bearing *many crowns*, who is called **FAITHFUL AND TRUE**, who has “*eyes as a flame of fire*,” v. 12., “*and his name is called* (v. 13., ὁ **ΛΟΓΟΣ**, the **LOGOS**) the **WORD OF GOD**.” We have seen already that he “*whose eyes are as a flame of fire*,” Ch. i. 14., is, **JESUS CHRIST**, whom John saw *in the likeness of a son of man*, i. e. *in human nature*, and who said to John “*I am THE FIRST AND THE LAST, and the Living one; I became dead, but behold living I am to Eternity*,”—the same who, in Ch. iv. 8., is called **Κύριος ὁ Θεός**, **JEHOVAH THE OMNIPOTENT**, and to whom are ascribed “*the glory and honor and power*,”—“*because*,” say the worshippers, “*thou hast created all things, and as they were made, so also, they exist by thy will*,” Ch. iv. 11.—Now what does John say in his Gospel?—“*In the beginning was the WORD, [ὁ ΛΟΓΟΣ] and the WORD was with GOD, and GOD was the WORD all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made and the WORD was made flesh [appeared in human nature] and dwelt among us.*” But—not to detain the reader,—with this torrent of evidence before us,—how much ought we to commiserate the blindness of those who persist in denying the Divinity of **JESUS CHRIST**, and, in derogation of his high characters, continue to call him “*a*

mere man—“*nothing but a man*”—“*simple human nature?*” Either the Apocalypse speaks falsely, or they are in error! Some of them indeed may be inclined to give up the book entirely,—to deny its divine authority; but if they have dispassionately attended to what has been advanced in these dissertations, they will have perceived that they must be prepared, if they insist on this, to go a great deal farther; for in the Epistles of the New Testament the divine authority of this book is acknowledged, by the quotations made from it by their respective writers, as has been shown (Dissert. II.), and, consequently the Epistles must also be given up!

Before closing this dissertation I beg to repeat that, respecting the fundamental doctrine of Christianity, established by this enquiry, I cannot but ascribe the darkness that has been imputed to the Apocalypse, on this point, principally to the wrong interpretation put on the 1st verse of the fifth chapter,—an interpretation entirely contrary to the usage of the Greek language, when the Preposition ἐπὶ governs an Accusative, and by which misinterpretation the strong, but common, Hebraism for *power* was taken, in its literal sense, for *the right hand of a person*. This misconception led to the interpolation of τὸ βιβλίον (*the book*) in verse 7.; and having thus made the text to speak of *two per-*

sons where the Writer had but one in his mind, it is no wonder that bold critics should in other places, which presented a glaring contradiction to this, have ventured to expunge words from the text. To this cause I cannot avoid ascribing the various readings presented by the MSS. in Ch. i. verses 8. and 11.; the words ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος, “*the Beginning and the End*,” in the former, and Ἐγὼ εἰμι τὸ Α καὶ τὸ Ω, ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος, “*I am the Alpha and the Omega, the First and the Last*” in the latter verse, being absent from many MSS. I have no doubt that these words are a genuine part of the text. The exclusion however must have been effected very early, for the majority of the manuscripts which omit them in the one verse, are the same that exclude them in the other; which shows that they must have had the same early mutilated prototype. The only thing that surprizes me is, that the words, “*I am the Alpha and the Omega*,” in v. 8. should, in every known Codex, have escaped the pruning hook of bold emendators. But in this verse it is possible the critic might think the speaker different from him who speaks in verse 11, though, as we have seen, the speaker is the same in both. Whatever led to the exclusion, the record has been watched over by its divine author in such a manner that the general doctrines of the Apocalypse have been pre-

served entire, and no way impaired. This, as has been shown, is so truly the fact, that the evidence stands complete, without the aid of the words excluded from these verses being required, even to strengthen it. What motive could any one have to interpolate these verses? It is impossible to assign one. Will it be said, that, possibly, he did it to establish, or assist in maintaining, a certain doctrine? This we have seen was not necessary, for the doctrine alluded to pervades the record, and is fully established without the help of the disputed words. But, on the other hand, it is easy to see a motive which might operate to cause a mutilation of these verses. I hope I shall not be understood as insinuating that these texts were wilfully corrupted, to serve a purpose; for the person who first altered them might have been very honest (however imprudent), and might have expunged the words on the idea that he was correcting an error of some former transcriber, in the copy before him. But freedoms have been used with the text, for the original autograph of the seven copies furnished to the seven churches, could not differ, but the MSS. now in existence do differ; and this difference I ascribe to the cause already assigned,—an idea that, in Ch. v. THE SITTING ONE *on the throne*, and THE LAMB *in the midst of the throne*, were distinct persons; for he

must be a careless reader indeed who cannot see that **THE LAMB** is **JESUS CHRIST**, and that he is the speaker in **Ch. i. 11.**, and if the first clause of this verse were left in, he would at once have been declared to be the person also that speaks in the 8th verse of the same chapter, and who is *the Sitting one* of **Ch. iv. 8, 9.**—making **JESUS CHRIST**, who is **THE LAMB**, to be also **THE KATHEMENOS**, contrary to the idea before taken up, that the **Lamb** of **Ch. v.** who is **JESUS CHRIST**, was there represented as a different person from **THE KATHEMENOS**. The scribe therefore who first presumed to expunge the disputed words in the 8th and 11th verses of **Ch. i.** (for I cannot but attribute the difference, in these instances, to exclusion rather than interpolation), might be strongly persuaded, that he was restoring the text to its primitive purity. But however this may be, respecting these passages, the fact established by a close examination of the structure and language of the **Apocalypse** will never be overturned ; that our **Lord, JESUS CHRIST, the ROOT OF DAVID, THE LAMB in the midst of the throne, is, JEHOVAH ELOHIM SABAOTH, THE LORD GOD OF HOSTS** : to him be eternal power and glory. Amen.

FINIS.





